

---

# PLANNING COMMITTEE

---

**Wednesday, 11th February, 2026**

**Present:** Councillor Dave Parkins (in the Chair), Councillors Bernard Dawson MBE (Vice Chair), Mike Booth, Loraine Cox, Clare Pritchard, Kath Pratt, Judith Addison, Noordad Aziz, Stewart Eaves and Munsif Dad BEM JP

**Apologies:** Councillors Joyce Plummer, Scott Brerton, Stephen Button and Josh Allen

---

**285 Apologies for Absence, Substitutions, Declarations of Interest and Dispensations**

Apologies for Absence were given by Councillors Scott Brerton, Stephen Button, Joyce Plummer and Josh Allen.

Councillor Munsif Dad BEM JP substituted for Councillor Brerton.

**286 Minutes of the Last Meeting**

The Minutes of the last Planning Committee held on the 17<sup>th</sup> of December 2025 were submitted for approval as a correct record.

**Resolved – That the minutes be received as a correct record.**

**287 Town and Country Planning Act 1990- Planning Applications for Determination**

**288 11/25/0485 - The Plough Pub & Restaurant, Broadfield, Oswaldtwistle, BB5 3RY**

Mr Joshua Parkinson, Planning Manager (Development Manager), presented the application to the committee, informing of the proposed change of use from a restaurant and bar to an adult's day centre.

No external changes were proposed to the building, the application retained the existing access points, including the ramped access available via the car park and pedestrian access point at the front elevation.

The application proposed operating times from 8am to 6pm 7 days a week.

No objections were received from Lancashire County Councils Highways team subject to a planning condition securing the existing parking provision at the site.

1 Letter of objection and 1 letter of support were received and are detailed on page 6 of the agenda.

1 Additional letter was received highlighting concerns with high-speed vehicles on the road after the agenda was made public.

Mr Parkinson highlighted that the public house has been marketed for sale since 2019 with only 2 offers being made for the property. One relating to this application and the other to use the site for retail use on the ground floor and residential space on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor. This offer was refused due to the offered price being lower than the accepted offer.

Mr Parkinson advised the committee that officers were satisfied that Policy DM8 (1(a)) had been sufficiently addressed.

Mr Parkinson also pointed out that there were 2 other public houses identified within 10 minutes walking distance of the site. Complying with Policy DM8 (1(b)).

The Application was recommended for Approval with the conditions listed on page 13 of the agenda.

Members discussed the application, mentioning their sadness at the loss of a popular local venue but considered the alternative use of the property more beneficial than the building remaining empty.

Members found the application to be acceptable but highlighted the change by the applicant to prevent wheelchair access mentioned at page 6 of the agenda due to highway concerns. Members discussed adding this as a condition to the applications approval to prevent this being used in the future.

**Resolved – The application was approved with authority delegated to the Chief Planning and Transportation Officer to draft an additional condition to those listed in the report, including restrictions of the ramp access to the property.**

**289 11/25/0504 - 58 Station Road, Rishton, BB1 4HF**

Miss Rosie Maguire, Graduate Planning Officer, presented the application to the committee. Miss Maguire informed the committee that the application proposed the erection of a 2.3 meter extension to the 1<sup>st</sup> floor, coterminous with the length of the ground floor (excluding the attached garage). The existing garage and conservatory would be converted into a united garage, increasing the height from 2.4 meters to 3 meters.

No Objections were received from Sports England or Hyndburn Council's Environmental Health Team.

10 Objections were received from residents, highlighted on page 17 of the agenda.

An additional 2 Objections were received after the agenda was published for similar reasons to those stated on the previously mentioned page 17 of the agenda.

Miss Maguire highlighted the applications scale and the encroachment on the neighboring property when assessed against the 45-degree guideline. Miss Maguire informed the committee that while the property already intersects the neighboring dwellings outlook, this does not justify further encroachment which would be materially worsened by the proposed application.

The application was recommended for refusal.

Members discussed the application and the impact on the neighboring residents, highlighting the loss of light to the neighboring property and its impact on the resident's enjoyment of their property.

**Resolved – The application was refused as per the officer's recommendations.**

**290 11/25/0431 - 4 James Avenue, Great Harwood, Lancashire, BB6 7ND**

Mr Adam Birkett Chief Planning and Transportation Officer presented the report to the committee, highlighting the properties features as a semi-detached dwelling with 3 bedrooms, 1 bathroom, living room, kitchen/diner and parking for 2 vehicles.

M Birkett informed the committee the application is in reference to a care home for 1 child with 2 carers present on a rolling basis.

1 Objection was received from a resident detailed on page 23 and 24 of the agenda. Lancashire County Councils Children's Services also submitted an objection, detailed on page 24 and 25 of the agenda. Lancashire County Council's Highways Team submitted no Objections.

Mr Birkett advised the committee that the Planning Inspectorate had granted the appeal of 2 similar applications in which the planning committee had refused the applications which have subsequently been overturned.

Mr Birkett advised the committee that while the Supplementary Planning Guidance in relation to Children's Care Homes is useful and some weight should be given to this, any conflict with the policy should be weighed in the planning balance.

Similarly, Mr Birkett informed that while the proposal removes a market dwelling at a time where the council is unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing supply the harm is not considered sufficient enough to warrant refusal of the application.

The application was recommended for approval with the conditions listed on pages 31 and 32 of the agenda.

Members discussed the number of applications for similar proposals which had been through the planning committee recently and questioned how closely the model mimics that of a family home. Members commented on the increased number of children being placed in these homes from outside the area and the impact this must have on vulnerable children.

**Resolved – Members voted to go against the officer decision and refuse the application on the following grounds:**

- Conflict with Policy 1 of the SPG
- Removing a market dwelling at a time when the council cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing.

**291 11/25/0400 - 4 Sefton Close, Clayton-le-Moors, Lancashire BB5 5WS**

Mr Adam Birkett Chief Planning and Transportation Officer detailed the report to the committee. Advising that the application related to a detached property with gated access to private parking for up to 6 cars. The property has 4 bedrooms with a 5<sup>th</sup> bedroom visible on the floor plans from a converted garage.

The application proposes to care for 3 vulnerable children between the ages of 8 and 17 who present emotional, social and behavioural difficulties.

111 Objections to the application were received and detailed on pages 34 to 36 of the agenda.

No Objections were given by Lancashire County Councils Highway Team.

Mr Birkett advised the committee that while there was some conflict with Policies 1 and 2 of the Children's Home Supplementary Planning Guidance there is no evidence to suggest this would result in undue harm to the residential character of the area. Similarly, while the application would remove a market dwelling at a time when the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing supply, the harm would not be significant enough to warrant refusal of the application.

The application was recommended for approval.

Members discussed the application and highlighted the applications comments regarding the children's emotional, social and behavioural difficulties. Members queried if this would impact the neighbouring resident's amenity more so than the type of children's home application that have been brought before the committee recently. Mr Birkett advised that there was insufficient evidence to suggest this would be the case and the planning system is unable to control the behaviour of individuals. Members also emphasised that any refusal to the application would need to be based on material planning reasons only.

**Resolved – The application was approved as per the officer's recommendation with the conditions noted in the agenda.**

**292 Update Sheet**

The update sheet was noted.

Signed:.....

Date: .....

Chair of the meeting  
At which the minutes were confirmed