

MINUTES OF: THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Date of Meeting: 6th OCTOBER, 2015

Present: Councillor Oakes (in the Chair)
Councillors Eaton, Fletcher, Haworth, Kempson, Lythgoe and Robertson

In Attendance: Stephen Stray, Planning Manager
Lauren Ashworth, Principal Planning Officer
Richard Bingham, Legal Officer
Abigail Wrench, Trainee Solicitor
Michelle Hargreaves, Committee and Member Services Officer

Also Present: 6 members of the public
1 member of press
Councillors Cheetham and Lamb

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES

Apologies were received on behalf of Councillor Morris (Councillor Haworth sub) and Councillor Procter (Councillor Lythgoe sub).

2. MINUTES

Resolved:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 1st September, 2015 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

The Chair noted that the Planning Officers would be outlining the main points of the application and any relevant additional information. She noted that the Committee were given copies of all reports and plans in advance of the meeting and had had adequate time to read the same.

5. Application Number 2015/0238

Demolition of existing public house and re-development of site and adjacent car park for construction of 10 dwellings.

At: Horse and Jockey, 85 Market Street, Edenfield, BL0 0JQ.

The Planning Manager introduced the application, outlined details of the site, the relevant planning history and the reason for it being brought to the Development Control Committee, being that it was a departure and major along with 4 representations that had been received from local residents.

The applicant sought planning permission to demolish the existing Horse and Jockey public house / restaurant, and redevelop the entire site (including the adjacent car park). The development would involve the construction of ten new dwellings and associated gardens, parking spaces and access road.

The Planning Manager, referred to page 15 of the report, it was noted that the rear portion of the site straddled the Green belt/Urban Boundary and that part of the site would be located within the Green belt land. It was proposed to bring the whole of this site into the Urban Boundary within the Lives and Landscapes Local Plan Part 2; however at this stage of the process it only carried limited weight and therefore, the part of the development that would be located in the Green belt must be considered inappropriate in principle and should only be approved in very special circumstances.

In relation to this, on page 18 of the report, further argument was provided in support of the justification for allowing the development in the Green Belt due to the very special circumstances that exist.

The committee were informed that the entire development was located within previously developed land and accorded to policies included within the report. In relation to Housing Policy, the applicant had submitted an amendment to the house type 3 to increase its size in order to meet the National Spacing Standards.

The properties would be built in natural stone and the gables would be rendered, it was felt this would improve the visual amenity of the scheme. It was noted that the separation distances between the development and neighbouring properties were considered acceptable.

No objections had been received from (RBC) Environmental Health. The Planning Officer noted that several changes had been made by the applicant in attempt to address concerns raised by neighbours.

LCC (Highways) had no objection to the scheme and amendments had been made to the layout of the scheme in line with their comments.

Additionally, the Planning Manager suggested an informative to be added in relation to the removal of Japanese Knotweed located on site.

Officers recommendation was for approval, subject to the conditions outlined within the report, along with a S. 106 Obligation. An informative regarding the Japanese Knotweed would also be included.

In determining the application, the committee discussed the following:

- Eyesore – neighbours would like something to be done with the site

- Knotweed was a problem and the informative was encouraged
- Parking – problems all over valley but hopefully there would be sufficient room onsite
- Untidy site – committee concerns to be addressed to the applicant
- Length of time to start development – sooner rather than later
- The potential for an additional condition regarding double yellow lines
- Proposed development was in keeping with the area
- Impact on residents as building work takes place
- Possibility of using stone from existing building when this was demolished
- Stopping HGV’s parking around the site prior to working, potentially causing disruption to local residents, and stopping work taking place at unsocial hours
- Bus stop and suggestion of new location

The Planning Manager responded to matters of clarification raised by the committee. In relation to the state of the current site, it was noted work had been done to serve a S.215 notice in order to improve the site, however due to the application submitted it had been held in abeyance as progress was being made by the landowner /applicant. This could be kept under review in terms of the issue raised regarding double yellow lines. It was confirmed this would be covered under a S.106 Obligation. The planning manager also agreed to discuss with LCC highways appropriate location for the bus stop.

A proposal was moved and seconded to approve the application in accordance with the officer’s recommendation subject to the conditions outlined within the report along with the S.106 Obligation and the additional written informative regarding removal of the Japanese Knotweed on site. The applicant would also be advised of the committee’s concern that the site was tidied

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

FOR	AGAINST	ABSTENTION
7	0	0

Resolved:

That the application be approved, subject to the conditions outlined within the report along with the S.106 Obligation and the additional written informative regarding the removal of the Japanese Knotweed on site. The applicant would also be advised of the committee’s concern that the site was tidy.

6. Application Number 2015/0303

Erection of log cabin to provide refreshments.

At: Car park/ Picnic Area, Cowpe Road, Cowpe

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the application, outlined details of the site and the reasons for it being brought before the Development Control Committee, being that the site was Council land.

Planning permission was sought for the erection of a log cabin to be sited on land at the Greenbridge Picnic Area located off Cowpe Road. The applicant intended to provide cold drinks and snacks and other items such as cycle repair kits, cycle lights etc in association with the

existing picnic area. A generator would be used to provide power.

The applicant's supporting statement explains that it was intended to benefit the surrounding community by providing facilities to support the rural location. It was also proposed to provide timber picnic benches. It was noted that an image of the type of typical picnic style bench had been supplied.

The committee was informed that LCC (Highways) had stated that there would be a loss of a number of parking spaces on the car park which may lead to an overspill onto the access road however they confirmed that based on evidence submitted by the applicant, there was no objection as it was a very secluded site that has a parking facility that was currently underutilised. It was unlikely that the provision of the cabin would increase the number of vehicles to an extent that would cause harm to the adjacent highway network.

The scheme was acceptable in principle and in terms of visual amenity, and was not likely to have an impact on wildlife.

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

In determining the application, the committee discussed the following:

- Positive scheme, should be good for walkers/cyclists
- Lovely site – proposal would improve the area
- Nice to see local people doing something positive in their area
- The proposal was located on the 'Round the hills walk'

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

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

FOR	AGAINST	ABSTENTION
7	0	0

Resolved:

That the application be approved subject to conditions outlined within the report.

7. Application Number 2015/0063

Erection of 4 houses and associated access road and landscaping.

At: Land at Holly Mount, St Mary's Way, Rawtenstall

The Planning Manager introduced the application, outlined details of the site, the relevant planning history for the application site and the reasons for this proposal being brought before the Development Control Committee, being that 3 or more objections had been received.

It was noted that the applicant first submitted this application which sought permission for four

houses and an associated access road that officers considered would result in harm, if not loss, of mature trees in the group to the rear of 9/11 Schofield Close. The Applicant was asked to amend the scheme and a Tree Preservation Order was made to afford protection to trees on the site; a further report appears on the agenda in relation to the TPO.

The applicant now sought permission for four houses of a different design and with a siting that would take them outside the Root Protection Zone of the group of trees to the rear of 9/11 Schofield Close. The scheme would include 2 pairs of spit level semi-detached houses; they would be constructed of natural stone and would have 3 bedrooms per dwelling. There would also be a construction of a private switch-back road along with a turning head of a sufficient size to accommodate a bin wagon.

With regard to statutory consultation responses, no objections had been received. In relation to notification responses, various objections had been acknowledged and details of these concerns were outlined within the report.

It was noted that the site was located within the urban boundary which was an area the Core Strategy identified as being the focus for most built development. It was also near to the town centre's services and facilities. The development would not be prominent or intrusive.

Due to the number of houses being proposed, there would not be a requirement for the applicant to provide affordable housing or to make financial contributions towards public transport provision. There would be sufficient distance between the proposed dwellings and the properties on Schofield Close and Haslingden Old Road (in excess of 20m from their rear gardens).

LCC (Highways) were satisfied that the current local road network could accommodate the additional traffic the proposed dwellings would generate.

Officers' recommendation was for approval, subject to the conditions set out in the committee report.

Mr Hartley spoke in favour of the application.

In determining the application, the committee discussed the following:

- Concerns in relation to existing trees and the potential of losing some and the need for a TPO
- If the applicant would be happy to replant / re-site the saplings on site if it was necessary for some to be moved
- Open land – if this would be open to the public
- Option of a public footpath to be included from the development

The Planning Manager responded to matters of clarification raised by the committee.

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

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

FOR	AGAINST	ABSTENTION
7	0	0

Resolved:

That the application be approved, subject to the conditions outlined within the report.

**8. RBC Tree Preservation Order No 1 (Holly Mount Way, Rawtenstall) 2015
At: Holly Mount Way, Rawtenstall.**

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the report and outlined the background information which informed the committee that a TPO was made on 22nd May 2015 to afford protection to trees, of various species, located on land to the north side of the recently-completed apartment block at Holly Mount that ascended up to 104-122 Haslingden Old Road.

It was considered appropriate to make the TPO as an application which sought planning permission had been received to erect upon the land four houses, and an associated access road, that officers considered would cause unnecessary and unacceptable harm to trees of public visual amenity value.

An objection to the order had been received and details of this objection were highlighted within the report. Having given consideration to this, officers were in the view that the TPO should be confirmed without modification.

Officers' recommendation was to confirm the TPO without modification.

A proposal was moved and seconded to confirm the TPO without modification.

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

FOR	AGAINST	ABSTENTION
7	0	0

Resolved:

That the TPO be confirmed without modification.

The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and concluded at 7.20pm

Signed: (Chair)