

# Late Information Report – 21<sup>st</sup> December

## 2015 Planning Committee

This report brings to the attention of the Planning Committee any late information, amendments, or corrections to the agenda items that have been published. The report is circulated at the start of the Committee meeting and copies can be inspected by anyone attending that meeting.

### **Late information, amendments, or corrections**

**Planning Ref.** 32/2015/15768

**Proposal.** Reserved matter for the appearance of 49 houses on land at Green Lane, Glusburn.

#### Additional Information Received

Following re-consultation on revised house types 5 letters have been received raising the following objections (summarised):

- Developer should stick to the revisions and not build the 3 storey dwellings.
- Development is overcrowded and badly laid out and does not reflect the character of the area. It will also spoil the landscape.
- No attempt has been made to extend off-road communication nearer the town centre or other amenities.
- Pedestrian route to Colne Road cannot be called multi-user as it contains steps which will prevent use other than by active pedestrians.
- There is a danger to the long term health of the sycamore tree on the western side of the field.
- Green Lane is too narrow to cope with increased traffic and traffic speeds, visibility at junction are poor.
- New estate should have speed bumps.
- Local utilities and services cannot cope with proposed increase in housing.

#### Amendments to the Report or Recommendation

N/A

**Planning Ref.** 32/2015/15584

**Proposal.** Storage Vessels, safety Guard Rails, Boundary Screening – Airedale Chemicals, Enterprise Centre, Cross Hills.

Additional Information Received

N/A

Amendments to the Report or Recommendation

**Officer note:** Officers have not recommended that a planning condition be attached to specifically require construction of the proposed boundary screen detailed on plan reference no: 1620-21-01 revision F. In officer opinion it is not necessary to construct this screen to make the development acceptable (although its construction causes no harm if the developer chooses to do so).

If members of the Planning Committee disagree with the officer assessment on this matter they are entitled to impose a planning condition to require construction of the screen wall in the interests of residential and / or visual amenity.

**Planning Ref.** 18/2015/16278

**Proposal.** Change of use of derelict former church hall to form a camping barn at Temperance Hall, Keasden.

Additional Information Received

The Environment Agency has now responded to the additional Flood Risk information provided by the applicant. The EA has confirmed that whilst they do not object in principle they still require further information before they will lift their objection. In particular the EA seek the following: -

- A narrative to detail how the occupants will be warned before the onset of flooding.
- An explanation of how occupants will reach a place of safety (outside of the floodzone) especially at night.
- Confirmation that the sleeping accommodation will be raised above floor level.

Amendments to the Report or Recommendation

None necessary. The recommendation is already that delegated authority is given to the DC Manager to grant permission subject to confirmation being received that the Environment Agency has no objections. It is therefore still recommended that this further information will need to be provided and approved by the EA before planning permission is granted.

**Planning Ref.** 31/2015/16262 & 31/2015/16266

**Proposal.** Applications to vary conditions 14 & 16 of original planning permissions 31/2014/14018 and 31/2013/14022

Additional Information Received

Additional information has been received from the applicant's agent regarding condition 16. Condition 16 presently requires the passing places on the adjacent road network to be provided prior to the commencement of development. The application seeks to amend that condition to allow the construction of the passing places to be delayed until 'prior to the first occupation' of the development. For the reasons set out in the committee report it was not recommended that this condition be altered.

The applicant's agent has stated that the Highway Authority has confirmed that the passing places can be constructed within the highway verge and therefore there is no problem with their delivery. They have also indicated that the applicant owns the land up to boundary with the highway verge so there can be no question of difficulties in the delivery of the passing places.

The applicant has also explained that their client wishes to progress with the formation of guest accommodation now (approved under 31/2013/14018) without forming the passing places; they will instead be formed prior to the occupation of the development.

Amendments to the Report or Recommendation

No explanation is given why the applicant wants to construct the passing places prior to the occupation of development (rather than the previously permitted prior to the commencement of the development).

Whilst the applicant's agent has indicated that they own land up to the highway verge, the plans submitted do not indicate this to be the case for the southernmost passing place. However, the Highway Authority now seems to have confirmed that the passing places can be formed within the highway verge and so there does seem to be no doubt that they can be delivered. This removes one of Officers reasons for resisting the proposed amendment to condition 16.

However, notwithstanding the absence of an objection to the amendment from the Highways Authority, Planning Officers remain concerned about the potential impact on the local highway network, including the amenities of other users of the local highway network, during construction works if the passing places are not formed

prior to the commencement of development. The extent of new development proposed by both applications is significant and therefore it is probable that there will be significant construction works. In Officers opinion the passing places should be provided prior to the commencement of development.

Consideration has been given as to whether it would be acceptable to vary the condition and allow just the guest accommodation units to be formed prior to the provision of passing places. However, the amount of development proposed for these units is still significant. Five units of guest accommodation are proposed and two of these units are formed from the demolition and subsequent rebuilding of an existing building. It therefore remains the case that in Officers opinion the potential impact on the local highway network, including the amenities of other users of the local highway network, would be unacceptable during construction works if the passing places were not formed prior to the commencement of development.

No amendment to the recommendation in the Committee Report is therefore proposed.