

Nelson, Brierfield & Reedley Committee Update Report 8th June 2026

26/0179/FUL: St Philip's Church, Leeds Road, Nelson

Following the applicant has also provided additional information, in the form of a waste management plan. This sets out the existing provision for waste collection and the anticipated change, as a result of the proposed development.

The points which have been raised should be noted by Members.

The information provided by the applicant removes the need for condition 5, as such the conditions recommended are as follows:

1. The proposed development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan received 24/03/2026, Site Plan received 20/05/2026, Proposed pod layout received 24/03/2026, Proposed pod floor plan received 24/03/2026, Proposed pod rear and side elevation received 24/03/2026, Proposed container layout received 24/03/2026.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. All materials to be used for the proposed development hereby approved shall be as stated on the application form and approved drawings and they shall not be varied without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: Those materials are appropriate for the development and site.

4. No customers for the food bank / pantry shall be allowed on the premises outside the hours of 09:00-15:30 Monday – Friday. The food bank shall remain closed on weekends and bank holidays.

Reason: In the interests of neighbouring amenity.

26/0191/HHO: 509 Colne Road, Reedley

Additional comments have been received from a member of the public raising concerns about the visibility splay onto Colne Road. This has already been covered in the committee report. However, they have also expressed concerns about the line of conifer trees which have recently been planted along the application site boundary, again due to the effect upon forward visibility. The land in question is outside the application site boundary and cannot be controlled by this application. The presence of those trees would not justify the retention of the panelling, although they also impact on visibility if they were to be removed the unacceptable impact of

the panelling would remain if it were to be approved. The recommendation remains to Refuse for the reasons detailed in the Committee Report.