

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

WEDNESDAY, 10TH JANUARY, 2018, 6.00 PM

SHIELD ROOM, CIVIC CENTRE, WEST PADDOCK, LEYLAND PR25  
1DH

### **AGENDA**

- |   |                        |
|---|------------------------|
| <p><b>6 Planning Application 07/2017/3652/FUL - Land South Of Orchard Avenue, New Longton</b></p> <p>Report of the Director of Development, Enterprise and Communities attached.</p>              | <p>(Pages 57 - 58)</p> |
| <p><b>7 Planning Application 07/2017/3144/FUL - 348 Station Road, Bamber Bridge</b></p> <p>Report of the Director of Development, Enterprise and Communities attached.</p>                        | <p>(Pages 59 - 60)</p> |
| <p><b>8 Planning Application 07/2017/3296/FUL - Golden Hill Short Stay School, Earnshaw Drive, Leyland</b></p> <p>Report of the Director of Development, Enterprise and Communities attached.</p> | <p>(Pages 61 - 62)</p> |

Heather McManus  
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Electronic agendas sent to Members of the Planning Committee Councillors Jon Hesketh (Chair), Rebecca Noblet (Vice-Chair), Renee Blow, Carol Chisholm, Bill Evans, Malcolm Donoghue, Derek Forrest, Mary Green, Ken Jones, Jim Marsh, Mike Nathan, Mike Nelson, Caleb Tomlinson, Linda Woollard and Barrie Yates

The minutes of this meeting will be available on the internet at [www.southribble.gov.uk](http://www.southribble.gov.uk)

#### **Forthcoming Meetings**

6.00 pm Wednesday, 7 February 2018 - Shield Room, Civic Centre, West Paddock, Leyland PR25 1DH

#### **Procedure of Debate at Planning Committee**

Whenever a planning application is dealt with by Planning Committee the Council is keen to allow the local community to participate in the process. The procedure that will ordinarily be followed is that:-

- Up to five members of the public who wish to speak against an application will be allowed to speak. Each will have up to four minutes in which to state their case.
- Up to five members of the public who wish to speak in favour of an application will then be allowed to speak. Again each will have up to four minutes in which to state their case.
- Borough councillors (not on Planning Committee) will then have the opportunity to make representations about the application. Each will have up to four minutes to state their case – whether for or against.
- The applicant/agent will then be invited to speak in support of the application. Ordinarily he/she will have up to four minutes to speak.
- The application will then be discussed by Committee. At this point members of the public, the applicant and other councillors not on Committee will not be able to speak further.
- Planning Committee will then take a vote on the matter.
- No paperwork, plans or photographs will be allowed to be circulated by the applicant/agent or member of the public at the meeting.

The Chairman of Planning Committee has discretion to vary these rules when dealing with a particular application if he considers it appropriate. Whenever members of the public speak (whether in opposition to a proposal or in favour of it) they should avoid repeating the same points made by other speakers.

### **Filming/Recording Meetings**

The Council will allow any member of the public to take photographs, film, audio-record and report on any Planning Committee meeting. If anyone is intending to record any such meeting (or part of such a meeting) then it would be very helpful if they could give prior notice of their intention to the Council's Democratic Services Team. Ideally 48 hours' notice should be given.

When exercising the rights to record a Planning Committee meeting a member of the public must not in any way be disruptive to that meeting. They must not provide an oral commentary on the meeting whilst it is continuing. If disruption is caused then the Chairman of the meeting may exclude that person from the rest of the meeting.

Members of the public will not be entitled to stay in the meeting if any confidential (exempt) items of business are being discussed.

Full details of planning applications, associated documents including related consultation replies can be found on the Public Access for planning system, searching for the application using the Simple Search box. <http://publicaccess.southribble.gov.uk/online-applications/>

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE: WEDNESDAY 10 JANUARY 2018**

### **UPDATE SHEET**

#### **ITEM 6 07/2017/3652/FUL Orchard Avenue**

A further 3 letters of representations have been received which raise the same concerns and which are addressed in the Committee report.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Planning Committee Update Sheet – 10<sup>th</sup> January 2018

### Item 7

#### 07/2017/3144/FUL – 348 Station Road, Bamber Bridge PR5 6EL

Two additional reports have been submitted by the applicant in support of the application.

The first report relates to Equipment Specification which has been shared with Environmental Health who have made the following comments in relation to its contents.

The documents suggest a background noise level between the hours of 09:00 to 23:00 of 47dB(A) but no further information was supplied. When and where was this figure measured and can we see the data. In addition it quotes the wrong standard (BS4142: 1997 which has been update in 2014).

The document then has some calculations of sound emissions from the extraction but in relation to a site at 294 Clarence Road, Sutton Coldfield, i.e. not this site. With distance correction based on 7m is this right. There is no tonal information although there appears to be one around the 250 Hz range.

In relation to the system itself do we do not have a plan showing the termination point of the extraction system. There is no information on any air handling/ conditioning units or whether walk in refrigeration unit is internal.

At the moment the information is very basic and not specific to the site, therefore in light of the lack of information the proposal cannot be supported based on the information supplied.

The second report is an Employment Land Availability study and a Sequential Test. The report states that this information was requested by the Council however, what was requested was details of how the site had been marketed as reference had been made to no one being interested in the site for light industrial purposes but no evidence had been supplied to demonstrate how the site had been marketed to support this statement. This information was requested in relation to satisfying the Controlling Re-Use of Employment Premises SPD.

Having looked through the report reference is made to Policy 9 of the Core Strategy which is for the provision of new employment/economic sites, and as such is not relevant to this scheme. The relevant policy is Policy 10 of the Core Strategy. The applicant, in his submission, has stated why, in his opinion, the property is suitable for the hot food takeaway use proposed, but he has not provided evidence to show how he has satisfied the criteria set out in Policy 10 for the loss of the property from an employment use.

Whilst it is accepted that the site is not within the “Best Urban” or “Good Urban” employment sites, it has still has a function in the employment offer in the Borough, and as such, from a policy point of view, there are still concerns about the potential loss of an employment unit without appropriate evidence being submitted.

The applicant provides a commentary in the statement, however, I would expect to see evidence to back up the statements he makes in order for the application to be acceptable in policy terms, however this is lacking in the submission.

An additional letter of objection has been received which raises the following concerns. This end of Station Road is predominantly residential with the existing commercial/ industrial business either starting work before 7am or working normal business hours. The resident's quality of life will be substantially downgraded if another business open to 11pm is to be allowed.

This appears to go against Central Lancashire Access to Healthy Living SPD 2012 which discourages planning consent for new take-aways. (This SPD is no longer actively in use)

The consultant report that states it meets criteria B 'need for proposed use' saying 'The development would meet a need for more retail shops and eating establishments, within the local community'. There is not a need for more take-aways demonstrated by the presence of plenty of existing premises. (It is not the purpose of the Planning System to regulate market forces) therefore this is not a material planning consideration.

## Planning Committee Update Sheet – 10 January 2018

### Item 8

#### Planning Application 07/2017/3296/FUL – Golden Hill Short Stay School

A number of minor changes to the report have been identified, and of which the applicant wishes to make you aware. These are as follows:

- Para 4.2 should read '*brown and beige resin cladding and grey render*' not '*brown, grey and beige resin cladding*'
- Para 4.9 – The applicants Project Plan at Page 49 states that '*100% of the new school building superstructure will be constructed off-site at McAvoy Group's specialist production facility*' This is incorrect as the main hall will not be. It would be more accurate to say that '*the school will predominantly be constructed off site at a specialist production facility*'.
- Page 4 of the applicants Project Plan states that '*the area to the rear of the site is to be broken up but not removed; this will form the base for the new soft play area as shown on the Architects drawings*'. To clarify no new soft play area is being provided, the footprint of the demolished building will be re-seeded as opposed to a hard surface.

This page is intentionally left blank