

**Application Number** 07/2017/2993/FUL

**Address** The Brambles Rest Home  
Park Avenue  
New Longton  
Preston  
Lancashire  
PR4 4AY

**Applicant** Mr Guloo Virdee

**Agent** Mr Chris Weetman

1 Reeveswood  
Eccleston  
Chorley  
PR7 5RS

**Development** Erection of a block of 7 No. intermediate residential care bungalows with a linked canopy to main building, re-alignment of existing internal road together with additional car parking spaces

**Officer Recommendation** **Refusal**  
**Officer Name** **Mrs Catherine Lewis**

Date application valid 02.10.2017  
Target Determination Date 27.11.2017  
Extension of Time 28.02.2018



## **1.0 Report Summary**

1.1 This planning application would normally fall for determination under delegated powers. However, following a request from a Councillor it was considered appropriate to bring the application to planning committee for determination.

1.2 Planning permission is sought for the construction of seven bungalows to provide semi dependant, living accommodation and associated car park spaces within the grounds and physically linked to the Brambles a Care Home off Park Avenue, New Longton.

1.3 The Health and Safety Executive advise against the development due to the nature of the residential development and the proximity to a major pipe line.

1.4 The majority of the Care Home is not located within the Green Belt but the proposed bungalows would be within the Green Belt which is subject to Policy G1 of the South Ribble Local Plan. This policy restricts development within the Green Belt unless the proposal meets one of the listed exceptions which includes small scale extensions and alterations.

1.5 The Care Home has had a number of extensions in the past and it is argued that due to the approved permissions which have been constructed, any further extension would constitute a disproportionate addition. It is therefore considered that the proposal does not meet the test of being an exception by virtue of the disproportionate additions.

1.6 Therefore, the proposed development constitutes inappropriate development and is contrary to Policy 145 criterion (c) of paragraph 145 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and criterion (c) Policy G1 of the South Ribble Local Plan by virtue of the disproportionate additions to the building.

1.7 The proposed development would fall within the consultation distance of Major Hazard Sites/pipelines and advice there are sufficient reasons on safety grounds for advising against the granting of planning permission in this case.

## **2.0 Site and Surrounding Area**

2.1 The application site is an existing residential home with a total of 32 bedrooms. Located on the western side of Park Avenue a short unadopted cul de sac off Chapel Lane, New Longton, the existing 15 properties are all residential. To the north and west of the site is open countryside with the southern boundary adjacent to the residential property known as Malasia.

2.2 There are two access points to the site both off Park Avenue. One serves the main entrance to the residential car home and a secondary gravelled access operates as a service/delivery entrance which serves the rear of the Care Home where there is additional car parking. There is also an informal gravelled car parking area adjacent to this access point.

2.3 The application site includes the existing residential home which has a large garden area to the north. The garden area to the site is within the Green Belt and the majority of the property is within the Existing Built Up Area.

## **3.0 Proposal**

3.1 Planning permission is sought for the construction of seven bungalows to provide semi dependant, living accommodation and associated car park spaces.

3.2 The bungalows measuring 9.6m x 5.9m with a maximum height of 4.9m and would be linked together in an L shaped block which in itself would be attached to the main building by the construction of a canopy.

3.3 The existing access which serves the front entrance of the Care Home would be used to serve the proposed bungalows. An internal access road would be constructed across part of an area currently used as a lawn and the scheme provides for the realignment of some of the existing car park spaces. A further fourteen spaces would be provided six to the rear of the site and eight adjacent to the front of the bungalows.

3.4 The proposed extension would be constructed to match the existing Residential Care Home namely brown facing bricks, and a grey concrete tile roof.

3.5 Additional information has advised that the development is to create a mini care village concept to enable people to live independently but who may require support which would be available at the push of a call bell. Day to day personal care would not be provided however in an emergency assistance would be available.

3.6 The proposal would increase the number of staff from 35 to 40. The increase of five members of staff would include 2 full time and 3 part time posts.

#### **4.0 Planning History**

4.1 Originally the property was a four bedroomed residential dwelling before being opened as a rest home in 1984. Two applications were refused in 1980 and 1981 to erect residential properties one of which was dismissed at appeal.

4.2 Applications to increase the number of beds have been received. One was refused Ref: 07/2000/0240 due to its excessive scale in proximity to the boundary with the property known as Malasia. Planning permission which included an increase in beds from 24 to 32 was granted in 2000 which provided for a reduction in scale from the previous scheme with some development within the Green Belt (ref 07//2000/0588). The argument presented at the time referred to the relatively minor scale of the overall proposal, the unsuccessful attempts to accommodate the necessary extension outside the green belt and the local employment benefits of retaining the business at this site. These arguments were accepted by the committee and the Secretary of State when the application was referred to him as a departure case. This was not implemented (Ref 07/2000/0588).

4.3 As this application was not implemented a further application was submitted for a similar scheme occupying the same footprint but a two storey development within the Green Belt which was approved under delegated powers and has been implemented (Ref.2004/0545).

07/1976/0352 One in No. detached dwelling house. Refused

07/1976/0351 One in No. detached dwelling house (outline).Refused.

07/1977/0432 Detached dwelling (O.A.) Refused

07/1978/0857 Detached house. Approve

07/1980/0857 Two detached dwellings. Refused

07/1981/0678 Outline, Two detached bungalows refused

07/1986/0216 Change of use to residential rest home. Approved

07/1986/0545 Residential caravan. Approve

07/1986/0773 Extension to rest home for elderly. Refused

07/1987/0119 Extension to rest home for elderly. Approve

07/1987/0348 Temporary residential caravan. Approve

07/1988/0234 Single storey rear extension and dormer extension. Withdrawn

07/1988/0375 Erection of extension comprising six single bedrooms, staff room and additional residents lounge. Refused

07/1996/0163 Siting of Portable Building for Office/Storage Use. Approve

07/2000/0240 Two storey side and front extensions to provide additional bedrooms with single storey element to front. Refused

07/2000/0588 Two storey extensions to sides, front and rear with single storey element to rear (Amended Scheme) Approve

07/2004/0545 Single storey extension to front and side following demolition of existing double garage. Two storey extension to other side. Conservatory and emergency escape staircase to rear. Approve

07/2004/1259 Removal of condition 6 of permission 07/2004/0545 and revised landscaping scheme under condition 3 to permit removal of conifer trees from southern boundary of site. Approve

07/2016/1081 Erection of a block of 7 No. bungalows to provide semi-independent living accommodation together with the provision of associated car parking spaces. Withdrawn 26.06.2016.

## **5.0 Summary of Supporting Documents**

5.1 The application is accompanied by the following documents:

- Design and Access Statement,
- Planning Support Statement
- Ecological Appraisal dated January 2016
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement dated 2016

## **6.0 Summary of Publicity**

6.1 A Site Notice has been posted and neighbouring properties notified. Five letters of representation have been received which raise the following summarised comments:

- Concern about the nature and size of the extensions on a very small and private road.
- Issues of maintenance as the road is in private ownership. Concern about the impact of the construction traffic on the un- adopted road. The proposal would create extra traffic which would cause more maintenance issues and residents would have to contribute to the upkeep.
- The area is Green Belt and there is a need to respect this designation.

- Parking is already an issue on Park Avenue as staff and service vehicles, park on the road rather than within the site. Concern is raised about cars parking on both sides of the road.
- Concern about safety due to the lack of footpaths, children playing in the street, and the extra traffic generated by the development.
- Impact of the proposed construction upon the existing residents within The Brambles.

## **7.0 Summary of Consultations**

**Health and Safety Executive:** Advise against the development due to the nature of the residential development and the proximity to a major pipe line.

**LCC Highways:** Initially no objection in principle but require a total of 14 car park spaces and clarification about the proposed refuse collection measures. The applicant has been advised to investigate possible improvements to the adopted road to support pedestrian movements. In response to the submission of a revised plan the car parking arrangements are acceptable for the existing and proposed development and acknowledge that the site is accessed from a privately maintained road. No objection subject to conditions controlling Wheel wash facilities and construction management plan.

**Arboriculturalist:** No objections subject to a condition protecting the trees during construction.

**Housing Services (South Ribble):** The nursing home is located within New Longton. An aging population and housing for older people has been identified as a priority in the South Ribble Housing Framework

**Ecology Services:** Same response as the previous application in that conditions controlling a precautionary approach to bats, protection of birds, tree protection, control of lights, and bio diversification measures are recommended.

**National Grid Plant:** No objection.

**Environmental Health:** Comments to be reported at the meeting.

**United Utilities:** Require conditions to ensure that the foul and surface water are discharged separately, and that a surface water management scheme is submitted in line with the hierarchy set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

## **8.0 Policy Background**

8.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in Chapter 13 seeks to protect Green Belt land and sets out the Governments intentions for green belt land. It states that “A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt.” However, there are exceptions to this, among which are buildings for agriculture or forestry; the provision of outdoor sport and recreation facilities or for cemeteries; extension or alterations to existing buildings provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; the replacement of buildings providing new building is within the same use and not materially larger; the limited infilling in villages and limited affordable housing for local community needs; the limited infilling or partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites.

### **8.2 Core Strategy**

**Policy 17: Design of New Buildings** expects the design and new buildings to take account of the character and appearance of the local area and effectively mirrors criterion in Local Plan policies QD1 and QD2.

**Policy 22: Biodiversity and Geodiversity** relates to biodiversity and geodiversity and seeks to conserve, protect, enhance and manage the biological and geological assets of an area.

**Policy 27: Sustainable Resources and New Development** seeks to ensure sustainable resources are incorporated into new development.

## **Central Lancashire Rural Development SPD Paragraphs 53-56**

### **8.3 South Ribble Local Plan**

**Policy G1: Green Belt** in the South Ribble Local Plan 2015 mirrors the NPPF's general presumption against inappropriate development and planning permission will not be granted for the construction of new buildings unless there are very special circumstances.

**Policy G16 Biodiversity and Nature Conservation** Seeks to protect, conserve and enhance the Boroughs biodiversity and ecological network.

**Policy G17: Design Criteria for New Development** seeks to ensure development proposals do not have a detrimental impact on existing buildings or on the street scene; does not have a detrimental impact on landscape features such as mature trees, hedgerows, ponds and watercourses; does not prejudice highway safety, pedestrian safety or the free flow of traffic and provide the required number of off-street car parking spaces to the standards set out in **Policy F1**.

## **9.0 Material Considerations**

9.1 The main issues include:

- Whether the proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt for the purposes of Policy G1 of the South Ribble Local Plan 2015 and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework);
- The effect on the character and appearance of the area; and
- If inappropriate development whether there are any other considerations which clearly outweigh the potential harm to the Green Belt by way of inappropriate development, and any other harm, so as to amount to the very special circumstance necessary to justify inappropriate development.
- Impact of the development upon the Major hazard pipeline.

9.2 Brambles Residential Care Home is located towards the end of the cul de sac known as Park Avenue and the curtilage of the site includes a substantially extended property and a large grassed area that forms the amenity space of the Home. There are two vehicular accesses: one to the main entrance which provides for seven spaces and a secondary access approximately 30 metres north from the main one which provides access to the rear of the Home, and some car parking.

9.3 The Home is located to the south of the application site and is within the settlement of New Longton. The proposed development is however within the Green Belt as defined on the policies map which accompanies the South Ribble Local Plan (2015).

9.4 The government attaches great importance to Green Belts and makes clear through its policy that the essential characteristic of them is their openness and their permanence. The Framework is a material consideration in the determination of planning proposals. Paragraph 143 of the Framework makes clear that inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and Paragraph 145 sets out the limited purposes for which the construction of buildings will not be considered inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

9.5 South Ribble Local Plan Policy G1 states that new building in the Green Belt will be deemed inappropriate unless it is for one of a given number of purposes. Policy G1 is set out below:

Policy G1:

*“As set out in the NPPF, there is a presumption against inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Planning permission will not be given for the construction of new buildings unless there are very special circumstances:*

*Exceptions to this are:*

- a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;*
- b) provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;*
- c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;*
- d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;*
- e) limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan; or*
- f) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.”*

9.6 Paragraph 145 of the NPPF states:

A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

- buildings for agriculture and forestry;
- provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
- the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- limited infilling in villages,
- limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites);and
- limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:

-not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or

-not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.

9.7 The applicant has submitted a planning statement which argues that as the proposal would be an extension to an existing building the proposal would fall within the list of exceptions (bullet point three) and would not constitute inappropriate development. The applicant advised that the existing size of the Home is some 3426m<sup>3</sup> in volume and the new extension would equate to 1503m<sup>3</sup> an increase by some 44%.

9.8 The applicant provides a section on the legal argument in terms of case law and advises that the courts have held case law must be taken in to account by the decision maker. Some of the case law quoted by the applicant advises that the prime importance of Green Belt is the protection of openness and secondary the prevention of encroachment. The applicant states that the proposal needs to be assessed against Paragraph 89 of the Framework which defines those forms of development which are acceptable in the Green Belt. They argue that the proposal is for an extension to a residential care home and as such the extension will be in the same use class which is all that is required by Paragraph 88 (now Paragraph 145) The applicant then questions whether the extension would be disproportionate or not.

9.9 The applicant has stated that house extensions in the Green Belt can be up to 50% as part of the Council's guidelines and not considered disproportionate. (This figure is taken from the Central Lancashire Rural Development Supplementary Planning Document). As the proposal represents a 44% increase in volume of the current Home, the applicant has argued that this would not be disproportionate. They further argue that the majority of the existing buildings are outside the Green Belt, within the settlement of New Longton thereby creating a unique situation. As house extensions can be up to 50% and the LPA has no other guidance it would be illogical and inconsistent of the LPA to take a different view to what is disproportionate on other buildings. The applicant concludes that the proposal would not be disproportionate over and above the existing Home and therefore is not inappropriate development.

9.10 The premises has been subject to a number of extensions and the calculations by Council Officers demonstrates the following:

The original development of the house and garage (planning permission 78/0857) provided for a volume of 542.40m<sup>3</sup>.

Due to previous extensions of 2539m<sup>3</sup>, currently the premises has a volume of 3081.39m<sup>3</sup> which equate to an overall increase of 428% from the original dwelling house (regardless of land allocation).

Part of these extensions are within the Green Belt (899.61m<sup>3</sup>) as a percentage of the current premises this equates to 29% within the Green Belt.

The proposed scheme would be solely in the Green Belt and would provide for 1422.86 m<sup>3</sup>. This would result in an increase of 2322.47m<sup>3</sup> in the Green Belt which would be 51.6% of the overall scheme.

9.11 Concern is expressed about the assumptions associated with the volume calculations put forward by the applicant. It is acknowledged that the proposed extensions would be approximately 50% of the total volume of the existing Home. However, both the Framework and Policy G1 of the Local Plan make clear that extensions should not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The National Planning Policy Framework at Annex 2: Glossary, defines the original building as "*A building as it existed on 1 July 1948 or if constructed after 1 July 1948 as it was built originally*". The planning history for the site demonstrates that the original building was a dwelling house but was granted planning permission from a residential dwelling of modest construction to a rest home in 1986 (Ref. 07/1986/0216).



9.12 It is acknowledged that the site is unusual in that a small part of the nursing home together with part of the grounds are within the Green Belt. However, the applicant has designed a high level canopy to link the existing Home to the proposed bungalows in an attempt to meet the classification of an extension within the Green Belt. There does not appear to be any functional need for the canopy and it is considered that such a feature would be contrived.

9.13 The Rest Home has had a number of extensions in the past and it is argued that due to the approved permissions which have been constructed, any further extension would constitute a disproportionate addition. It is therefore considered that the proposal does not meet the test of being an exception by virtue of the disproportionate additions.

### **Very Special Circumstances**

9.14 Planning policy does provide for inappropriate development within the Green Belt provided that very special circumstances can be demonstrated.

National policy at paragraph 144 of the NPPF states:

*“When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.”*

9.15 It is acknowledged that the site is uncommon in that part of the curtilage is within the existing built up area and part within the Green Belt. Furthermore, the proposed development of seven semi-independent units to provide for additional care facilities adjacent to a Residential Care Home does have merit. The Housing Officer has advised that South Ribble has an aging population and housing for older people has been identified as a priority in the South Ribble Housing Framework. However, it is considered that this aspect would not outweigh the harm that would be caused by the proposed development within the Green Belt.

9.16 The proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt contrary to policy G1 of the South Ribble Local Plan and the Framework. It would also conflict with one of the purposes of the Green Belt which is to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

9.17 Substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt and very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. The applicant has advised that the development should be assessed under Paragraph 89 (now 145) and does not need to submit very special circumstances. This submission is not accepted.

9.18 Therefore, it is considered that very special circumstances have not been demonstrated which would outweigh the harm caused to the Green Belt by the proposal.

### **Character and appearance**

9.19 The development is located on a large, flat, grassed area and the north and west boundaries are landscaped with a belt of trees which restrict some views in to the site. Further, there is conifer planting to the eastern boundary which partially reduces views from the eastern boundary. There are two other residential properties located further north which have large residential curtilages.

9.20 The proposed site layout demonstrates an L shaped, single storey development with the access road realigned. Car park spaces would be provided in between the proposed development and the Rest Home. Although the materials of the proposed development would match the existing rest home and the proposal is fit for purpose, the design of single storey units and form of the proposal would appear as an incongruous feature within the countryside.

9.21 It is therefore considered that the development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the site and wider area and is contrary to criterion (b) of Policy G17 of the South Ribble Local Plan.

### **Openness**

9.22 The Framework states that openness is one of the essential characteristics of Green Belts. However, it is considered that the introduction of new development on a large rectangular area would lead to encroachment and extend the urban sprawl. Thereby, contrary to the aim of Paragraph 133 which states:

*“The fundamental aim of Green Belt Policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence.*

9.23 The applicant has advised that the proposal is appropriate development and previous case law has determined that where development is found to be ‘not inappropriate’ it should not be regarded as harmful to the openness or purposes of the Green Belt. It is the officer’s view that the proposal is inappropriate.

### **Highway Issues**

9.24 Lancashire County Council Highways that advised that the level of traffic generated by this proposal would have a negligible impact on safety and capacity in the immediate vicinity of the site.

### **Car parking**

9.25 The existing Residential Care Home provides for a total of 32 beds and under planning permission 2004/0545 required 7 car park spaces: Five to the front car park with 1 disabled bay and a further three provided at the rear. The site also includes a gravelled area adjacent to the secondary access used as a car park.

9.26 The applicant has submitted plans to demonstrate that the existing access which serves the front entrance of the Care Home would be used to serve the proposed bungalows. An internal access road would be constructed across part of an area currently used as a lawn and the scheme provides for the realignment of some of the existing car park spaces. A further fourteen spaces would be provided six to the rear of the site and eight adjacent to the front of the bungalows. The secondary access would no longer be required.

9.27 LCC Highways has advised that the proposed site layout, access arrangements and off road parking provision (total of 22 parking spaces) are all acceptable for the proposed bungalows and the existing care home, as shown in drawing 16/025/L01 revision D.

9.28 Concerns have been raised about the state of the un-adopted road. LCC Highways has advised that the site is accessed from a privately maintained road which falls outside the applicant’s area of ownership. The road does not currently meet LCC’s adoption standards (i.e lighting, drainage footways). However, conditions controlling wheel cleaning and a construction management plan to be submitted and approved are recommended.

## **Impact upon Residential Amenity**

9.29 The side wall of nearest residential property known as Lambourne House is located some 16m away from the rear elevation of the proposed bungalows. It is considered that the separation distance is acceptable and the amenities of the adjacent property would not be unduly affected. Further, the boundary treatment which would separate this property from the proposed development includes a high hedge over 3m in height with some trees.

9.30 Therefore, it is considered that the proposal meets the design requirements of Local Plan policy G17 and the adopted Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2005) which is relevant in terms of separation distances etc.

## **Other Matters**

9.31 The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) is a statutory consultee for certain developments within the Consultation Distance of Major Hazard Sites. Their advice is that there are sufficient reasons on safety grounds for advising against the granting of planning permission. This is due to the proposed development falling within the pipe line associated with National Grid Gas PLC. On the previously withdrawn application we consulted National Grid Gas and although they raised no objection the HSE still maintained their objection. The HSE has verbally advised that they would be prepared to provide a written statement if the application were to be refused as part of any appeal process.

## **Wildlife**

9.32 The application is accompanied by an Ecological Appraisal Report dated January 2016. Ecology Services has advised the following:

### **Bats:**

Evidence of bats were found in the loft of the care home and that precautions are taken throughout the construction works to avoid any disturbance to the bat roost. A condition controlling this aspect is recommended.

### **Birds:**

As there are trees in close proximity to the development a condition protecting nesting birds is recommended.

### **Mammals:**

During the construction phase a condition to ensure that small mammals for example hedgehogs are protected is recommended.

**Trees:** All trees to be retained on site should be protected and a condition is recommended to address this issue.

### **Biodiversity Enhancement:**

In line with Section 11 of the NPPF, Ecology Services recommend that opportunities for biodiversity enhancement should be incorporated in to the new development. These could include bat boxes, bird boxes and native shrub planting. Policy G16 of the South Ribble Local Plan encourages biodiversity and this could be controlled by condition.

## **10 CONCLUSION**

10.1 The construction of seven bungalows to provide semi dependant, living accommodation and associated car park spaces within the grounds and physically linked to the Brambles Care Home is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy G1 of the South Ribble Local Plan. The majority of the Care Home is not located within the Green Belt

but the proposed bungalows would be and Policy G1 of the South Ribble Local Plan restricts development unless the proposal meets one of the listed exceptions which includes small scale extensions and alterations.

10.2 The Care Home has had a number of extensions in the past and due to the approved permissions which have been constructed, any further extension would constitute a disproportionate addition. It is therefore considered that the proposal does not meet the test of being an exception by virtue of the disproportionate additions.

10.3 The proposed development would cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt and as very special circumstances have not been provided the development should be refused.

10.4 The proposed development would fall within the consultation distance of Major Hazard Sites/pipelines and advice there are sufficient reasons on safety grounds for advising against the granting of planning permission in this case.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Refusal.

### **REASONS FOR REFUSAL:**

1. The construction of seven bungalows and a linked canopy to provide semi dependant, living accommodation and associated car park spaces within the curtilage designated as Green Belt would amount to disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building and is therefore inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is contrary to Paragraph 145 criterion ( c ) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Policy G1 criterion (c) of the South Ribble Local Plan.
2. The construction of seven bungalows and a linked canopy to provide semi dependant, living accommodation and associated car park spaces within the curtilage designated as Green Belt would be inappropriate development which would cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt, contrary to Paragraph 143 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
3. The proposed development is within the Consultation Distance of a major hazard pipeline. An assessment indicates that the risk of harm to people at the proposed development site is such that HSE's advice is that there are sufficient reasons on safety grounds, for advising against the granting of planning permission in this case.
4. The proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The applicant has not demonstrated 'very special circumstances' to justify the proposal. As such the proposal is contrary to Paragraph 144 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Policy G1 of the South Ribble Local Plan.

### **RELEVANT POLICY**

#### **NPPF National Planning Policy Framework**

**POLG1 Green Belt**

**POLG17 Design Criteria for New Development**

**POLG16 Biodiversity and Nature Conservation**

**Note:**

