

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE  
HELD AT NELSON TOWN HALL  
ON 24<sup>TH</sup> JULY, 2017**

*PRESENT –*

*Councillor K. Hartley - (Chairman – in the Chair)*

**Councillors**

*W. Blackburn  
T. Cooney  
L. M. Crossley  
M. Goulthrop  
J. Starkie  
K. Turner – substitute for G. Waugh*

**Officers in attendance**

<i>Neil Watson</i>	<i>Planning, Building Control and Licensing Services Manager</i>
<i>Barbara Kay</i>	<i>Solicitor</i>
<i>Sarah Waterworth</i>	<i>Committee Administrator</i>

*(Apologies were received from Councillors G. Waugh and D. Whipp)*



*The following people attended the meeting and spoke on the item indicated –*

<i>Judith Douglas</i>	<i>17/0245/FUL Full: erection of three</i>	<i>Minute No. 34(a)</i>
<i>Duncan Walsh</i>	<i>houses at land at Gaylands Lane, Earby</i>	
<i>Bob Brown</i>		
<i>Ken Davison</i>		

**32. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

Members were reminded of the legal requirements concerning the declaration of interests.

**33. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED**

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> June, 2017 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**34. PLANNING APPLICATIONS  
REFERRED FROM AREA COMMITTEES**

**(a) 17/0245/FUL Full: Erection of three houses at Land at Gaylands Lane Earby for Mr R G Walker**

At a meeting West Craven Committee on 4th July, 2017 decision to refuse this application was

referred as a recommendation to this Committee as the decision would represent a significant risk of costs to the Council.

**RESOLVED**

That the application be **refused** for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed development lies within the Earby Conservation Area outside of the urban boundary. The development would have a detrimental impact on the character of the Conservation Area, particularly the impact it would have when viewed from the public footpath network to the north of the site where it would result in a loss of views and detract from the Conservation Area's character. The impact would result in less than substantial harm but it would be sufficient to justify refusal of planning permission when weighed against the benefits Framework. The development would be contrary to policy ENV 1 of the adopted Part 1 Pendle Local Plan – Core Strategy.
2. The design of the development is poor and does not integrate with open countryside adjoining. The development is thus contrary to policy ENV 1 of the Pendle Local Plan part 1 – Core Strategy and to the National Planning Policy Framework with particular reference to paragraph 64.

CHAIRMAN \_\_\_\_\_