

UPDATE REPORT 11th January 2019
FURTHER UPDATE REPORT 15th January 2019 IN RED

FOR DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE MEETING OF 15th January 2019

B1 2018/0535 – Reeds Holme Works, Rawtenstall

Since publication of the Committee report, several updated plans have been received which reflect the latest site layout. The plans have been updated only to ensure that they all refer to the most recent iteration of the site layout drawing, and no change is proposed to the recommendation made in the Committee report. However, it is proposed that Condition 2 is amended to reflect the updated drawing numbers, and would read as follows:

“2. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following unless otherwise required by the conditions below:

- *Application form received 06/11/2018*
- *‘Burnley Road Frontage’ details by Urban Green received 06/11/2018*
- *Main Drainage Strategy (Drawing Number TAY 002 REV. C) received 07/01/2019*
- *Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Management Strategy (Betts Ref: HYD350_ALLIED.TEXTILES.RAWTENSTALL_FRA&DMS) received 06/11/2018*
- *‘Bin Store Details’ (Drawing Number 18030) received 06/11/2018*
- *‘Site Sections’ (Drawing Number 18030_04_Rev. A) received 07/01/2019*
- *House Type Dadford Brick (Drawing Number PA30) received 06/11/2018*
- *House Type Gosford Brick (Drawing Number PA34) received 06/11/2018*
- *House Type Gosford Stone (Drawing Number PA34) received 06/11/2018*
- *House Type Alton G Brick (Drawing Number PA35) received 06/11/2018*
- *House Type Lydford Brick (Drawing Number PA42) received 06/11/2018*
- *House Type Lydford Stone (Drawing Number PA42) received 06/11/2018*
- *House Type Alton G Stone (Drawing Number PB35) received 06/11/2018*
- *House Type Aldenham Brick (Drawing Number PD32) received 06/11/2018*
- *House Type Downham Brick (Drawing Number PD49) received 06/11/2018*
- *House Type Downham Stone (Drawing Number PD49) received 06/11/2018*
- *House Type Milldale Brick (Drawing Number PT310) received 06/11/2018*
- *House Type Milldale Stone (Drawing Number PT310) received 06/11/2018*
- *House Type Eskdale Brick (Drawing Number PT41) received 06/11/2018*
- *House Type Kentdale Brick (Drawing Number PT42) received 06/11/2018*
- *House Type Kentdale Stone (Drawing Number PT42) received 06/11/2018*
- *2 Bedroom Apartments (Wensum) Proposed Elevations received 21/12/2018*
- *Boundary Treatment Layout (drawing ref: 18030_03 Rev E) received 07/01/2019*
- *Boundary Details (Drawing Number 18030_05_Rev. A) received 07/01/2019*

- *Landscape Supporting Notes (Drawing Number UG_11822_LAN_LSN_DRW_07 REV. P01) received 06/11/2018*
- *Planting Plan (1 of 2) (Drawing Number UG_11822_LAN_SL_DRW_05 Rev P06) received 08/01/2019*
- *Planting Plan (2 of 2) (Drawing Number UG_11822_LAN-SL_DRW_06 Rev P06) received 08/01/2019*
- *Site Layout (Drawing Number 18030 06 Rev. M) received 21/12/2018*
- *Landscape Strategy (Landscape Strategy Rev E UG_11822_LAN_LCS_DOC_08 Rev E) received 08/01/2019*
- *Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan (UG_11822_LAN_LMP_DOC_09 Rev F) received 08/01/2019*
- *Hard & Soft Landscape General Arrangement Sheet 1 of 2 (Drawing Number UG_11822_LAN_GA_DRW_01 Rev P07) received 08/01/2019*
- *Hard & Soft Landscape General Arrangement Sheet 2 of 2 (Drawing Number UG_11822_LAN_GA_DRW_02 Rev P07) received 08/01/2019*
- *Hard Landscape Plan Sheet 1 of 2 (Drawing Number UG_11822_LAN_HL_DRW_03 Rev P07) received 08/01/2019*
- *Hard Landscape Plan Sheet 2 of 2 (Drawing Number UG_11822_LAN_HL_DRW_04 Rev P07) received 08/01/2019*
- *Construction Environmental Management Plan received 06/11/2018*
- *Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Issue 03) received 10/01/2019*
- *Interim Residential Travel Plan (October 2018) received 06/11/2018*

Reason: *For the avoidance of doubt.”*

Since publication of the Committee Report and the Update Report, comments have been received on this application from Rossendale Civic Trust, stating the following:

“Looking at your reports on Reeds Holme to this month’s DEVCON, we see that you have achieved some welcome results in the areas, see below, that we noted to the Applicant and yourselves.

However can’t see a reference to relate density to the Local Plan – the Applicant’s Planning Statement refers to a net density of 40/Ha: is there an agreed definition for net and gross in this case? To exclude or include areas that are primarily used and maintenance paid for by the residents?

Also can’t see a height for: the retention and lowering of the existing stone factory wall fronting Burnley Road. Is this to be a Condition to include reuse of a significant portion of its stone features from its windows and arch?”

In response to the comments received, the proposed density and layout of the development is considered acceptable in the context of the site. Statutory consultees have also raised no objection to the proposed density or layout.

In response to the query regarding the retention of the existing stone factory wall, the proposed boundary treatment plan shows that the wall is to be retained and lowered to a height of 0.6m along the Burnley Road frontage of the site. If the application is approved, the boundary treatment plan (*drawing ref: 18030_03 Rev E*) would be covered by proposed Condition 2 – and the development would need to be implemented by the developer in accordance with that plan. It is considered that the

reduction in height of the existing factory wall is acceptable, and there has been no objection from the Council's Conservation Officer in this regard.

Having regard to the above, there is no change to the recommendation or conditions contained within the Committee report.

B4 2018/0479 – Garage Plot 1A, Mark Street, Stacksteads

Since publication of the Committee report, a comment has been received from a member of the public stating as follows:

“I note a couple of errors in the entry at B4. These may possibly cause some confusion and might lead Committee members to believe that the applicant has more space on which to build than is the actual case so am writing to give you time to make the necessary amendments.

Under 'Application Details' the proposed garage is described as lying next to Plot No 2 and boundary fencing along Mark Street. In fact Plot 1 lies next to Plot 2, Plot 1A lies between Plot 1 & the boundary fence.

Also, under Planning History, the historic application 2004/199 is shown as relating to Plot No 1 but I think you will find that it refers to a different plot and not No 1.”

The description of the site contained within the Committee report states *“the site of the proposed garage lies next to Plot No. 2 and boundary fencing along Mark Street.”*

Officers have re-checked the submitted site location plan, and it does appear that it would be more accurate to describe the site as being between Plot 1 and the boundary fence.

There is no error however on the submitted plans, and it is not considered that the comments received have any implications for the acceptability of the scheme under consideration. As such there is no change to the recommendation or conditions contained within the Committee report.

In terms of the planning history, application 2004/199 relates to the adjacent plot (Plot 1) to that now under consideration (Plot 1A), and as such is relevant in providing a planning history context to the current application.

Mike Atherton
Planning Manager
11/01/2019