

# Public Document Pack



**Meeting of:** Planning and Licensing Committee  
**Date:** Thursday, 5th November, 2020  
**Time:** 6.00 pm.  
**Venue:** Zoom

**This agenda gives notice of items to be considered in private as required by Regulations 5 (4) and (5) of The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012.**

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>AGENDA</b>	<b>Page No</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>5 Market Place, Middleton</b>  Change of use from financial and professional services (A2) to nightclub (Sui Generis).	<b>3</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Planning Appeals</b>  To note the following appeals:  e. Lidl Store, Littleborough (to be circulated)	<b>4</b>

## **Planning and Licensing Committee Members**

Councillor Shakil Ahmed  
Councillor Irene Davidson  
Councillor Rachel Massey  
Councillor Shaun O'Neill  
Councillor Aasim Rashid  
Councillor John Taylor  
Councillor Peter Winkler  
Councillor Mohammed Zaman

Councillor Phil Burke  
Councillor Susan Emmott  
Councillor Amna Mir  
Councillor Faisal Rana  
Councillor Peter Rush  
Councillor Shah Wazir  
Councillor Sameena Zaheer

For more information about this meeting, please contact  
Peter Thompson  
Committee and Constitutional Services  
Rochdale Borough Council  
Number One Riverside  
Smith Street  
Rochdale  
OL16 1XU

Telephone: 01706 924715  
e-mail: [peter.thompson@rochdale.gov.uk](mailto:peter.thompson@rochdale.gov.uk)

# Agenda Item 7

## **Planning and Licensing Committee Update Report – 5<sup>th</sup> November 2020**

**AGENDA ITEM 7 – 20/00805/FUL – 5 Market Place, Middleton, M24 6AE**

### **ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS**

Comments have been received from Councillors Malcolm Boriss, June West and Carol Wardle all objecting to the application. In summary the objections relate to concerns about public safety and anti-social behaviour as well as the impact on heritage assets.

#### **Case Officer Comments:**

The additional representations received refer to matters that have already been addressed in the original Officer Report and the recommendation remains the same.

# Agenda Item 8

## Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



Date of Meeting	5th November 2020
Portfolio	Councillor Carol Wardle, Cabinet Member for Planning, Development & Housing
Report Author	Ryan Killeen
Public/Private Document	Public

<b>Application:</b> 19/01086/FUL	<b>Township:</b> Pennines	<b>Ward:</b> West Littleborough
<b>Appeal Reference:</b> APP/P4225/D/20/3257952		<b>Decision level:</b> Delegated
<b>Site Address:</b> Lidl, Stockton Street, Littleborough, OL15 8JY		
<b>Proposal:</b> One stone signage wall comprising one internally illuminated fascia logo sign and 2 non-illuminated information signs		
<b>Applicant:</b> Lidl Great Britain Ltd		<b>Agent:</b> Mr Joshua Ambrus
<b>Planning Inspectorate Decision:</b> Appeal Dismissed – 23 October 2020		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The application for a 5.5m x 3m free-standing artificial stone wall with internally lit signage was refused on 31<sup>st</sup> July 2020 as it presented an unduly prominent, incongruous, dominant and intrusive addition to the street scene that was out of keeping with the immediate setting.</li> <li>– The Inspector considered that the incorporation of the large and bold logo which utilised a singular large image served to emphasise the scale of the display, particularly so at times of illumination.</li> <li>– Although in the context of other commercial advertising, the size and bulk of the wall in its elevated siting, when taken in combination with the scale of the signage and isolated position, was considered to contrast the predominant scale of development fronting Church Street/ Featherstall Road, and would appear disproportionately large in its setting, appearing intrusive in the street scene.</li> <li>– The Inspector agreed with the council that the harm to the adjacent Non-Designated Heritage Assets would only have a limited discernible impact, and as such, did not warrant refusal on these grounds, but would nevertheless, add to the impact on the visual amenity of the area.</li> <li>– Whilst the signage would fulfil the operational requirements of the appellant as a retailer, and match the existing stone wall on site, the Inspector did not consider this to outweigh the harm identified, concluding that the proposal would not accord with Policies P2, P3 and DM1 of Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy (2016) together with Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</li> </ul>		