

## **LATE ITEMS REPORT**

### **FOR DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE MEETING OF 19<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY 2008**

#### **ITEM B1 – : 2007/664 – POLICE OPERATING CENTRE, BACUP ROAD, WATERFOOT.**

Amended plans have been received since the application was originally submitted which include information that did not form part of the initial consultation. The amended plans and additional information that have been circulated to members via email on 15/02/2008 which is also the start date of the 14 day re-consultation period. The amended plans include alterations to fenestration, internal layout and car parking. In addition the following information has been received:

- 1) The number of staff associated with the building would be 130 in total on a shift cycle spread over 24 hours, 7 days a week.
- 2) The Centre will be fitted with high-efficiency, gas-fired condensing boilers, air heat pumps, cooling systems have been designed-out wherever possible and automatic lighting control has been used to reduce energy usage.
- 3) In relation to travel planning, the centralising of several departments, car sharing, cycle parking and showering and changing facilities are proposed to reduce the need to travel and the applicant would be willing to enter into a condition requiring a travel plan.

Environment Agency – raise no objection to the scheme and request that the same conditions as previously imposed on application 2007/130 be attached to this application if approved.

LCC Highways – highlight that the visitor parking is some distance from the entrance to the building, that visibility splays need to be provided and maintained free of obstruction at the junction of the main car park and visitor car park with Bacup Road, that a Traffic Regulation Order needs to be funded by the applicant and a condition limiting glare from lights within the site to passing traffic.

The recommendation remains for approval, subject to no adverse comments being received to the further consultation carried out on 15/02/2008.

#### **ITEM B2 – 2007/716 – BROADCLOUGH FARM**

An additional reason for refusal is recommended:

10. The proposed development would be seriously detrimental to the residential amenities of occupiers of dwellings to the south of the site by reason of the height and size of the new houses which would lead to overlooking and loss of privacy. The proposed development would conflict with the criteria of Saved Policy DC.1 of the adopted Rossendale District Local Plan.

**ITEM B3 – 2007/737 – PACK HORSE GARAGE**

Councillor Darryl Smith is unable to attend the meeting and has therefore requested the following letter of support be made available for Members:

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE – 19<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2008**

**APPLICATION 2007/737 – PACK HORSE GARAGE**

Dear Committee Members

Unfortunately I am unable to attend the meeting due to a residents meeting commitment; however I would like to make comment on the above application.

At the development control meeting in December when the original reserved matters application was heard in relation to the above site, many of you were sympathetic and supportive to the proposed development but had some minor concerns relating to the design, such as bin storage.

Since the last meeting the applicant has worked extremely hard to address all the issues that members raised on the night and has complied with all requests for information from the case officer. Given these facts I am bitterly disappointed that yet again despite the site having outline permission for residential dwellings that the scheme is being recommended for refusal.

I mentioned in my letter prior to the meeting in December that Pack Horse garage has historically been used as an HGV depot and that it had never sat comfortably with its' surroundings and I believe it still doesn't today given that most if not all industry / commerce carried out in Edenfield is centred at the Bridge Mills Industrial Estate on Rochdale Road. The car workshop which was operating from these premises has now relocated to other premises and is not operating from Pack Horse Garage.

Pack Horse garage has an HGV operators licence still in place, which would allow for the operation of five HGVs' from the site, a thought nearby residents would dread.

It seems to me that the only viable option for this site is residential housing (given the situation relating to business and the HGV operating licence outlined above).

As one of the local Ward Councillors I am very much in support of this application as I feel it would make a massive improvement to this particular area of the village.

The application has generated a lot of interest within the village and has the support of the majority of the residents including the Residents' Association and immediate neighbours to the proposed development. It seems somewhat ironic that the case officer is recommending refusal stating that the development would be seriously detrimental to the residential amenities of occupiers of the adjacent property when they have indicated their support for the scheme!

I also stated previously that the design of the development offering one bedroom apartment accommodation would bring much needed, more affordable property to the village. I have already been approached by two constituents keen to know more about the development because of this reason, one a student in his final year who would like to stay living in the village when he attains his degree and sees this as potentially an affordable option and the other at the other end of the property scale wanting to downsize to something more manageable.

At the last meeting the applicant agreed to a Section 106 payment of £10,000 if the application was approved, to be used in relation to providing new community centre facilities in Edenfield (despite this not being stipulated when outline permission was granted in 2005 and the fact that the meeting was to agree reserved matters) which would greatly benefit the village given the precarious situation in relation to the existing community centre.

Should the application not be approved I have some major concerns for this site, will it revert back to an HGV operation or some other business, sitting uncomfortably with it's neighbours or will it become derelict?

I ask that you consider all the information I have provided above and join with me in support of this application.

Thank you.

COUNCILLOR DARRYL SMITH

**ITEM B4 – 2007/738 LIVESY SHOE COMPANY, 206 BACUP ROAD**

An additional objection letter has been received from a resident of Eastwood Crescent. It repeats concerns from neighbours that are included in the main report.

A revised plan has been received showing modifications to the access to the car park including the set back of the entrance gate.

**ITEM B5 – 2007/739 - UNIT 8 SPODDEN MILL, STATION ROAD. FACIT, ROCHDALE**

A letter supporting the proposal has been received from Mr. Melding of Unit 10, Spodden Mill. Mr. Melding points out that he has worked in the adjoining unit for several months and has no complaint about the proposed activities. Furthermore he points out that although there is a limited car parking space available; however there are not too many cars outside at any one time.

**ITEM B6 – 2007/750**

No further comments.

**ITEM B7 – 2007/0764 - WHITE HORSE PUBLIC HOUSE, EDGE LANE, WATERFOOT.**

No further comments

**ITEM B8 – 2007/ 0767 - BACUP LEISURE HALL, BURNLEY ROAD, BACUP**

No further comments

**ITEM B9 – 2008/0009 11 DALE STREET STUBBINS**

The Council have received a land registry search for the plot of land where the garage is located. It is stated that the land is registered to a company in Middlesex. This information provides us with the information that the applicant has not served notice on the owner of the land, which is a compulsory aspect of any planning application. As such this renders the application invalid until notice has been served on the correct owner.

ADRIAN HARDING  
ACTING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL TEAM MANAGER 18/02/08