

LATE ITEMS REPORT

FOR DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE MEETING OF 26 JUNE 2007

B1 - 2007/210 - HIGHER BRIDGE CLOUGH HOUSE, COAL PIT LANE, BACUP

Since the report has been published, three additional letters and three emails have been received which object to the proposal on the following grounds

- Application publicity
- Noise
- Water supply and treatment of effluent
- Protection of livestock
- Increased traffic
- Unsuitable location
- Property value
- Outdated Local Plan

The application was advertised by site notice and by letter, referred to in the report. The issue of noise has also been addressed in the report and conditions proposed by the Environmental Health Officer have been recommended to acoustically control the building between the hours of 8pm and 8am. Additionally, water supply and treatment of effluent has also been addressed by condition, as recommended by the Environment Agency. The Highway Authority has raised no objection in relation to the traffic issues. In relation to the protection of livestock and property value, these are not material planning considerations and cannot be taken into account. The proposal has been considered in relation to the Adopted Local Plan, it being the current plan in force for the Borough.

An objector has said that the property is subject to a restrictive covenant preventing business uses from the site. The Council has not had sight of the covenant and cannot confirm its existence. Furthermore, this would be a private matter.

Officers remain on the view that permission should be granted.

B2 - 2007/242 : VALLEY VIEW, HIGHER TUNSTEAD, BACUP

A letter has been received from the applicant indicating that the proposed development will not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy or outlook for the objectors.

Officers remain on the view that permission should be granted.

B3 - 2007/249 : HOLLY MOUNT, ST MARY'S WAY, RAWTENSTALL

This application originally proposed the provision of lifts in the Apartment Blocks permitted by Planning Permission 2006/320 in a manner resulting in an increase in ridge-height, complexity of roof-shape and protrusions. As a consequence the report appearing on the main agenda recommends refusal of the application due to the detriment that would unnecessarily and unacceptably be caused to the setting of Holly Mount House (a Listed Building) and to the Rawtenstall Town Centre Conservation Area.

I am now in receipt of amended drawings that propose the provision of lifts in the Apartment Blocks in a manner which will mean the resulting buildings will differ little from those permitted by Planning Permission 2006/320. The amended drawings would result in no increase in the complexity in roof-shape or the number of protrusions. It would entail a reduction in the gutter-height of each of the Apartment Blocks by approx 0.3m, and an increase in the ridge-height by approx 0.3m compared with the drawings approved for 2006/320.

As a result of these amendments I do not consider the resulting buildings will appear materially different from those that would result from their construction in accordance with Planning Permission 2006/320. Accordingly, it is considered appropriate to recommend permission be granted for the scheme as now amended, subject to conditions consistent with those of Planning Permission 2006/320.

However, as the period of re-consultation with neighbours has not yet expired it is recommended that Committee give authority to determine the application to the Head of Planning, Legal & Democratic Services, after consultation with the Chair, upon the expiry of this period.

NEIL BIRTLES
Senior Planning Officer
Development Control
22/6/07