

Development Management Committee Update Report 23rd June 2026

3(a) Applications for over 60 housing units

26/0221/REM - Reserved Matters: Residential development of up to 113 dwellings (Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale) of Outline Planning Permission 22/0774/OUT varied by 23/0557/VAR at site of former Riverside Mill and land bordering with Charles Street and Baker Street, Reedyford Road, Nelson

Amended plans have been submitted responding to LCC Highway's comments and they have responded as follows:

Pedestrian and cycle links

All the proposed linkages are shared pedestrian/cycle routes, 3.5m wide connecting the adjacent highways Reedyford Road, Elizabeth Street, Crawford Street and Charles Street.

A 3.5m wide pedestrian/cycle link was previously requested to be added to Dover Street and it is unclear if this is included.

Refuse collection

Bin collection points are included adjacent to the estate roads as previously requested.

Travel Plan

Mosodi Travel Plan Rev 1 dated June 2026 is now submitted and amended as requested.

Conclusion

Lancashire County Council would request the Dover Street pedestrian/cycle link is confirmed. Subject to this there is no objection to the proposal.

Officer Comments

The applicant confirmed that the Dover Street pedestrian / cycle link is proposed, however, LCC Highways raised concerns about visibility at the point where the pedestrian / cycle access to Dover Street meets the highway, due to the existing stone wall at that point. A further amended plan has been received which shows a section of the existing stone wall reduced in height to increase visibility. This would not result in any unacceptable visual, heritage or residential amenity impacts and appears that this is likely to address LCC Highway's concerns in relation to visibility. LCC Highways have been reconsulted and their response is awaited.

For clarity, in relation to Nelson, Brierfield and Reedley Committee's comments regarding affordable housing, the applicant's intention is for the development to be 100% affordable housing, however, as detailed in the report there is no policy basis or necessity for any affordable housing to be required.

The application remains that the approval of the application and any conditions necessary is delegated to the Assistant Director Planning, Building Control and Regulatory Services.

3(b) Referrals from area committees

26/0018/VAR - Variation of Condition: Vary Condition 2 (Plans) of Planning Permission 25/0431/HHO at 33 Heyhead Street, Brierfield

Officer Comments

Amended plans have been received which alter the proposed external materials beneath the roof overhang from off-white render to black marble tiles with gold detailing.

The retention of black marble tiling beneath the roof overhang would continue to introduce an inappropriate and visually intrusive feature that is out of keeping with the character and appearance of both the host property and the surrounding residential area.

The harm arising from the proposal is further exacerbated by the site's prominent corner plot position, which results in the extension being highly visible from multiple public vantage points. Rather than integrating with the host dwelling and wider street scene, the extension would appear as a dominant and discordant feature that draws undue visual attention and disrupts the visual cohesion of the area.

As such, the amended variation would represent poor design, resulting in demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area, contrary to Policies DM16 and DM24 of the Pendle Local Plan Fourth Edition (2021–2040) and the adopted Design Principles SPD.

Therefore, the recommendation has now been changed back to refusal.

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

1. By reason of its design, the proposed variation undermines the approved scheme and would result in an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development, causing demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area. It is therefore contrary to Policies DM16 and DM24 of the Pendle Local Plan Part 1 (2021–2040) and the adopted Design Principles SPD.

26/0180/HHO - Full: Erection of two storey and part single storey side and rear extension at 153 Walton Lane, Nelson

The applicant has submitted a change in the proposal which includes additional elements. Relevant consultees and neighbours were reconsulted on a 21-day expiry which is to expire on 08/07/2026.

Consultee Response

Highways

Further comments were received on 22/06/2026 –

1. Recommendation

The Highway Development Control Section of Lancashire County Council has no objections to the planning application in principle.

2. Highway Impact Assessment

With regard to your amended consultation letter dated 8th July 2026, the following comments are based on the submitted information provided by the applicant to date.

As shown in submitted drawing 'Location and Site Plan Drawing AB0613 – 06', three off-street car-parking spaces are proposed. The proposed dimensions are more than adequate in size to serve the development and are above the recommended standards for a three-bedroom dwelling.

However, as the parking layout is shown, the boundary wall appears to require removal and alterations to the existing vehicular crossover requires extending to an adequate width. As there is an existing footway streetlight at the edge of the curtilage, the extended vehicular crossover will have to be 'dropped' and then 'raised' prior to the streetlight.

Lancashire County Council Highways therefore requests that the applicant submits amended plans demonstrating how compliant off-street parking is to be achieved considering the above information and in accordance with the standards, prior to the application being determined.

Parish/Town Council

No comments received.

Environmental Services (Health)

No further comments received.

Public Response

The nearest neighbours have been notified by letter with no further responses having yet been received.

Officer Comments

Amended plans have received which alters the proposal from a two-storey side extension to two storey and part single storey side and rear extension. The following material considerations apply:

Design and Materials

The Design Principles SPD advises that two-storey side extensions to semi-detached properties should respect the symmetry and spacing of the original pair and avoid creating a terracing effect. Such extensions should typically be set in from the side boundary, set back from the principal elevation by at least 1m, and incorporate a lower

ridge line to remain subordinate in scale. Two storey extensions should also normally have a pitched roof.

The amended proposal comprises a two-storey and part single-storey side extension which would wrap around the rear of the dwelling to create a two-storey and part single-storey rear extension. The two-storey side element would project approximately 3.64m from the side elevation and extend to the shared boundary with No.151. It would be set back approximately 5.36m from the principal elevation and would project approximately 3.5m beyond the rear elevation. The roof would comprise a pitched roof form with a reduced ridge height of approximately 6.22m, compared to the main dwelling, ensuring that it remains subordinate in appearance.

The proposal also incorporates single-storey elements to the front and rear. The front element would infill the area between the principal elevation and the set-back two-storey extension, whilst the rear element would occupy the area between the two-storey extension and the east side elevation of the main dwelling. Both elements would feature flat roofs with a height of approximately 2.8m.

External materials are proposed to match the existing dwelling, including rendered walls, white UPVC doors and windows, and concrete roof tiles.

The host dwelling forms part of a pair of semi-detached properties. The original relationship between the pair includes an attached single storey side element set back circa 4.2m from the principal elevation, creating a clear separation between the two properties. This relationship is characteristic of the immediate area, including neighbouring properties such as No.147 and No.149.

Planning permission has already been granted for a two-storey side extension at the adjoining property, No.151, which would similarly extend to the shared boundary. Whilst the proposed two-storey extension would further alter the relationship between the pair of dwellings, the set back from the principal elevation, reduced ridge height and subordinate roof form would ensure that it remains a subservient addition to the host dwelling and would not result in a harmful terracing effect.

The proposed rear extensions would not be readily visible from public vantage points and therefore would not have an adverse impact on the character or appearance of either the host dwelling or the wider area.

Whilst the proposal would result in a notable increase in the size of the dwelling, the scale, design, roof form and matching external materials would ensure that the extensions remain sympathetic to the host dwelling. Taking into account the approved extensions at No.151 and the size of the plot, the proposal would not result in a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or wider street scene.

Overall, the development would be acceptable in terms of design in accordance with Policies DM16 and DM24 of the Pendle Local Plan Fourth Edition (2021-2040) and the adopted Design Principles SPD.

Residential Amenity

The Design Principles SPD advises that extensions should be designed to avoid causing an unacceptable overbearing effect, loss of light or loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers.

At the adjoining property, No.151, there is a first-floor side landing window facing the application site. The proposed extension would be positioned approximately 3.2m from this window. Whilst the extension would result in some increase in enclosure to this window, it serves a non-habitable room and is therefore afforded a lower level of protection. Taking this into account, together with the existing relationship between the properties, the resulting impact would not be so significant as to give rise to an unacceptable overbearing effect or materially harmful loss of light to the occupiers of No. 151.

No.151 also includes a first-floor front elevation window serving a bedroom (habitable room) within the approved two-storey side extension. This window would be positioned approximately 6.4m behind the principal elevation of the dwelling. The proposed two storey side extension would be circa 1.1m ahead of this window however the 45-degree line would not be in breach and would not result in an unacceptable loss of light or overbearing impact to this habitable room.

The proposed single-storey front side extension would extend beyond the existing porch at No.151 by approximately 2.2m. The nearest window serves a WC and is therefore afforded limited protection. Whilst there are additional windows serving the porch area, the extension would not breach the 45-degree line and would not give rise to unacceptable overbearing or overshadowing impacts.

To the rear, the proposed two-storey extension would project approximately 3.5m beyond the rear elevation and extend up to the shared boundary with No.151. However, No.151 already includes an existing two-storey rear extension which projects further than the proposed development and incorporates a blank side elevation facing the application site. Given this established relationship, the proposal would not result in any unacceptable overbearing or overshadowing impacts.

With regard to No.155, the proposed two-storey rear extension would be set in from the shared boundary by approximately 4.27m. Whilst No.155 is positioned approximately 3.4m forward of the application property, it is also situated at a higher ground level. The two-storey extension would not breach the 45-degree guideline when measured from the nearest habitable room window and would not result in unacceptable overbearing or overshadowing impacts.

The proposed single-storey rear extension would breach the 45-degree line in relation to No.155. However, having regard to its modest height of approximately 2.8m, its set back from the shared boundary and the higher ground level of No.155, the development would not result in an unacceptable loss of light or overbearing impact in this instance.

In terms of privacy, the proposed extensions would incorporate windows within the front and rear elevations. The front-facing windows would not project beyond the established principal elevation building line and would not introduce any materially different overlooking relationships.

To the rear, the first-floor windows would be positioned approximately 9.5m from the rear boundary and around 16m from the conservatory glazing at No.12 Boulsworth Crescent. However, given the single storey nature of the conservatory this relationship would not be directly facing and would only result in downward views which would limit any substantial view into the neighbouring property. Therefore, the relationship would not give rise to a materially harmful loss of privacy. Ground-floor rear windows would also be screened by the existing boundary treatments. Separation distances to other

rear-facing habitable room windows would be approximately 21m or greater, consistent with the guidance contained within the SPD.

The proposed development would therefore be acceptable in terms of residential amenity in accordance with DM16 and DM24 of the Adopted Pendle Local Plan Fourth Edition (2021-2040) and Adopted Pendle Design Principles SPD.

Highways

The proposed development proposes to accommodate three off-road parking spaces at the front of the dwelling in line with the maximum parking requirements set out in Policy DM37 of the Pendle Local Plan Fourth Edition (2021-2040)

LCC Highways have raised no objection in principle to the proposed development. However, further details have been requested demonstrating that the proposed parking spaces, boundary alterations and vehicular access arrangements can be delivered in accordance with the County Council's parking standards. These details should be submitted prior to determination. Subject to satisfactory amended plans being received, no highway safety objections are raised.

Conclusion

The recommendation has been revised from refusal to delegate grant consent as the amended plans introduce a more subordinate form of development which overcomes the previous concerns regarding the impact on the character and appearance of the area and neighbouring residential amenity.

RECOMMENDATION: Delegate Grant Consent

Delegate authority to the Planning, Building Control and Regulatory Services Manager to grant planning permission subject to the receipt of satisfactory amended parking/access details and provided that no additional material planning considerations are raised through the ongoing consultation process.

26/0191/HHO - Full: Demolition of existing pedestrian gate, widening of existing vehicular access with the addition of a privacy screen and the installation of electric sliding gates at 509 Colne Road, Reedley

An issue with the accuracy of the plans has been brought up, regarding the height of the original railings. The applicant's agent has been made aware of this and has provided a revised plan.

Additional comments have been received from a member of the public raising issues of security and the need for this development in order to provide protection from crime. The issue of security and privacy had been raised in the original report. There would be no benefit, in terms of crime prevention, from the proposed development. In fact, the proposed development would have a detrimental impact in this regard, by creating a fortified appearance akin to a gated community. This contributes to the fear of crime as the boarded railings creates a reinforced compound effect, which divorces the dwelling from the public highway.

Another response has also been received raising serious highway safety concerns over the visibility splay. The issues raised have already been addressed in the committee report.

The public comments do not change the recommendation of refusal. However, it should be added that **enforcement action is recommended**.

26/0204/FUL - Full: (Major) Erection of 28 no. dwellings with detached garages and associated landscaping, infrastructure and altered vehicular access at Land at Field Number 0087, Earby Road, Salterforth

Following the publication of the committee report final comments from the LLFA was received. Based on their assessment of the additional information submitted by the applicant in the form of an updated drainage scheme and a drainage statement the LLFFA has withdrawn its objection to the proposed development based on drainage, subject to recommended conditions. Final comments from Yorkshire water are awaited.

Subject to the recommended conditions, acceptable drainage can be achieved on site, and the proposal would be acceptable in terms of drainage and flood risk.

Following the publication of the committee report, an additional statement from the applicant addressing the concerns raised at the area committee meeting was also received. The agent has also emailed a copy of this statement to members of the DM committee. The main points of the statement are summarised below:

- Principle of the development: evidence to prove that the previous permission for 34 dwellings is extant, including photographs of the existing concrete foundation for the garage of Plot 28 as constructed on site in July 2022, copy of emails from Building control officers regarding inspections for the foundation works carried out.
- Other considerations: there is i) no difference in the highway access location and the surface water drainage and sewerage systems; ii) no difference in terms of trees, hedgerows, landscaping and ecology; iii) no greater effect on neighbours' amenity and outlook; and, being slightly smaller, it will have less effect in terms of traffic generation and local infrastructure. Therefore, none of the six grounds for refusal put forward by the Area Committee are justified.

The applicant has also highlighted two other recent appeals where costs were awarded against the council where the Council failed to produce evidence to substantiate its reasons for refusal.

The points raised are in line with the officer's assessment and recommendation, and does not change the recommendation which is for Delegate Grant Consent subject to acceptable landscaping, housing mix and affordable housing compliance.