

MINUTES OF: THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Date of Meeting: 24th May 2017

Present: Councillor Procter (in the Chair)
Councillors Eaton, Fletcher, Kempson, Kenyon, Neal and Robertson

In Attendance: Nicola Hopkins, Planning Manager
Lauren Ashworth, Principal Planning Officer
Abigail Wrench, Legal Officer
Yasmin Ahmed, Legal Officer
Carolyn Sharples, Committee and Member Services Manager

Also Present: 6 members of the public
Councillor Lamb

Prior to the start of the meeting a short silence was held as a mark of respect for those affected by the incident in Manchester.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES

There were no apologies.

2. MINUTES

Resolved:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 21st March 2017 be signed by the Chair and agreed as a correct record.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

4. URGENT ITEMS OF BUSINESS

There were no urgent items of business.

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, which they had adequate time to read.

5. Application Number 2016/0187 (Agenda Item B1)

Demolition of existing commercial premises and replacement with a live work unit.

At: Unit 3, Shawclough Road, Whitewell Bottom

The Principal Planning Officer outlined the details in the report and noted that the application had been deferred from the meeting held on 28th February 2017 to allow amended plans to be

submitted. The Principal Planning Officer detailed the amended proposals including relevant planning history, consultation responses received and changes to conditions as detailed in the update report.

Mr S. Hartley spoke in favour of the application. Members asked questions for clarification purposes only.

The recommendation was to approve the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the report and update report.

In determining the application members discussed the following:

- The possibility of delegating matters relating to the pre-start condition relating to condition 7 to the Planning Manager rather than having to come back with a fresh application.

The Planning Manager confirmed that the condition was required by Lancashire County Council (LCC), but no response had been received prior to the meeting regarding the information submitted by the agent. It was possible to delegate the decision.

Members continued to discuss the following:

- It would be a shame to delay when it could be resolved within a matter of weeks.
- Better to delegate.
- Application had been deferred and they had gone over and above in providing the additional detail.
- As it was with LCC, the timetable to resolve the issue would need to be realistic.
- Delegate with a response deadline from LCC of within 2 weeks.

A proposal was moved and seconded to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation and subject to the conditions detailed in the Update Report and with delegated authority to the Planning Manager in consultation with the Chair in relation to the pre-start condition detailed in Condition 7 of the report and Update Report.

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

FOR	AGAINST	ABSTENTION
7	0	0

Resolved:

That planning permission was granted subject to the conditions set out in section 11 of the report and amended conditions 2, 3 and 4 as detailed in the Update Report, and with delegated authority to the Planning Manager, in consultation with the Chair, in relation to the pre-start condition detailed in Condition 7 of the report.

6. Application Number 2017/0100 (Agenda Item B2)

Outline application: Erection of 22no. bedroom care home (Use Class C2) with all details for approval except for landscaping.

At: Former Health Centre, Yorkshire Street, Bacup, OL13 9AE

The Principal Planning Officer outlined the details in the report including the proposal, relevant

planning history and consultation responses received. The Environment Agency had advised that the culvert under the site was in poor condition and would need repairing or replacing.

The recommendation was to grant outline planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the report and satisfactory resolution of the ecological matters in respect of bats. It was also recommended that delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to further consider the ecological implications for the development and to address any necessary mitigation by condition, or to refuse outline planning permission if there would be an adverse impact without suitable mitigation measures prior to 13 June 2017 (the current target date) or an agreed extended time period.

In determining the application members discussed the following:

- Was the culvert underneath the building and did it need repairing before any work commenced?
- Would they have to wait for the work to be done and repaired before starting to build?

The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that the condition of the culvert was poor and there was a condition recommending that a survey needed to be undertaken to determine whether it needed replacing or repairing. The survey of the culvert was set out in the timetable and would need to be done in accordance with the timetable. It did not say it had to be carried out before the development commenced. The structural survey would need to be undertaken and a scheme and timetable put forward, from which it would need working out whether it would need to be done before construction started.

Members continued to discuss the following:

- If it was under the building it would need to be repaired or replaced prior to the building going up.
- This area was a gateway to Bacup, it was currently an eyesore and improvements would be welcomed.
- It would be an asset to the town centre and would provide jobs in the area and surrounding areas.
- Could the delegation be in consultation with the Chair including the applicant providing written evidence of the repair or replacement of the culvert?

The Planning Manager clarified that the delegation should say to the Planning Manager and the delegation itself was regarding dealing with the ecology in relation to bats and not the culvert repairs/ replacement.

A proposal was moved and seconded to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation in addition to the delegation being in consultation with the Chair of the committee.

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

FOR	AGAINST	ABSTENTION
7	0	0

Resolved:

That outline planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report and satisfactory resolution of the ecological matters in respect of bats. That delegated authority be

granted to the Planning Manager, in consultation with the Chair, to further consider the ecological implications for the development and to address any necessary mitigation by condition, or to refuse outline planning permission if there would be an adverse impact without suitable mitigation measures prior to 13 June 2017 (the current target date) or an agreed extended time period.

7. Application Number 2017/0113 (Agenda Item B3)

Demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings, and construction of new nine-bedroomed dwelling, with associated access and landscaping works

At: Birtle Edge House, Castle Hill Road, Bury, BL9 6UW

The Planning Manager outlined the details in the report including the proposal, relevant planning history, representations received and the additional planning condition as detailed in the Update Report. The site was in the Greenbelt, however it was not considered to be inappropriate development since there was an existing building there and the development was not materially larger than the dwelling it replaced.

Mr D. Horton spoke in favour of the application.

The recommendation was to approve full planning permission subject to the conditions detailed in the report and Update Report.

In determining the application members discussed the following:

- Although it was in the Greenbelt it would replace the existing building.
- It had a similar look with superb views.
- The concerns raised were minor when balanced with the need for the accommodation.
- There were extenuating circumstances as it would assist with quality of life and providing a support network for those concerned.
- Vehicles were already able to get to the farms beyond the property and there were sufficient passing places.
- It would be a new building on the existing site.
- Was there a condition on the restriction of certain types of vehicles?

The Planning Manager confirmed that there was not a condition restricting certain types of vehicle, however the Construction Management Plan would detail any restriction on the type of vehicle permitted based on the access limitations.

A proposal was moved and seconded to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation including the additional condition detailed in the Update Report.

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

FOR	AGAINST	ABSTENTION
7	0	0

Resolved:

That full planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report and Update Report.

8. Application Number 2017/0116 (Agenda Item B4)

Conversion and extension of outbuildings to create 1 no. new three-bedroomed dwelling, with associated access and landscaping

At: Land to the west of Holmes Drive (Rear of 110 Burnley Road), Bacup

The Planning Manager outlined the details in the report including the proposal, relevant planning history, representations and consultation responses received.

The recommendation was to approve the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

In determining the application members discussed the following:

- Concerns over the number of vehicles at the property.
- Tight access onto a busy road, not a good access.

The Planning Manager confirmed that there was sufficient proposed parking with turning facilities and two car spaces had been provided within the curtilage of the proposed dwelling which was deemed acceptable.

Members continued to discuss the following:

- There was space for one car within the garage, with space for another on the property.

A proposal was moved and seconded to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation.

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

FOR	AGAINST	ABSTENTION
6	1	0

Resolved:

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

9. Application Number 2017/0112 (Agenda Item B5)

Conversion of dwelling to create two separate dwellings (1 no. three-bedroom, and 1 no. five-bedroom) with associated access and landscaping works (part retrospective)

At: 3-6 Lodge Terrace, Lower Clowes Road, Rawtenstall, BB4 6EL

The Planning Manager outlined the details in the report including the proposal, relevant planning history, representations and consultation responses received. The application sought planning permission for the conversion of the existing dwelling, with no changes proposed to the existing elevations.

The recommendation was to approve the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

A proposal was moved and seconded to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation.

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

FOR	AGAINST	ABSTENTION
7	0	0

Resolved:

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and concluded at 7.10pm.

Signed:

(Chair)