

Update Sheet

Planning Committee 22nd Jan 2020

11/19/0358 Major full: Conversion of former public house to 10 no apartments (1bed) including demolition of rear annex and changes to windows and insertion of veluxes in roof

Comments have been received from Cllr McGinley yesterday which are available below as part of the update to the Planning Committee Report. Please note the attached photographs of the Village Inn also provided.

Comments were as follows:

1. The Village Inn is a fairly smart looking building
2. Ten single one bed apartments suggest occupancy by unemployed, problem people etc
3. Do you feel this is keeping with the area- I do not
4. No parking on Maple street is possible, although the road on Water Street is clear at the point of this building
5. I have checked several times and the road is mostly clear- see photographs attached
6. Many people in such flats cannot afford transport- so it is not likely to be even ten cars there, let alone 20
7. Will there be a resident supervisor in one of the flats? I suggest strong control may be necessary
8. Should there have been 5 or 6 larger flats for couples
9. I saw somewhere that the applicant was a Cllr- is this the case?

Some of these matters are addressed in the report but as these are noted above I will deal with them below:

Officers agree the Village inn is a 'smart' building and have worked through the pre application process and though the application consideration to ensure its key features are retained- the roof is no longer being affected as was initially proposed and the windows will be retained, for example.

The application is for 10no residential flats, there is no control over the occupancy, nor nothing to suggest in the application that they will be occupied by 'unemployed problem people', they will be available for purchase or rent on the open market. This means anybody can live in them as there are no restrictions, being a residential use.

Coupled with this there is no control over the number of cars each occupant (s) will have, although as the location is central in a sustainable location car ownership is not as important as it would be in say a rural area. As the flats are for C3 use, there is no requirement for a live in supervisor. The applicant did reduce the number of flats from the pre application advice submission to 10, and the new layout now meets with the requirements in terms of flat sizes as a result. Officers are satisfied with this in terms of the relevant planning policy. As the flats meet these requirements, there is no policy basis to require larger flats than this.

Officers and LCC Highways agree with the assertion that there are no parking issues in the surrounding streets and that roads have been clear when they have visited the site.

Finally Officers also agree that the use of flats in this area is acceptable, this is for residential use in a residential area and in line with the policy which controls the locations of flats in Hyndburn.

The agent has confirmed the applicant is not a Councillor.

The photographs provided are below:





11/19/0433 Householder: Conversion of integral single garage to provide living accommodation – bedroom, ensuite wet room and kitchen

Comments have been received from Cllr McGinley yesterday which are available below as part of the update to the Planning Committee Report. Please note the attached photographs of the Mill Gardens also provided.

1. I know the occupants are LCC and HBC CLLR JENNY MOLYNEUX and her ex-Cllr husband Gareth;
2. My comments have nothing to do with any politics - so no declaration of interest needed;
3. My views concern only the facts and principles involved;
4. The issue centres around the parking issue. A 4 - bedroom facility requires 3 car-parking spots;
5. Planning should NOT be based upon the fact the family have only one car;
6. The general rules which apply to all is that there must be more car parking allocated;
7. If they sell the property for a profit, any new family with three or more cars will have to park on the road;
8. PLEASE LOOK AT PHOTOS attached which highlight future problems;
9. I spoke to neighbours who are not happy with the proposals;
10. Parking on the road here always creates problems, I assure you;
11. Neighbours suggested Councillors should not receive any preferential treatment;
12. Herein lies the whole essence of the need to REFUSE THIS APPLICATION. Should we approve it on this occasion, what do we do with every future Planning Application from non-Cllrs in the whole Borough? Do we refuse their plans as they do not comply with the requirements for extra car-parking spaces. That would be truly disgraceful, showing nepotism and/or favouritism. Or do we set a precedent with a Councillors application and on every future occasion have to morally approve Plans even though there are insufficient car-parking spaces. Surely not, colleagues;
13. WE SIMPLY CANNOT HAVE ONE LAW FOR A COUNCILLOR - AND A DIFFERENT ONE FOR NON-COUNCILLORS;
14. Sorry to strongly suggest refusal of this Application, but we have to remember we are charged with integrity, fairness; equality, openness and transparency. By approving this application, we would be "selling ourselves down the river"; and forever be accused of favouritism
15. Are you prepared to take such a risk. I certainly am not.
 - LCC Highways did initially raise concern in regards to the loss of parking and the increase in bedrooms from 3 to 4. Maximum parking standards found in Guidance Note 8 of the Development Management DPD states that properties with 4 bedrooms should seek a maximum of 3 parking spaces. The application is for an occupant with special care needs and this has been awarded significant weight in the application's determination. On visiting the

site, I was satisfied that, if required, adequate parking could be provided in the form of the driveway of the property, on-street parking, and a parking area adjacent to the junction with Arthur Street.

- The Council have received no response from any residents on the application.
- The comments suggest preferential treatment towards the applicant because of the fact that the applicant is a Councillor. I would like to assure members that the planning office approach every application with the utmost professionalism, regardless of who the applicant may be. Each application is considered on its own merits and in this case, the need to aid an occupant with special care needs has been given significant weight.

The photographs provided are below:



