

## **Colne Committee Update Report 8<sup>th</sup> August 2019**

### **19/0314/HHO – St Bartholomew’s Church**

Further comments have been received on the following:

- 1 I would like to know how you have concluded that the above planning application should be approved following the receipt of a petition with over 1300 signatures opposing it.
- 2 How much weight did you give to this petition and how can you approve with so much local opposition?
- 3 How is metal roof in keeping with the heritage on the site?
- 4 Furthermore, how can you say creating a vehicular access to the site would NOT adversely impact Building, Conservation area or visual amenity... Of course it would.
- 5 Lack of necessity for the development
- 6 No arrangements for recycling of waste
- 7 No details of CCTV security

Comments on each point:

- 1 Weight is not given to the number of comments but on the planning merits of comments.
- 2 Planning decisions are not approved or refused based on the weight of comments. Decisions based simply on public opposition or support would be unlawful. Decision need to be based on the planning merits of a case.
- 3 The impact on the listed building is considered as part of the report to Committee
- 4 The Committee report comments on the changes to the development where a vehicular access is no longer proposed.
- 5 This is not a material planning matter.
- 6 The application proposes extensions to part of the building but does not agree the principle of development which is already established. The disposal of waste arises from the use of the building and not the extensions and as such the application does not impact on that matter hence there is no requirement to provide additional facilities.
- 7 The application does not propose new CCTV as it is not shown on external elevation plans. Any installation on the fabric of the building would require Listed Building Consent.

The comments received do not alter the recommendation or the planning balance. The proposals are acceptable and approval is still recommended to both applications.

### **19/0430/FUL – 17 White Lee Avenue, Trawden**

Following submission of amended plans, 5 additional letters of objection were received from neighbouring occupiers, their comments are summarised as follows:

- Insufficient parking spaces on plot. The garage is not large enough to count as a parking space.
- Loss of privacy to neighbouring gardens.
- Deadline should have been extended to comment on revised plans, as some neighbours were away.
- Proportions of the house will be out of keeping with existing large detached properties.
- Harm to the ‘open’ feel of the estate and cause overdevelopment.
- The property would not be 1 metre from adjacent properties.
- Single storey rear element would contravene 45 degree rule.
- Risk of de-stabilisation of land and the drainage of water.

- A construction method statement would not be sufficient to control the congestion across the estate.
- Building work would be severely disruptive and inconvenient for all residents.
- The policies of the Trawden Forest Neighbourhood Plan should hold great weight.
- The property would be overbearing to directly adjacent dwellings.

**The recommendation to approve still stands.**

**19/0453/ADV – Lidgett, Skipton Old Road, Colne**

Following submission of amended plans, 3 additional responses have been received objecting on the following grounds:

- The sign is within a CA and shows no cohesion with it in colour, style, materials, size or scale even at its reduced size;
- There is disconnect with the development when it is as far away as you can get from and out of sight of the proposed show house, the marketing suite and the entrance to the estate;
- It is positioned randomly within the CA causing harm with no mitigating benefit to the development;
- In this digital age it is unnecessary;
- The sign has been reduced in height and size which is disappointing as the developers should have applied before erecting the sign and had discussions with Planning at that stage, this is too little too late and the objections should be taken seriously; and
- The sign is too large and not in keeping with English Heritages recommendations.

Comments have also been received from Colne Parish Council – Strongly object as this is incompatible with the setting of a Conservation Area.

LCC Highways have no objection to the amended scheme.

**The recommendation to Grant Advert Consent still stands.**