

**MINUTES OF: THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**Date of Meeting:** 13<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER 2011

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

**In Attendance:** Rebecca Taylor, Planning Officer  
Stephen Stray, Planning Manager  
Sarah Blackwell, Assistant Solicitor  
Michelle Hargreaves, Committee and Member Services Officer  
Councillor L McInnes  
Councillor C Lamb

**Also Present:** 19 members of the public.

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

Apologies had been submitted on behalf of Councillors L Barnes (Cllr Eaton sub) and Stansfield (Cllr Cheetham sub).

**2. MINUTES**

**Resolved:**

That the minutes of the meetings held on 15<sup>th</sup> November 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**

There were no declarations of interest.

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**5. Application Number: 2011/0406**

**Change of use of garage building to residential with single storey extension to east elevation.**

**At: Land adjacent to 143 Todmorden Road, Bacup.**

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 a conversion of an existing building, and its extension to the east side, to form a residential property with two bedrooms.

The site was located to the north east side of The Flowers public house, the site had a frontage to Todmorden Road, but takes its access from an unadopted/unmade track to the rear which was also used by the public house, nearby garages and 143-149 Todmorden Road.

The building would be converted to a two bedrooled property with a full extension of the width of the building. There would be an inward opening gate within the fence accessing a small area of outdoor private amenity space and a bin storage area.

The application had received 5 letters, 3 letters objected to the proposal and 2 had provided comments only, details of these were highlighted in the report.

In relation to policy context, planning officers accepted that the proposed development was in accordance with PPS7. It was to be constructed of stone and slate to match the current materials of the existing building, the chimney stack on the rear roof plane would be retained.

As the property was situated at a lower level to Todmorden Road, it was not considered to have an impact on the countryside. There would also be no impact on neighbour amenity.

Officers recommendation was for approval subject to conditions highlighted in the report.

Mr Hartley spoke in favour of the application.

In determining the application the committee discussed the following:

- Structural survey carried out.
- Ensuring the driveway would be constructed out of porous material.
- What measures would be taken if the building collapsed.
- Previous advertisement for garage.
- Derelict building to be put back into use.

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.

## **6. Application Number 2011/0549**

### **Erection of one attached dwelling.**

**At: Land adjacent to 'Ashfield', Vicarage Lane, off Haslingden Road, Rawtenstall.**

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 a re-submission of application 2011/0407, with the following amendments:

- The building had been shifted 2m further away from the party-boundary with Overdale and Highfield, enabling planting along the southern boundary with Overdale.
- The applicant had removed the ground and first floor bay windows on the west elevation closest to, and enabling outlook towards, Overdale.
- The garage would have one large door rather than two smaller doors.
- The boundary wall to be erected adjacent to the public footpath on the east side had been reduced in height and a railing would make up the rest of the height.

The building would be constructed in brick with stone detail and a slate roof. The previous application had been refused, reasons for this was highlighted in the report.

LCC (Highways) had no objections and Electricity North West also had no objections but wished the applicant to contact them prior to development.

Two letters of objection had been received; details of these were outlined in the report. It was noted that since publication, a further letter of objection had been received; details were highlighted in the update report.

In relation to visual amenity, officers deemed that the proposed dwelling would not be a prominent feature of the streetscene. With regards to neighbour amenity, officers deemed the separation distances between the proposed dwelling and other properties acceptable.

Officers recommendation was for approval, subject to conditions outlined in the report.

Mr Entwistle spoke against the application and Councillor McInnes also spoke on the application.

In determining the application the committee discussed the following:

- Other authorities and their spacing distances.
- Chimney design.
- Public footpath and the retaining wall.
- Drainage.
- Overbearing for other properties

The Planning Manager and Planning Officer clarified issues raised by the committee.

A proposal was moved and seconded to refuse the application due to the overbearing nature of the design, scale and size of the development on nearby properties and the closeness of the development to neighbouring properties, contrary to the Officers recommendation.

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

<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>	<b>ABSTENTION</b>
5	1	1

**Resolved:**

That the application be refused due to the overbearing nature of the design, scale and size of the development on nearby properties and the closeness of the development to neighbouring properties.

**7. Application Number 2011/0548**

**Change of use of former scrap yard to campsite for static and touring caravans and area for tents including the provision of a welfare block and the use of existing house for use as a warden accommodation**

**At: Former Scrap Yard, Blackwood Road, Stacksteads, Bacup.**

It was noted that this application had previously been to committee (Application Number 2011/0285) which had been refused.

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 an amended scheme which included the following changes:

- Widening the access into the site and providing a larger area of hardstanding for vehicles to pull into when entering the site
- Relocation of the waste sluice and toilet and shower block away from the access-point to the north eastern corner, where better screened by existing trees.
- Increased number of parking spaces along the western boundary from 6 to 10
- Repositioned tent area so it was now adjacent to the southern boundary of the site and extended approximately 8.5m into the site
- The touring caravan hook-ups would be in the centre of the site and the number of plots had been reduced to 6
- The redundant house on the site would be refurbished and brought back into residential use with an office to manage the site (in the interim the static caravan nearest the site entrance would be used for this purpose).

LCC (Highways) had no objections as the concerns raised had been addressed.  
RBC (Environmental Health) also had no objections.

RBC (Forward Planning) suggested that the applicant provided signage to link the site with the tourist attractions in the borough.

Eight letters of objection had been received; concerns raised were outlined in the report.

In relation to visual amenity, the area was well screened with trees and the applicant had stated that more trees would be planted. With regards to neighbour amenity, any noise would be addressed by the 24 hour manning on site. The separation distance in respect of access was deemed appropriate.

Officer's recommendation was for approval subject to conditions highlighted in the report.

Mrs Holmes spoke against the application.

In determining the application the committee discussed the following:

- Septic tanks.
- Potential previous usage brought back.
- A lot of issues from previous application resolved.
- Process of phase 1 application.
- Time limit for occupation of house.
- Clarification of number of hook ups.

The Planning Manager and Planning Officer clarified issues raised by the committee.

A proposal was moved and seconded to approve the application, with the conditions outlined in the report along with an additional wording to condition 6 that one of the static caravans on site shall be used for security purposes and shall be used as such until the house on site has been suitably renovated, the precise wording of the condition to be agreed in consultation with the chair.

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

<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>	<b>ABSTENTION</b>
4	2	1

**Resolved:**

That the application be approved with the conditions outlined in the update report along with the request that one of the static caravans on site shall be used for security purposes and shall be used as such until the house on site has been suitably renovated to accommodate site security.

**8. Application Number 2011/0535**  
**Erection of pair of semi detached dwellings**  
**At: Land adjacent to 1 Grafton Villas.**

The Planning Manager 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 pair of semi-detached dwellings in the side garden of 1 Grafton Villas, including the demolition of the existing garage.

Each of the dwellings would have 2 bedrooms and be two storeys, with a porch projecting to the front. They would have external walls of natural coursed stone, with an obscure glazed first floor landing windows in each gable, beneath a hipped-roof of natural grey slate.

LCC (Highways) had no objection subject to conditions outlined in the report.

RBC (Property Services) had no objection to the proposal however noted that when the land was sold by RBC in 1983 the purchaser covenanted that the land was not to be used for any purpose other than as a garden for the use and benefit of the adjoining dwelling house (No. 1 Grafton Villas). The applicant should liaise directly with RBC Property Services to discuss the possibility of releasing the land from the covenant.

Several objections had been received and details of these were highlighted in the report. There were also some letters received in support of the application.

In relation to visual and neighbour amenity, both were deemed acceptable by officers.

Officers recommendation was for approval, subject to conditions highlighted in the report.

In determining the application the committee discussed the following:

- Clarification of where the owner lived.
- Concerns of losing 6 car parking spaces.
- Closeness to neighbouring properties.
- Removal of conifers.
- Design of dwelling.
- Emergency service access.

The Planning Manager clarified issues raised by the committee.

A proposal was moved and seconded to refuse the application, contrary to the officers recommendation due to the impact upon parking provision for neighbouring properties which would result in unacceptable pressures on the highway network for parking; inadequate separation distances between the proposed development and neighbouring properties and loss of light/outlook for residents of the terrace on Bold Street along with the visual impact of the proposal as a result of parking arrangements.

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 due to impact upon parking provision for neighbouring properties which would result in unacceptable pressures on the highway network for parking; inadequate separation distances between the proposed development and neighbouring properties and loss of light/outlook for residents of the terrace on Bold Street along with the visual impact of the proposal as a result of parking arrangements.

**9. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

**Resolved:**

To consider passing the appropriate resolution under Section 100 (A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 that the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item of business since it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information under Paragraphs 3-6 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

**10. Update on planning appeal for 2011/0046 at Holmefield House.**

The Planning Manager outlined the purpose of the update to the committee.

The Committee clarified issues raised in relation to the update with the Planning Manager.

**Resolved:**

That the recommendation outlined in the report be agreed.

**The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and concluded at 8.35pm**

**Signed:**

**(Chair)**