

PLANNING COMMITTEE
Schedule of Supplementary Information

12th November 2020

**Members are advised of the enclosed information that was either
received or requested after the production of the planning applications report**

**Bolton
Council**

06379/19

Ward	Location
HULT	THE COPPICE, FIRS ROAD, BOLTON BL5 1EZ

Tally of objection responses

24no. local households have submitted 53-objections to the proposal. This is because there have been revisions and fresh rounds of consultation. To give some context, 3no. of the households submitted between 4 and 5 objection letters; with 1no. submitting 9 objection letters. The remaining 17no. households have submitted between 1 and 3 objections to the proposal. A further 12-objections were received from named individuals who did not give a postal address.

New Comments received

A letter offering neutral opinion of the proposal has been received from a neighbour, stating that any development of the site requires significant care and sensitive architecture due to how exposed it is. They do not object, but wish for high quality materials and a constructive solution to any redevelopment proposal.

Councillor correspondence

Councillor John Walsh and ward councillor Diane Parkinson have previously forwarded copies of objections from neighbours about the proposal and the quality of the submission to the Council. No opinions have been expressed by these councillors

Ward councillor Derek Bullock has submitted a letter of support setting out the following points:

- As Ward Councillor, has received no negative comments in relation to this application from residents.
- As he understands it, the Application has been subject to a long-drawn out process with the applicant fully cooperating with Planning Officers suggestions on what changes were needed for it to be approved.
- Considers that this scheme is acceptable and that it would greatly improve what has been for a long period an empty plot, replacing a former semi-derelict house with an overgrown garden, that badly detracted from adjoining properties-to the detriment of local residents.
- Does not object to this application being approved.

Officer response: The committee report sets out that the applicant has indeed engaged in positive amendments to the design of the building to address earlier officer concerns and policy requirements. The report also sets out why officers do not consider the applicant has sufficiently addressed their remaining concerns about the quantity of space set aside for landscaping, and the limited benefits of the proposed landscaping, along Firs Road. The concerns that failure to sufficiently resolve the issues may result in a recommendation for refusal at Committee have been conveyed to the applicant on several occasions. Officers have suggested that the building footprint/ position relative to the Firs Road boundary needs to move back to allow much more space for landscaping but the applicant has declined to consider this solution.

With regards to the issue of the previous house being derelict and the site overgrown. Photos available from Google Streetview only shown the site in 2009 and 2011. Documentation accompanying this current application states that 'a previous owner cleared the site of all trees'. This must then have occurred before 2017 when the same applicant submitted application 01613/17 to demolish and erect a 2.5 storey dwelling. Neighbour objections to that application note that trees were cut down before the application was submitted in August 2017. This implies that the site has been clear of overgrown plants and trees for at least 3 years. The 2017 proposal was withdrawn in September 2017 on technical validation grounds and proceeded no further.

With regards to the dwelling, neighbours lodged an enforcement complaint in August 2019 (19/0382/09) alleging unauthorised demolition of the house had commenced on 29th July 2019. Officers determined that no planning breach had occurred as a Prior notification to demolish the house (06200/19) and rearrange soil to 'landscape' the site had been approved on 25th July 2019. There are no photos of the site or property in the Council's planning records prior to 2019. Current site photos show the site to be tidy and earth having been landscaped to smooth out the site post demolition.

08990/20	
Ward	Location
LLDL	LITTLE LEVER YOUTH CENTRE, HERBERT STREET

Additional representations received:

Public Protection (EHO) officer's comment in respect of impact of providing canopies to the rear. Whilst use of the space is understood to be existing the canopies would allow use of the space in inclement weather. Given the proximity of houses, in the event of a grant of permission, it would be prudent to restrict the hours of use by condition. Hours are suggested.

The applicant has submitted further details setting out that the replacement gates and fence at the revised entrance will match the existing installations. Details also explain that the canopies will be blue in colour. A misunderstanding between the Centre and the agent means fixed canopies were proposed but the agent has now confirmed that the Youth Centre wish to propose retractable canopies, not fixed.

Officer Response:

A condition restricting the use of the canopied areas outside the period 09:00 – 18:00 Monday to Friday and outside 10:00 – 15:00 on Saturdays and Sundays would minimise the noise impact on neighbours and satisfy policy.

'Condition 2' within the report already sufficiently addresses the gate/fence issue. The description of the development does not state fixed canopies and so there is no need to amend it.

09252/20

Ward	Location
GRLE	FORMER BOLTON INTERCHANGE, NEWPORT STREET / TRINITY STREET

Legal Services colleagues were asked to advise on the implications, if any, of permitted development rights for the proposed development – due to the fact that bodies such as the Council (including in its role as Local Highway Authority), Transport for Greater Manchester, Network Rail and the rail operators all benefit from wide ranging permitted development rights in relation to their functions and responsibilities.

The conclusion that Officers have reached is that whilst certain elements of the proposed development may well benefit from permitted development rights, particularly where works are proposed within or adjoining existing highways, as the development as a whole cannot entirely be considered to be permitted development it is right that planning permission was sought.

However, Officers are certain that the related works to Trinity Street and its junctions with Newport Street and Bradshawgate are permitted development as they fall entirely within existing highways.

Members are also advised that references to Councillor Howard in the report should of course refer instead to Councillor Susan Haworth, Elected Member for Harper Green Ward. Officers apologise for this autocorrect error.