

**MINUTES OF: THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**Date of Meeting:** 12<sup>th</sup> June 2012

**Present:** Councillor Robertson (in the Chair)  
Councillors, Ashworth, Cheetham (sub for Cllr Morris), Eaton, Oakes,  
Procter and Roberts.

**In Attendance:** Neil Birtles, Principal Planning Officer  
Rebecca Taylor, Planning Officer  
Sarah Doherty, Solicitor  
Michelle Hargreaves, Committee and Member Services Officer

**Also Present:** 12 members of the public  
1 member from the Press  
Councillor Alyson Barnes  
Councillor Liz McInnes

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

Apologies of absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Morris (Councillor Cheetham sub).

**2. MINUTES**

**Resolved:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> April 2012 be signed by the Chair and agreed as a correct record.

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**4. URGENT ITEMS**

There were no urgent items.

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

- 5. Application Number: 2011/0457**  
**Erection of 10 houses, including new club access & car parking.**  
**At: Loveclough Working Mens Club, Commercial Street, Loveclough.**

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the application and outlined details of the site and the nature of the application which was to seek the following:

- Erection of a terrace of 8 houses fronting Commercial Street, to be of 2-storeys in height and natural stone/slate construction.
- Erection of 2 detached houses to the southern end of the verge, to be of 2-storeys in height and natural slate construction.
- Relocation of the public entrance to the Club building and its smoking shelter from the northern to the southern elevation, removal of the illuminated signs on the northern elevation, and replacement of 2 openable windows in this elevation with non-openable acoustic double-glazed windows.
- Formation of a new vehicular access with footway to its north side that descends the 5m from Burnley Road to the south side of the Club building, giving access to 21 newly formed spaces to serve the Club.

Consultation responses had been received. No objections had been submitted from RBC (Environmental Health) subject to conditions relating to the club building and ensuring minimal noise distribution. Further information was provided in the update report in relation to the arrangements in respect of the club, which indicated the building would be adequately modified to meet the concerns of RBC (Environmental Health).

LCC (Highways) had no objections subject to the access road being built to adoptable standards.

With regard to representations, 2 objections had been received for reasons highlighted in the report. A letter of support had been received from Limey Valley Residents Association (LVRA) noting that the scheme would enhance a brownfield site.

In relation to Housing Policy, bullet point 7 of Policy 2 prioritises the development of previously developed land. Policy 4 considered affordable housing as only a small portion of the site was greenfield it was not considered that a contribution towards affordable housing would be required.

The proposed 8 terrace units would be constructed in stone and slate which would be in keeping with the other houses. Certain trees would also require removal.

In relation to neighbour amenity, there would be no detrimental effect from either the proposed units or the club building.

LCC (Highways) was satisfied that the sight lines had been maintained and that sufficient parking had been provided along with a footway that would run along Commercial Street.

Officers recommendation was for approval subject to conditions along with an Open Spaces contribution and a Section 278 agreement with LCC.

Mr Kinder spoke in favour of the application.

In determining the application the committee discussed the following:

- Operation of the club
- Whether there was any other financial way of assisting the clubs future
- External development
- How the scheme had overcome set backs from core strategy and housing policy
- One way access suggested by (LVRA)
- Good amount of consultation
- Enhancement of a Brownfield site
- Neighbour amenity, proximity of club to new houses
- Number of new access roads leading onto Burnley Road

The Principal Planning Officer clarified issues raised by the committee.

A proposal was moved and seconded to approve the application subject to the conditions listed in the committee report, along with a Legal Agreement to secure the Open Spaces Contribution and a Traffic Regulation Order.

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 applications be approved subject to the conditions listed in the committee report, along with a Legal Agreement to secure the Open Spaces Contribution and a Traffic Regulation Order.

**6. Application Number 2012/0156**

**Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 16 dwellings.**

**At: Ashley Court, John Street, Whitworth.**

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the application and outlined details of the site and the nature of the current application which was to seek permission for the demolition of the vacant block of flats and erection on the site of 16 dwelling units, to comprise of 4 1-bed flats, 4 2-bed houses and 8 3-bed houses.

The submitted scheme proposed:

- Construction of a short cul-de-sac taking access directly from John Street midway along the site frontage.
- To each side of this cul-de-sac would be a line of 2-storey buildings, the dwellings to have off-street parking to the front and rear gardens that extend up to Elm Street and the street to the south.

- The buildings were to be constructed in buff-coloured brick, with grey concrete roof tiles.

Each 3-bedroomed property would have a tarmaced drive and to its side a secondary car space with permeable re-inforced grass surface; this was to avoid the front gardens appearing unduly hard-surfaced. The 2 properties nearest John Street would each have only a drive; the pre-application scheme had been amended to makes these houses 2-bedroomed.

In relation to consultation responses, RBC (Housing) supported the application and RBC (Environmental Health) had no objection to the proposal. LCC (Highways) raised some concern in relation to on street parking and therefore recommended a traffic regulation order, in part to address a pre-existing problem.

Whitworth Town Council also had no objections but requested that the development be built in stone or reconstituted stone and not brick as stated in the application.

Two objections had been received; reasons for these objections were outlined in the report.

The site was in the urban boundary in Whitworth and there would be no change in the use of the site. With regard to Housing Policy, all the development would be affordable housing.

An additional condition for tree screening was also included, as some trees would be lost but none of these had a TPO.

The applicant was asked for a contribution towards open space provision but had indicated that this could not be made for viability reasons. Officers deemed this acceptable as the development was providing affordable housing and near to existing recreational facilities.

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

In determining the application the committee discussed the following:

- Site sections plans
- Good scheme as currently an eyesore
- Clarification on parking arrangements
- Enforcement and car parking
- Tweak wording of condition 10 in relation to times of lorry movements
- Affordable housing

A proposal was moved and seconded to approve the application, subject to the conditions outlined in the report with the additional request of the wording of condition 10 to regulate times of construction lorry movements as the site was near a school.

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 outlined in the report with the additional request of the wording of condition 10 to regulate times of construction lorry movements.

**7. Application Number 2012/0077**

**Erection of No.1 dwelling.**

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

The Planning Officer introduced the application and outlined details of the site, relevant planning history and the nature of the current application which was to seek permission for the erection of No.1 dwelling. The dwelling would be 8.7m to ridge at the highest point and 5m to ridge. The property was roughly T-shaped positioned to the eastern side of the site.

The main bulk of the building was sited 10m from the eastern boundary of the site and a further 5m from the nearest point on the properties on Melia Close. There was a projecting 1.5 storey garage which would extend up to 2m from the site boundary with doors facing southwards towards the proposed entrance to the site. The garage was a double garage large enough for two vehicles with a generous driveway in front.

The main elevation facing towards Overdale and Highfield (southern) would be blank. Although the garage would face towards these properties and have a single dormer windows approximately 22m away and the single storey extension to the west elevation would have a glazed elevation facing towards Overdale approximately 27m away.

Previous applications had been submitted for this application and these were outlined at to the committee. The scheme that was proposed had been amended to address the reasons for refusal at the last committee meeting.

No objections had been received from LCC (Highways), United Utilities and Electricity North West.

With regard to representations, 3 letters of objection had been received; details of the concerns raised were outlined in the officers report and update report.

The application was located in the urban boundary and was acceptable in principle and also accorded with the housing policy.

Officers recommendation was for approval, subject to conditions which included the applicant to provide material samples prior to development.

Ms Pilling spoke against the application and Mr Hartley spoke in favour of the application. Councillor McInnes also spoke on the application.

In determining the application the committee discussed the following:

- Height of the ridge in comparison to other properties
- Planning reasons
- Footprint of proposed dwelling
- Location of hedge to be reduced
- Replanting of trees/shrubs due to some being removed

A proposal was moved and seconded to approve the application along with 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	0	1

**Resolved:**

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

**8. Application Number 2012/0076**

**Erection of No.3 5m high lighting columns to the south of the existing ménage (retrospective) and erection of No.3 5m high lighting columns to the north of the existing ménage.**

**At: The Former Pit Yard, Dean Lane, Water.**

The Planning Officer introduced the application and outlined details of the site, relevant planning history and the nature of the current application which was to seek retrospective permission for the erection of No.3, 5m high lighting columns to the south of the existing ménage and erection of No.3, new 5m high lighting columns to the north of the existing ménage.

The columns would be of tubular galvanised steel construction. Those existing and proposed would all be the same with 50w Son-T type lamps.

The agent had stated that the lights were necessary to extend the time in which the ménage can be used in conjunction with the equestrian business. The lighting would not be on past 10pm in the evening. The bulbs had been chosen at the lowest output

available and positioned/angled to only throw light onto the ménage and not neighbouring properties.

Eight objections had been received; details of these were highlighted in the report. LCC (Highways) had no objections to the application.

The lighting columns can be viewed from numerous areas however the light itself points downwards not outwards. The columns were situated over 100m from neighbouring properties.

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

Ms Wilson spoke in favour of the application.

In determining the application the committee discussed the following:

- Why the application was retrospective
- Height of the columns
- Timer option

A proposal was moved and seconded to approve the application along with 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>
7	0	0

**Resolved:**

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

**9. Enforcement Report – Q4.**

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the report to the committee which was to provide elected members with an update on current enforcement activity.

The report focused on updating members with details relating to the current number of open planning enforcement files, the different stages of any enforcement action paying particular attention to any details relating to enforcement notices issued, appeals and details of any court hearings pending for the third quarter of this year.

Following this information, members discussed the following:

- Appendix B was referring to enforcement actions only

- Working relationship between Planning and Enforcement
- Actions following complaints and signing off closed files
- Shutter policy and timescales for installing shutters

**Resolved**

That the report be noted.

**The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and concluded at 8.20pm**

**Signed:**

**(Chair)**