

**MINUTES OF: THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**Date of Meeting:** 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2018

**Present:** Councillor Procter (in the Chair)  
Councillors Fletcher, Eaton, Roberts, Haworth (sub), Marriott and Lythgoe (sub).

**In Attendance:** Mike Atherton, Planning Manager  
Carolyn Sharples, Committee and Member Services Manager  
Abigail Wrench, Legal Services Officer  
James Dalgleish, Principal Planning Officer

**Also Present:** Councillors Bromley and Lamb  
17 members of the public

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

Apologies were received for Councillors Kempson and Robertson, Councillors Haworth and Lythgoe were substituting.

**2. MINUTES**

**Resolved:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on the 28<sup>th</sup> August 2018 be signed by the Chair and agreed as a correct record.

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

**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: (Agenda Item B1) 2018/0424 – Rossendale Holiday Cottages, Dean Lane, Water – Erection of guest house accommodation comprising of 8 guest rooms for maximum additional occupancy of 16 people (Use Class C1), with associated facilities including lounge, restaurant, spa and indoor pool, in addition to landscaping, car parking and access road.**

The Principal Planning Officer outlined the application as detailed in the report. The application was a re-submission, but with further clarification since the previous committee decision. There

had been 29 objections from members of the public and one letter of support. No issues had been raised by statutory consultees.

An objector spoke against the application and members asked questions for clarification.

The applicant spoke in favour of the application and members asked questions for clarification.

Councillor Bromley spoke against the application on behalf of ward members.

The Chair also brought members attention to a letter of support from the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Tourism, Councillor MacNae.

In determining the application members discussed the following:

- Traffic movement.
- Narrow lane with no footpath in places.
- Vehicles staying overnight.
- Parking availability for additional workers.
- Points 3-9 on pages 14-15, why had these conditions not already been achieved?
- Concerns of residents.
- High quality development.
- The road would still be narrow whatever happens.
- Boosting tourism, but not at the detriment to the community.
- The applicants had offered to work with local residents.
- Highways had not objected, so the application would be won on appeal if refused.
- The business was complimentary to the countryside.
- Government policy promotes economic development.
- Cars would be parked on a busy road.
- Vehicles were going to school in that location and there was no footpath.

In relation to points 3-9 the Planning Manager confirmed that pre-commencement conditions had to be met before a scheme was started once a decision had been approved, and not prior to a decision being made.

A proposal was moved and seconded to refuse the application contrary to the officer's recommendations for the following reasons:

- Highway safety
- Noise
- Traffic movements at certain times
- Light pollution
- Visual impact

The Planning Manager confirmed that the previous reasons for refusal were:

- Highway safety
- Light pollution
- Overdevelopment
- Noise

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

FOR	AGAINST	ABSTENTION
3	4	0

The motion was lost.

A proposal was moved and seconded to approve the application in line with the officer's recommendations, subject to the conditions in section 11 of the report, and with the following additional condition:

- That construction work hours would be:
  - Weekdays: 7.00am – 7.00pm
  - Saturdays: am only
  - No Sundays or Bank Holidays

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

FOR	AGAINST	ABSTENTION
4	3	0

**Resolved:**

The application was granted in line with the officer's recommendation, subject to the conditions in section 11 of the report, and with the following additional condition:

- That construction work hours would be:
  - Weekdays: 7.00am – 7.00pm
  - Saturdays: am only
  - No Sundays or Bank Holidays

**6. Application Number (Agenda Item B2) 2018/0383 – Land off Rockcliffe Road, Bacup – Revised house types/plots to 20 of the proposed dwellings.**

The Principal Planning Officer outlined the application as detailed in the report. The application was to vary 20 houses from semi-detached to terraced design. There had been no statutory or public objections.

There were no speakers registered for or against the application.

In determining the application members discussed the following:

- Reduced numbers, from 26 to 24.
- Easier to sell.

A proposal was moved and seconded to approve the application in line with the officer's recommendation, subject to the conditions in section 11 of the report.

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

FOR	AGAINST	ABSTENTION
7	0	0

**Resolved:**

The application was granted in line with the officer’s recommendation, subject to the conditions in section 11 of the report.

**7. Application Number (Agenda Item B3) 2018/0368 – Unit 3, Rising Bridge Business and Enterprise Village, Blackburn Road, Rising Bridge – Expansion of the existing gym units from Units 1 & 2 into Unit 3.**

The Principal Planning Officer outlined the application as detailed in the report. There had been no statutory or public objections.

The Chair noted that the application had been called before the committee by Councillor Kenyon.

In determining the application members discussed the following:

- Parking facilities and availability.
- Spice Rooms parking agreement.
- Customers would park on the street if there were no spaces.
- It was barrier operated parking.
- Someone operated the barrier.
- Gym attendance was a continuous process, with people staying ½ - 1 hour.
- Parking would become available on a regular basis.

For clarification, the Principal Planning Officer informed that they had been notified previously of an informal parking agreement with the Spice Rooms, but there was no such agreement. The current assessment by the Highways Authority had been based on there being no informal parking agreement. Their assessment had been based on the 3 units only and they had not raised any objections. In addition to this, they had sent out enforcement officers on 5 occasions but no tickets had needed to be issued.

A proposal was moved and seconded to approve the application in line with the officer’s recommendation, subject to the conditions set out in section 10 of the report.

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

FOR	AGAINST	ABSTENTION
7	0	0

**Resolved:**

The application was granted in line with the officer’s recommendation, subject to the conditions set out in section 10 of the report.

**8. Application Number (Agenda Item B4) 2018/0434 - Rear of Rawtenstall Market Hall, Burnley Road, Rawtenstall – Full: Erection of a greenhouse.**

The Principal Planning Officer outlined the application as detailed in the report. The greenhouse would be for community use and the land was owned by the Council, which is why the report was before the committee.

There were no speakers registered for or against the application.

In determining the application members discussed the following:

- Good use of the land.
- Supporting Civic Pride.
- Concern over anti-social activity.

In response to a members question, the Planning Manager noted that it would be for the owner/users to take action against anti-social activity.

A proposal was moved and seconded to approve the application in line with the officer's recommendation, subject to the conditions set out in section 10 of 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:**

The application was granted in line with the officer's recommendation, subject to the conditions set out in section 10 of the report.

**The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and concluded at 7.20pm**

**Signed:**

**(Chair)**