

**MINUTES OF: THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**Date of Meeting:** 14<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2011

**Present:** Councillor Robertson (in the Chair)  
Councillors, L Barnes, Graham, Nuttall, Oakes, Roberts and Stansfield.

**In Attendance:** Neil Birtles, Principal Planning Officer  
Richard Elliot, Planning Officer  
Clare Birtwistle, Principal Legal Officer  
Michelle Hargreaves, Committee and Member Services Officer

**Also Present:** Approximately 35 members of the public

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES**

No apologies had been received.

**2. MINUTES**

**Resolved:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> March 2011 be signed by the Chair and agreed as a correct record.

**3. URGENT ITEMS**

The Chair reported that there were no urgent items of business.

**4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Stansfield declared a personal and prejudicial interest on Item B6 and left the room before the item was heard.

**It was agreed that the order of the agenda would be changed and item C2 would be taken first.**

**5. Nominations for Call-In Councillors**

It was agreed that the two nominated Call-In councillors on the Development Control Committee as detailed in point 5 of the Planning Call-in Procedure would be:

- Councillor Robertson
- Councillor Stansfield

## **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

### **6. Application Number 2010/667**

**Erection of 85 dwellings and associated bridge over river, roads, garages and landscaping**

**At: Orama Mill, Hall Street, Whitworth.**

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the application and outlined details of the site, the relevant planning history and the nature of the current application which was to seek planning permission for the above development.

The application had been deferred at the last committee for reasons addressed within the report. Officers had since met with the applicant to discuss how the design issues would be best resolved. Arising from this an amended Site Layout had been received that would result in erection of 85 houses on the site as a whole. For that part of the site between Cowm Park Way South and the river it was now intended to:

- Retain more of the existing tree cover near to the junction of Hall Street/Cowm Park Way South, with stand-off distances between windows and gardens that makes it more likely that occupiers will not wish them removed.
- Erect 6 houses to the north of the main estate road and to face Cowm Park Way South, rather than 7 with their backs to it.
- Incorporate elements of stone detailing into those houses which would be most visible from the existing highway.

LCC (Highways) were satisfied that the dwellings proposed were being provided with safe and satisfactory access and parking arrangements.

The Applicant was proposing to still provide 12 units of affordable housing on the site, together with contributions which were highlighted in the report.

Officer's recommendation was for approval subject to conditions and a Section 106 obligation.

Mr Farrington spoke in favour of the application and Councillors Neal and Bradbury spoke on the application.

In determining the application the Committee discussed the following:

- Use of Church entrance
- Access on Lloyd Street and Hall Street
- Availability for open space/ children's play areas
- River development
- Funding for bus service
- Visual design and materials

- Pelican crossing
- Possibility of bridleway

The Planning Officer clarified issues raised by the Committee.

A proposal was moved and seconded to approve the application, with the conditions highlighted in the report, plus the additional condition in relation to construction traffic access.

Voting took place on the proposal, the result of which was as follows:

<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>	<b>ABSTENTION</b>
7	0	0

**Resolved:**

That the application be approved subject to the conditions highlighted in the report plus the additional condition in relation to construction traffic access.

**5. Application Number: 2011/46**

**Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 74 residential units**

**At: Holmefield House, Holcombe Road, Helmshore.**

The Planning Officer introduced the application and outlined details of the site, the relevant planning history and the nature of the current application which was to seek the erection of 74 residential units comprising a mix of 10 2-bed, 26 3-bed and 38 4-bedroomed homes, including an apartment block of 6 units.

A third of the houses would be detached and the others semi-detached or in short terraces. One of the buildings towards the northern boundary and another in the south-west corner of the site would be 3-storey and the rest 2 or 2.5 storeys in height, constructed in a mix of art stone, buff brick and red brick, under slate grey roofs.

Consultation had taken place and the responses were highlighted within the report. A total of 24 objections had been received along with an on-line petition bearing 39 signatures, a further objection had been received which amplified the objections stated in the report.

The scheme complies with RBC's Interim House Policy Statement and provides 20% affordable housing. The applicant had requested deletion of Condition 16.

Officer's recommendation was for approval subject to a Section 106 obligation and the conditions included in the update report.

Mr Clowes spoke against the application, Mr Calvert spoke in favour of the application and Mr Walsh spoke on the application. Councillor Essex also spoke on the application.

In determining the application the committee discussed the following:

- Viability of commercial site removed
- Local transport
- Loss of employment land
- Primary school places
- Character of Helmshore
- Number of dwellings
- Design quality and materials

A proposal was moved and seconded to refuse the application contrary to the Officer recommendation due to over development and lack of school places.

Voting took place on the proposal, the result of which was as follows:

FOR	AGAINST	ABSTENTION
6	1	0

**Resolved:**

That the application be refused contrary to the Officer recommendation due to over development and lack school places.

**6. Application Number: 2011/153**

**Erection of three and a half storey building with 11 apartments and basement parking.**

**At: Flaxmoss House, Helmshore Road, Helmshore.**

The Planning Officer introduced the application and outlined details of the site, the relevant planning history and the nature of the current application which was to seek permission for the erection of a three and a half storey building, to contain 11 2- and 3-bed apartments over basement parking for 15 cars and with 9 external parking spaces.

The applicant's had agreed to provide 2 units of affordable housing, which equates to the 20%, and accord with the Council's Interim Housing Policy Statement.

No trees along the boundaries of the site would be removed. However, the group of 4 unprotected trees within the site was to be removed. Seven new trees were to be planted. A new pedestrian access would be formed to the north of the existing Helmshore Road access. It was also proposed to serve only Flaxmoss House from Campion Drive.

Consultation had taken place and fifteen objections had been received, details of these

were highlighted in the report, and further comments had also been received on the day of the committee. The applicant had responded to the objections, these had been provided along with the update report.

Officer's recommendation was for approval, subject to a Section 106 obligation along with the conditions outlined in the report.

Mr Buckley spoke against the application and Councillor Essex spoke on the application.

In determining the application the Committee discussed the following:

- Design in relation to Flaxmoss House
- Roof height
- Neighbour amenity
- Access on Campion Drive
- Car parking

The Planning Officer clarified issues raised by the Committee.

A proposal was moved and seconded to refuse the application contrary to the Officer recommendation due to over development of the site and highway related issues.

Voting took place on the proposal, the result of which was as follows:

<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>	<b>ABSTENTION</b>
7	0	0

**Resolved:**

That the application be refused, contrary to Officer's recommendation due to over development of the site and highway related issues.

**8. Application Number 2011/101 & 2011/102LBC  
Conversion/New build to form 25 apartments and associated parking  
At: Old Market Hall, Bacup.**

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the application and outlined details of the site, the relevant planning history and the nature of the current application which was to seek an amended proposal to: convert the Old Market Hall to 16 apartments, demolish the red-brick building added on the west side of the Market Hall and erect a 3-storey J-shaped building to accommodate 9 apartments, the ground-floor of this building to provide parking for 9 cars, with access from a courtyard which was to contain a further 8 car parking spaces.

The Applicant had indicated that the re-submission proposes 25 units of accommodation (3 less than the previously refused scheme), and increases the number of parking spaces to be provided within their site to 17 (5 more than the previously refused scheme).

Further information had been provided in the update report relating to amended plans in relation to the Coach House. The applicant had advised that they were now willing to make a contribution of £15,000 towards transport related issues and Play Space/ Public Open Space provision.

Consultation had taken place and the responses were highlighted in the report.

Following this information, Officers had now recommended approval.

In determining the application the Committee discussed the following:

- Bringing building back into use
- Current state of building
- Car parking
- Interior design of apartments

A proposal was moved and seconded to approve the application subject to a Section 106 obligation along with a delegation to officers to agree conditions in consultation with the Chair to enable the Highway Authority and Council's Conservation Officer to contribute to their composition.

Voting took place on the proposal, the result of which was as follows:

<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>	<b>ABSTENTION</b>
6	1	0

**Resolved:**

That the application be approved subject to a Section 106 obligation along with conditions to be agreed in consultation with the Chair.

**9. Application Number 2011/56**

**Side/rear extensions providing additional 12 bedrooms**

**At: Sunnyside Rest Home, Coupland Close, Whitworth.**

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the application and outlined details of the site, the relevant planning history and the nature of the current application which was to seek permission for extension of the Rest Home to eliminate shared-occupancy bedrooms (of which there were presently 4), and up the total number of bedrooms from 8 to 20 (each

single, with en-suite facilities), including one special care bedroom. Further details were outlined in the report.

Consultations had taken place and no objections had been received from LCC (Highways) or RBC (Environmental Health). However, two representations had been made; one of these in objection to the application, further information relating to this was stated in the Officers report. A further objection had been received after the report had been published; the update report had outlined this information.

An additional condition had been added with regards to Coupland Close/Coupland Street. This would ensure that residents would not be affected and that any damage caused by the construction of the development would be made good at the applicant's expense.

Officer's recommendation was for approval subject to conditions.

Mr Neal spoke in favour of the application and Councillor Bradbury spoke on the item.

In determining the application the Committee discussed the following:

- Time spent in bedrooms
- Number of extra residents
- Funding
- Neighbour amenity
- Local facilities

A proposal was moved and seconded to approve the application subject to the conditions highlighted in the report along with the additional condition in the update report.

Voting took place on the proposal, the result of which was as follows:

<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>	<b>ABSTENTION</b>
6	1	0

**Resolved:**

That the application be approved subject to the conditions highlighted in the report along with the additional condition in the update report relating to Coupland Close/Coupland Street.

**NB. Councillor Stansfield had declared an interest on this item and left the room at this point in the meeting.**

**10. Application Number 2011/77**  
**Erection of 5 dwellings**  
**At: Former Airtours Car Park, Helmshore.**

The Planning Officer introduced the application and outlined details of the site, the relevant planning history and the nature of the current application which was to seek permission for the erection of five dwellings, four of which would form a staggered linked terrace with their back gardens extending towards Musbury Brook and their front elevations facing Park Road. They would have sufficient of a setback from Park Road to accommodate not only front gardens and the drive to access them, but between the drive and Park Road a series of garages at a level approximately 1m below that of Park Road. The remaining dwelling would be at the site entrance, positioned between Park Road and the new drive and to face towards Park Road

All of the dwellings and the garages would be constructed in natural stone under natural slate pitched roofs.

The linked-houses would be 26+m from the existing terraced houses on Park Road and their garages approximately 7m away, but approximately 1m lower. The detached property would be approximately 14m from the dormer-bungalow at Tor Foot Cottage. The existing stone wall fronting Park Road would be maintained and extended to front the detached dwelling.

Consultation had taken place and several objections had been received; details were outlined in the report.

Following the publication of the report, the applicant had requested the deletion of condition 7.

Officer's recommendation was for approval subject to unchanged conditions.

Mr Norman spoke against the application, Mr Hartley spoke in favour of the item and Councillor Essex also spoke on the item.

In determining the application the Committee discussed the following:

- Windows
- Removal of plot 1
- Distance between windows
- Condition 7 not removed
- Constraints of the site

A proposal was moved and seconded to approve the application subject to conditions highlighted in the report.



Voting took place on the proposal, the result of which was as follows:

<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>	<b>ABSTENTION</b>
2	4	0

As a result of this a further proposal was moved and seconded to refuse the application due to the form of development of Plot 1 and neighbour amenity.

Voting took place on the proposal, the result of which was as follows:

<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>	<b>ABSTENTION</b>
4	2	0

**Resolved:**

That the application be refused contrary to officer's recommendation due to the form of development of Plot 1 and neighbour amenity.

**Councillor Stansfield returned to the meeting at this point.**

**11. Application Number 2011/104**

**Erection of extensions to north, west and east sides of the dwelling, re siting of previously permitted garage with games rooms over, new vehicular access, extension of garden and new boundary wall to front.  
At: Rockcliffe Farm, Pennine Road, Bacup**

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the application and outlined details of the site, the relevant planning history and the nature of the current application which was to seek permission for a more extensive extension to the east-facing elevation of the house and omission of the raised patio previously permitted. It would also include the re-siting of the previously approved garage with games-room and formation of new vehicular access to the highway. An extension of the domestic curtilage to include part of the verge fronting Pennine Road, with a new boundary wall to enclose it would also be included.

Consultation had taken place and a letter of objection had been received. A further letter had been received expressing concerns with the impact of the new development on privacy of neighbours along Ramsey Avenue.

Officer recommendation was for approval subject to conditions.

In determining the application the Committee discussed the following:

- Program of works in relation to boundary wall

- New proposed vehicle entrance

A proposal was moved and seconded to approve the application subject to the conditions highlighted in the report along with amended condition 2 as detailed in the update report.

Voting took place on the proposal, the result of which was as follows:

<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>	<b>ABSTENTION</b>
7	0	0

**Resolved:**

That the application be approved subject to the conditions highlighted in the report along with the amended condition 2 as detailed in the update report.

**12. Application Number 2011/109  
Detached garage  
At: 16 Heycrofts View, Edenfield**

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the application and outlined details of the site, the relevant planning history and the nature of the current application which was to seek permission for the construction of a detached double garage, with wc projection to its side, and formation of a new hard-surfaced area within the front garden.

The proposed garage would be located between the house and Market Street. It would be 7m wide and 7m in depth, increasing in part to 9m to accommodate the wc. It would have an eaves height of 2.4m and a ridge height of 4.2m. The building would be constructed in natural stone, under a slated roof. The hardstanding formed in front of its 2 up-and-over doors would be accessed from Heycrofts View and extend partly across the front of the house so vehicles can turn and exit to the highway in forward gear.

RBC (Building Control) had been consulted and drainage issues had been addressed in the Building Regulation Application it had received and approved for this outbuilding.

Officer's recommendation was for approval subject to conditions.

Mr Doyle spoke against the application.

**The Committee resolved in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 4.1 of the Council's Constitution to continue the meeting after 9.30pm**

In determining the application the Committee discussed the following:

- Over development
- Loss of sunlight
- Development rights
- Design

The Principal Planning Officer clarified issues raised by the committee.

A proposal was moved and seconded to approve the application subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

Voting took place on the proposal, the result of which was as follows:

<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>	<b>ABSTENTION</b>
3	4	0

As a result of this a further proposal was moved and seconded to refuse the application due to over development and neighbour amenity.

Voting took place on the proposal, the result of which was as follows:

<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>	<b>ABSTENTION</b>
4	3	0

**Resolved:**

That the application be refused contrary to Officer's recommendation due to over development and neighbour amenity.

**13. Application Number 2011/004  
Formation of off street parking facility/boundary fence (retrospective)  
At: 3 Mount Pleasant, Rawtenstall**

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the application and outlined details of the site, the relevant planning history and the nature of the current application which was to seek retrospective permission for extension of the hard surfaced area approximately 2m nearer to the terraced properties fronting Haslingden Road, requiring permission by reason of its elevation and the fence topping it.

The resulting hardstanding was 5m in width and 7.3m in depth to the edge of the vehicular access. It was supported by a breeze block retaining wall of approximately 1.5m in height, which was grey in colour and unpainted. The fence topping it had a 1m high solid panel solid panel above which was an arched decorative trellis, with a height itself of 1.5m.

The rear fence was situated 5.2m from the first floor windows of 227 Haslingden Road.  
Officer's recommendation was for approval.

Mr Ali spoke in favour of the application.

In determining the application the Committee discussed the following:

- Issues relating to retrospective applications
- Blocking of pedestrian access
- Visual impact of breeze blocks

The Principal Legal Officer gave the Committee advice regarding retrospective applications.

A proposal was moved and seconded to approve the application subject to the conditions highlighted in the report.

Voting took place on the proposal, the result of which was as follows:

<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>	<b>ABSTENTION</b>
6	1	0

**Resolved:**

That the application be approved subject to the conditions highlighted in the report.

#### **14. Rossendale Shop Front Design Guide**

The Chair outlined the purpose of the report which was to recommend to Cabinet the adoption of the Rossendale Shopfront Design Guide as a Supplementary Planning Document, the approval of the final document to follow a period of consultation and to be delegated to the Director of Business in consultation with the Portfolio Holder.

That the Committee recommend to Cabinet that all future minor amendments to the policy to be delegated to the Director of Business in consultation with the Portfolio Holder.

**Resolved:**

That the Committee recommend to Cabinet the adoption of the Rossendale Shopfront Design Guide.

**The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and concluded at 10.00pm**

**Signed:**

**(Chair)**