

**MINUTES OF: THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**Date of Meeting:** 6<sup>th</sup> November 2018

**Present:** Councillor Procter (in the Chair)  
Councillors Eaton, Fletcher, Kempson, Marriott, Roberts and Robertson.

**In Attendance:** Mike Atherton, Planning Manager  
Jenni Cook, Committee and Member Services Officer  
Abigail Wrench, Legal Services Officer  
James Dagleish, Principal Planning Officer  
Mark Bray, Enforcement Officer

**Also Present:** Councillors Bromley, Essex and Johnson  
6 members of the public  
0 press

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

There were no apologies or substitutions.

**2. MINUTES**

**Resolved:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on the 2<sup>nd</sup> October 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) 2018/0374 – Land at Eden Lane, Edenfield. Two storey dwelling, detached double garage and alterations to access.**

The Principal Planning Officer outlined the application as detailed in the report. The application was for a detached four bedroom dwelling with a detached garage. There had been 7 objections, not the 9 as stated in the committee report from residents which had mentioned visual and neighbour amenity, parking and safety issues. There had been 4 letters of support from members

of the public. No issues had been raised by statutory consultees. The Officer's recommendation was for refusal.

There were no speakers against the application. The applicant's representative spoke in favour of the application and members asked questions for clarification.

Councillor Johnson spoke in favour of the application on behalf of ward members. Councillor Cheetham was unable to attend due to County Council business and had submitted an email in support of the application which had been circulated to members. The Chair also read out this email to the meeting.

In determining the application members discussed the following:

- The urban boundary was discussed and whether the site was defined as infill.
- Similar applications had been granted.
- Tidying up an area was not a good enough reason to grant planning permission.
- The Council's 5-year land supply was discussed.
- The site was not a very green space and had a long planning history.

In relation to the question of whether the site was classed as 'infill' the Planning Manager referred to the planning appeal 6 years ago in which the Inspector did not accept the infill argument and the appeal was dismissed. It was confirmed that the site had always been in greenbelt and that members must be satisfied that any very special circumstances that led them to approve the application must be balanced against outweighing the substantial harm to the greenbelt.

A proposal was moved and seconded to approve the application contrary to the officer's recommendation, with conditions delegated to the Planning Officers and the Chair.

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

FOR	AGAINST	ABSTENTION
5	2	0

**Resolved:**

The application was granted contrary to the officer's recommendation with conditions to be delegated to the Planning Officers and the Chair.

**6. Application Number (Agenda Item B2) 2018/0468 – Royal British Legion, 81-83 Deardengate Haslingden. Change of use of ground floor from social club to auction house, first floor from function rooms with 1. No apartment to 3. No apartments and 1 No. apartment in loft space.**

The Principal Planning Officer outlined the application as detailed in the report. The application was for a change of use from social club to auction house with the spaces above to be occupied by apartments. Objections had been received from neighbours that had highlighted neighbour amenity and parking concerns. No statutory objections had been received; comments had been made regarding the times that the auction house would operate and satisfactory provision of storage.

There were no speakers registered for or against the application.

In determining the application members discussed the following:

- Any use of the building would bring additional parking.
- This was a good use of an old building.
- The site visits were noted and had given a better understanding of highways matters.
- The applicants could be approached to ensure access and considerate parking on a 'good neighbour' basis.

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

**7. 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Planning Enforcement Update Report**

The Enforcement Officer outlined the report and updated members on a very busy quarter's work. The officer thanked members and colleagues for the work and co-operation over the last 6 months to achieve the results.

Members discussed the following:

- The Enforcement Officer and planning officers were thanked for their hard work.
- Members should contact enforcement officers with any concerns and these would be investigated.

**Resolved:**

The update was noted.

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

**Signed:**

**(Chair)**