

Application Number:	2019/0573	Application Type:	Full
Proposal:	Conversion of 4 no. Garages to form a single dwelling, with associated amenity space and car parking.	Location:	Land Adjacent 1 Lumb Cottages, Meadow Park, Ramsbottom
Report of:	Planning Unit Manager	Status:	For publication
Report to:	Development Control Committee	Report Written:	10/02/2020
Applicant:	Mr Lee Jeys	Determination Expiry Date:	10 th February 2020
Agent:	Mr Richard Gee		

Contact Officer:	James Dagleish	Telephone:	01706 238643
Email:	jamesdagleish@rossendalebc.gov.uk		

REASON FOR REPORTING	
Outside Officer Scheme of Delegation	
Member Call-In Name of Member: Reason for Call-In:	
3 or more objections received	✓
Other (please state):	

HUMAN RIGHTS

The relevant provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 and the European Convention on Human Rights have been taken into account in the preparation of this report, particularly the implications arising from the following rights:-

Article 8

The right to respect for private and family life, home and correspondence.

Article 1 of Protocol 1

The right of peaceful enjoyment of possessions and protection of property.

1. RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee approve planning permission subject to the conditions set out in this report.

2. SITE

The building, the subject of this application, is a single storey freestanding garage block constructed of red brick under an asbestos sheet roof. It is located in a small pocket of residential development approximately 680 metres south west of the junction of Aitken Street and Meadow Park on land forming part of the Green Belt.

The building currently houses six single garages. The land immediately to the east of the garages comprises a substantial area of hard surfacing which is marked out and used for the parking of cars. Access to the site is from Lumb Village to the north.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

2018/0400 - Demolition of 3 no. garages and erection of 2 no. dwellings, with associated amenity space and car parking – (Refused and appeal dismissed).

2019/0288 - Full: Conversion of 4 existing garages into a 2 bed dwelling, with associated amenity and parking provision (Refused).

4. PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought to convert four of the six garages into a single two bed roomed dwelling with associated parking space provided to the front and associated garden space provided to the front and rear. It is understood that the other two garages are separately owned and are to remain in use for the parking of vehicles.

Further to the refusal of application 2019/0288, the applicant has submitted further information to address the three reasons for refusal of that application, as follows:

1) It has not been demonstrated that the building is of permanent and substantial construction and therefore capable of being converted to a single dwelling without significant re-building. The development cannot reasonably be viewed as an 'exception' to green belt policy. No 'very special circumstances' have been demonstrated for allowing a development of this nature, and the development would represent inappropriate development that would, by definition, cause harm to the green belt. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the provisions of Policy 1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2) It is not possible, from the information submitted, to properly ascertain the likely effect that the development will have upon the trees to the immediate west and south west of the site. These trees are considered to have collective amenity value and, in the view of the Local Planning Authority, their loss would significantly harm the visual amenity of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the provisions of policies 1, 18, 23 and 24 of the Core Strategy and Sections 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3) There is a reasonable possibility of great crested newts living in the vicinity of the site. However, it is not possible, from the information supplied, to properly ascertain the likely effect that the development may have upon the newts should they be present. In the absence of such information there is a possibility that the development could potentially harm a protected species. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the

provisions of policies 18 and 24 of the Core Strategy and Section 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The applicant has provided the following response to the reasons for refusal of application 2019/0288, and has submitted supplementary reports accordingly:

“In response to Reason 1, we are pleased to submit a Structural Inspection Report prepared by ARG Design Consulting Engineering, which confirms that the building is of permanent and substantial construction and readily convertible without extensive works.

In response to Reason 2, we are pleased to submit an Arboricultural Impact Assessment Overview by Bowland Tree Consultancy.

In response to Reason 3, we are pleased to submit an Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey & Daytime Bat Survey by Rachel Hacking Ecology, which confirms that, due to the limited connectivity between the ponds and the site and the lack of terrestrial habitat within the construction zone, GCN is not considered to be a constraint on development and no further survey work is necessary.”

The submitted plans themselves are essentially the same as the previous application, with a few amendments and the inclusion of a full landscaping scheme.

5. POLICY CONTEXT

National

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

Section 2 Achieving Sustainable Development

Section 5 Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes

Section 8 Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities

Section 9 Promoting Sustainable Transport

Section 11 Making Effective Use of Land

Section 12 Achieving Well Designed Places

Section 13 Protecting Green Belt Land

Section 14 Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Section 15 Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

Section 16 Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

Development Plan Policies

Rossendale Core Strategy DPD (2011)

AVP5 Strategy for South West Rossendale

Policy 1 General Development Locations and Principles

Policy 2 Meeting Rossendale’s Housing Requirement

Policy 3 Distribution of Additional Housing

Policy 9 Accessibility

Policy 16 Preserving and Enhancing Rossendale’s Built Environment

Policy 18 Biodiversity and Landscape Conservation

Policy 23 Promoting High Quality Design and Spaces

Policy 24 Planning Application Requirements

Other material considerations

National Planning Practice Guidance

RBC Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (2017)

6. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

RBC Environmental Health

No comments have been received.

LCC Highways

No objection subject to conditions.

Land Contamination

No objection subject to conditions.

United Utilities

No objection.

LCC Public Rights of Way

No comments have been received.

Tree Officer

No objection subject to conditions.

Ecology

No objection subject to conditions.

Conservation Officer

No objection subject to amendments.

Environment Agency

No objection.

Cadent

No comments have been received.

7. NOTIFICATION RESPONSES

To accord with the General Development Procedure Order notification letters were sent to neighbouring properties on 17/12/2019. A site notice was also posted on 18/12/2019.

Seven letters of objection have been received, raising the following points in summary:

- Parking and access issues.
- Application does not address previous concerns.
- Incompatible with existing / retained garages.
- Facing materials are unsuitable.
- Drainage issues.
- Plans are inaccurate.
- Damage to local roads and infrastructure.
- Contrary to planning policy.
- No facilities for waste disposal.
- Risk of flooding.
- Land contamination.
- Structural stability issues.
- Inappropriate design.
- Harm to visual amenity.
- Harm to neighbour amenity.
- Dwelling would be unfit for purpose.

8. **ASSESSMENT**

The main issues for consideration in this instance are:

- a) Principle
- b) Visual Impact
- c) Neighbour Amenity
- d) Highway Safety
- e) Tree Issues
- f) Ecology
- g) Drainage
- h) Flood Risk
- i) Land Contamination
- j) Other Issues

Principle

Sustainability

The application site lies outside of the Urban Boundary and is wholly within the Green Belt. The building is not physically remote as it is located within a settlement containing a small number of houses, however Lumb contains no public transport and no services or facilities. As such, occupiers of existing and any proposed dwellings are reliant on the private car (although it is noted that cycle links to Ramsbottom are excellent). However, officers are mindful that the development proposes the re-use of an existing building, and does not involve the construction of a new building. In doing so the proposal provides an opportunity to visually enhance the immediate area (this is considered further in the Visual Amenity section later within the report). Furthermore, officers note that this is the third planning application for the residential conversion of the building and in none of the previous applications or appeal has sustainability been cited as a reason for refusal.

On balance, and for the reasons above, officers consider that a reason for refusal on sustainability grounds could not be substantiated in this particular case.

Green Belt

Being located within the Green Belt, the proposal needs to be considered initially against the provisions of Policy 1 of the Core Strategy and Section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The former seeks to primarily locate development within the defined Urban Boundary but does allow for limited works outside of it provided that the proposal in question meets all other relevant national and local planning policies.

The latter primarily seeks to maintain the openness of the Green Belt but also identifies circumstances where development will be viewed as appropriate within it. Since the Council does not currently have any other specific adopted Green Belt policies itself, and since the relevant provisions of Policy 1 are very limited, it is proposed to rely primarily on the contents of Section 13 of the NPPF in determining this application.

Section 13 of the NPPF states that *'...the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open' adding that 'the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence'*. The general thrust is that any form of development within the Green Belt is inappropriate and therefore by definition harmful to it unless it represents one of the exceptions identified in paragraphs 145 and 146 of the Framework or 'very special circumstances' can be demonstrated for allowing it.

Paragraph 144 adds that *'...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 resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations'*.

Paragraphs 145 and 146 identify the nature of development that can normally be viewed as an exception to Green Belt policy and therefore acceptable in principle. This includes *'...the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction'* provided that the conversion works preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.

Paragraph 134 identifies the five purposes of including land within the Green Belt which are:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The applicant has submitted a structural survey report by ARG Design, which concludes:

"In summary, we feel that the structure is suitable for the conversion to a habitable residential dwelling. There are some minor works required, however, these are common

defects found in this type of project. There are a number of items that would be carried out as follows:

- New brickwork to garage openings.
- Replacement roof structure to provide a more aesthetically pleasing appearance.
- Repair of small sections of external walls.
- Strapping of roof to walls as per current Building Regs requirements.

The above items will be not be costly or difficult to achieve safely as part of a refurbishment.”

It is considered that the submitted report demonstrates that the proposed development would accord with the relevant exception set out in paragraph 146 of the Framework having regard to the above. The development would also not conflict significantly with any of the reasons for including land within Green Belt set out in paragraph 134. With particular reference to paragraph 134 bullet point ‘c’, the building would not be significantly expanded nor would its proposed curtilage encroach into undeveloped countryside (the garden area would be to the front of the proposed dwelling, replacing an area of hard standing currently used for the parking of vehicles).

As such, the development would not be inappropriate within the Green Belt and is acceptable in principle.

Visual Amenity

The proposed works would not involve any significant extension to the existing building.

The submitted structural report states that the following works will be carried out to the building to facilitate the conversion:

- New brickwork to garage openings
- Replacement roof structure to provide a more aesthetically pleasing appearance
- Repair of small sections of external walls
- Strapping of roof to walls

Further to discussions between the case officer and the applicant’s agent (and taking into account the comments of the Council’s Conservation Officer), the following amendments have been agreed in respect of the proposal:

- Natural slates are now to be used on the roof of the building.
- Black aluminium rainwater goods are to be used.
- Window units are to be of painted timber construction.
- Doors are to be of painted timber construction.
- The fenestration of the building has been amended to utilise more sensible openings to serve the proposed rooms.

There are two grade II listed buildings/structures in the vicinity of this site, Lumb Old Hall and a railway viaduct. However, since these are both located at least 80 metres away, and since there would be no public vantage point from which the new development would be seen against the backdrop of either structure, it is considered that the former would reasonably preserve the settings of the latter.

With the above in mind the proposal is, subject to conditions, considered to be acceptable in terms of its scale, design and its likely impact upon nearby heritage assets - reasonably satisfying the requirements of policies 1, 16, 23 and 24 of the Core Strategy and Sections 12, 15 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework in this regard.

Neighbour Amenity

a) Light

The proposal will not lead to the creation of a building that would be significantly larger than the existing garage 'block'. Consequently, it should not have any unduly significant effect upon the level of light currently received by the neighbouring properties.

b) Overlooking

The proposal will not give rise to unacceptable overlooking of neighbouring properties either. All windows to be formed within the building will either face an 'embankment' and trees located to the rear (west) of the property or the road/public footpath that lies to the front (east).

c) Overdevelopment

The proposal will not lead to the overdevelopment of the defined application site.

d) Amenity Space

A previous planning application (2018/0400 – for two dwellings) was refused, in part, because of concern about the very limited level of private amenity space proposed by that scheme, a concern supported by the Inspector at the appeal stage. However, it is considered that this has now reasonably been overcome by reducing the number of dwellings to one and increasing the amount of associated garden.

In terms of the internal space of the proposed dwelling, although relatively small in size it is considered that the dwelling would not provide an unduly cramped living environment and that the dwelling would provide a reasonable standard of amenity for its occupants.

In view of the above, it is considered that in pure 'amenity' terms the proposal would be acceptable, reasonably safeguarding the amenities currently enjoyed by the surrounding properties and ensuring the provision of adequate associated garden space. The proposal therefore satisfies the requirements of Policy 24 of the adopted Core Strategy in this regard.

Highway Safety

The agent has indicated that two car parking spaces are to be provided in conjunction with the new dwelling to the front of the building. This is considered to be an acceptable level of parking for the two bedroomed dwelling that would be created.

Whilst it would not be possible to satisfactorily turn those vehicles around within the defined site it would be possible to do so by reversing them onto the adjoining road (or vice versa). Such manoeuvres would, it is contended, be safe in this instance as this road is unlikely to be experiencing significant vehicular and pedestrian use, and vehicles using it are unlikely to be travelling at very high speeds at this point.

Vehicular access to the development is to be gained via Meadow Park, an unadopted road which is narrow and quite poorly surfaced at this point, and which also 'suffers' from issues of 'on-street' parking. However, it is not envisaged that a development of one dwelling would significantly increase its vehicular use over and above that which it is currently experiencing nor is it envisaged that the level of traffic generated would cause any significant inconvenience to users of the public footpath. In view of this it is considered that a further refusal of this application on these grounds would also be difficult to sustain despite concerns to the contrary. In coming to this view consideration has also been given to the fact:

a) that if the four garages, the subject of this application, were brought back into use as garages the level of traffic that they would generate would be greater than that generated by the proposed dwelling;

b) that whilst a previous application for two dwellings was refused in part on highway safety grounds, this was not supported as a reason for opposing the development by the Inspector at the subsequent appeal stage.

The garages do not currently appear to be in use and the agent has indicated that when they were they were not used in connection with any of the properties in the immediate vicinity. This being the case it is not envisaged that the proposal would lead to any issues of 'on street' parking arising from vehicles being displaced from the garages onto the adjoining highway.

Local residents have expressed other highway related concerns. However, it is considered that a further refusal of this application on any of these grounds could not reasonably be sustained as:

a) there is no known formal planning requirement that requires any of the land forming part of the application site to be retained in use for parking purposes;

b) it is not envisaged that the proposal would lead to significant reversing movements up this particular stretch of Meadow Park and any such movements would not, it is contended, cause any significant highway safety concerns in this instance;

c) it is considered that it would be possible to make suitable provision for the parking of construction vehicles within the application site in the event of the application being approved; and

d) given the relative infrequency that emergency, refuse and 'septic tank' vehicles would be likely to visit the site it is considered that it would be unreasonable to refuse the application purely on the grounds that the existing access arrangements are not ideally suited for them.

Furthermore, the proposal has been assessed by the Local Highway Authority, which has raised no objections to it. This is however subject to a condition requiring the submission of a construction method statement which sets out the measures that are to be put in place, during the construction of the development, to ensure that suitable provision is made for the parking of vehicles, for the siting of any temporary buildings and compounds, and for the storage of materials during that time.

In view of the above it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of access, parking and highway safety.

Tree Issues

The Council's Tree Officer has raised no objection to the proposed scheme subject to the inclusion of several conditions as follows:

- Any pruning of existing trees shall be kept to an absolute minimum, undertaken to BS 3998 (2010) and subject to a method statement submitted for approval prior to commencement.
- All trees on the site shall be protected by fencing to BS 5837 (2012) prior to commencement.

The Tree Officer originally requested that a full landscaping scheme be submitted for the development. The applicant submitted such a scheme in response (prepared by Penny Bennett Landscape Architects), and the Tree Officer and the Council's ecology consultant are both satisfied with its contents. However, the Tree Officer has requested the submission of a detailed planting schedule (which has not been included within the landscaping scheme).

Subject to a further condition requiring the submission and approval of such a planting schedule prior to the commencement of development, the scheme is considered acceptable.

Ecology

The Council's ecology consultant has raised no objection to the proposed scheme subject to the inclusion of several conditions requiring the following:

- Submission and approval of a reasonable avoidance measures method statement in relation to amphibians.
- No works to trees within the bird nesting season.
- Submission and approval of a Himalayan Balsam control method statement.
- Submission and approval of a method statement to protect the River Irwell and nearby Biological Heritage Site during construction works.
- Specified measures in increase the biodiversity value of the site to be incorporated into the development.

Subject to the above, the scheme is considered acceptable in terms of ecology.

Drainage

United Utilities and the Environment Agency have been consulted on the application, and neither have raised any objection nor have they requested the inclusion of any conditions.

Final details of drainage proposals from the site would be subject to further control through the Building Regulations Approval process and if appropriate through a S.104 Agreement between the developer and United Utilities.

Flood Risk

The building adjoins Flood Zones Two and Three but actually lies within Flood Zone One. The Environment Agency has raised no objection to the proposed development.

With this in mind, it is considered that it would be unreasonable to resist the application on grounds of flood risk.

Land Contamination

The Council's Land Contamination Officer has raised no objection to the proposed development subject to conditions requiring further investigation of the site and if appropriate the submission, approval and implementation of a suitable scheme of remediation.

Subject to the imposition of conditions to this end it is considered that the proposal would be acceptable in land contamination terms.

9. SUMMARY REASON FOR APPROVAL

The proposed scheme is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt, as it entails the re-use of a building demonstrated to be of permanent and substantial construction, will preserve the openness of the Green Belt and will not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. Subject to conditions, the scheme is considered acceptable in terms of visual and neighbour amenity, highway safety and all other relevant material planning considerations. The development therefore accords with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies 1, 16, 18, 23 and 24 of the Core Strategy DPD.

10. CONDITIONS

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To accord with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings, unless otherwise required by the conditions below:

- Submitted application form
- Location Plan (338ROS-100B)
- Landscape Layout (445/01)
- Landscape Specification (Penny Bennett Landscape Architects)
- Proposed Site Section (338ROS-107A)
- Proposed Section (338ROS-108A)
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan (338ROS-105E)
- Proposed Elevations (338ROS-106G)
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment Overview (Rev. A January 2020)

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of development.

3. No development shall take place until full details (including samples) of the proposed materials for use in the repair of the elevations and roof of the dwelling hereby approved

have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development. Construction of elevations is limited to repair and infilling of openings only.

4. No development shall take place until a construction method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved method statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period.

The method statement shall provide for:

- The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
- The loading and unloading of plant and materials
- The storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
- The erection and maintenance of security hoarding
- Details of working hours
- HGV delivery times and routing to / from the site
- Contact details for the site manager

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

5. Notwithstanding any information submitted with the application, no development shall take place until an investigation and risk assessment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted report shall include:

- i) Where potential risks are identified by the Preliminary Risk Assessment, a Phase 2 Site Investigation report shall also be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of development. The investigation shall address the nature, degree and distribution of land contamination on site and shall include an identification and assessment of the risk to receptors focusing primarily on risks to human health, groundwater and the wider environment; and
- ii) Should unacceptable risks be identified the applicant shall also submit and agree with the Local Planning Authority in writing a contaminated land remediation strategy prior to commencement of development. The development shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the duly approved remediation strategy or such varied remediation strategy as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of mitigating hazards associated with land contamination and preventing pollution.

6. Pursuant to condition 5 and prior to first use or occupation a verification report, which validates that all remedial works undertaken on site were completed in accordance with those agreed with the Local Planning Authority, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of mitigating hazards associated with land contamination and preventing pollution.

7. Pursuant to condition 5, no further intrusive site investigation or remediation work shall take place until a method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, which includes measures to ensure that any such invasive works will avoid causing any harm to trees which are to be retained on or adjacent to the site.

The intrusive site investigation / remediation works shall thereafter be implemented in strict adherence to the approved method statement.

Reason: In the interests of protecting trees to be retained on or adjacent to the site.

8. Any pruning of existing trees to be retained on or adjacent to the site shall be kept to an absolute minimum, undertaken to BS 3998 (2010) and shall be undertaken in strict accordance with a pruning method statement which has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not cause harm to trees to be retained on or adjacent to the site.

9. Prior to commencement of development, all trees on site shall be protected by fencing to BS 5837 (2012). The fencing shall thereafter be retained for the duration of the construction phase.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not cause harm to trees to be retained on or adjacent to the site.

10. No development shall take place until a detailed planting schedule has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The planting shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details within the first planting season following the substantial completion of the development. Any trees or shrubs forming part of that scheme which, within a period of 5 years from the completion of those works, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with replacement trees or shrubs of similar size and species.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and biodiversity enhancement.

11. No development shall take place until a reasonable avoidance method statement for amphibians (by a suitably experienced ecologist) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved method statement shall be adhered to and implemented in full as part of the development.

Reason: In the interests of protecting amphibians.

12. No trees, shrubs or other vegetation shall be removed from the site between 1st March and 31st August inclusive unless a competent ecologist has first undertaken a detailed check of the vegetation for active birds' nests immediately before the vegetation is cleared and has provided written confirmation that no birds will be harmed and/or that there are

appropriate measures in place to protect nesting bird interest on site. Any such written confirmation shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard nesting birds.

13. Prior to any development taking place, a method statement detailing eradication and/or control and/or avoidance measures for Himalayan Balsam, Japanese Knotweed, Rhododendron and Montbretia shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The agreed method statement shall be adhered to and implemented in full for the duration of development.

Reason: In the interests of controlling invasive species.

14. No development shall take place or material or machinery brought on site until a method statement to protect the River Irwell and the adjacent Biological Heritage Site from accidental incursions by machinery, spillages, dust and debris has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The method statement shall be strictly adhered to for the duration of construction works.

Reason: In the interests of protecting the River Irwell and adjacent Biological Heritage Site.

15. Prior to first occupation of the dwelling hereby approved or upon substantial completion of the development (whichever is the sooner), the following shall either be permanently affixed to the exterior walls of the building, or shall be integrated into the exterior walls of the building:

- Two bat boxes.
- Two bird boxes.
- Two bee bricks or bee blocks.

All of the above shall be retained and maintained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the development provides an adequate net gain for biodiversity.

11. **INFORMATIVES**

1. The Local Planning Authority has a Core Strategy (adopted in November 2011) and a series of Supplementary Planning Documents, which can be viewed at:

http://www.rossendale.gov.uk/downloads/download/331/core_strategy_local_plan_part_1_adopted

The Council operates a pre-application planning advice service. All applicants are encouraged to engage with the Local Planning Authority at the pre-application stage. In this case the applicant did not engage in pre-application discussions.

The Local Planning Authority has considered the application and where necessary considered either the imposition of planning conditions and/or sought reasonable amendments to the application in order to deliver a sustainable form of development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the local planning policy context.

2. Whilst the building to be demolished has been assessed as low risk for bats, the applicant is reminded that under the Habitat Regulation it is an offence to disturb, harm or kill bats. If a bat is found during demolition all work should cease immediately and a suitably licensed bat worker employed to assess how best to safeguard the bat(s). Natural England should also be informed.

3. United Utilities have advised that they strongly recommend that no construction commences until the detailed drainage design, submitted as part of a Section 104 agreement, has been assessed and accepted in writing by United Utilities. Any works carried out prior to the technical assessment being approved is done entirely at the developers own risk and could be subject to change.