

Proposed development: Full Planning Application for Change of use of former Public House and landlord's flat to six self-contained flats, demolition of the single storey rear extension, erection of a new a single storey rear extension and associated car parking.

Site address:

**Black Bull Public House
101 High Street
Belmont
Bolton
BL7 8AJ**

Applicant: Mr Ian Winrow - Belmont Bull LLP

Ward: West Pennine

Councillor: Colin Rigby

Councillor: Jean Rigby

Councillor: Julie Slater



1.0 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

1.1 APPROVE – Subject to conditions; as set out in paragraph 4.1.

2.0 KEY ISSUES/SUMMARY OF PLANNING BALANCE

- 2.1 This application is presented to the Committee through the adopted Chair Referral Process of the Scheme of Delegation. The proposed development is considered to be consistent with the Borough's strategic aims and objectives, in that it corresponds with the Council's overarching growth strategy, through delivery of housing which will assist in widening the choice on offer in the Borough in a sustainable location; is justifiable taking into account loss of the community facility and is acceptable from a highway safety / efficiency perspective. The proposal is also satisfactory from a technical point of view, with all issues having been addressed through the application, or capable of being controlled or mitigated through planning conditions; in accordance with the Local Development Plan.

3.0 RATIONALE

3.1 Site and Surroundings

- 3.1.1 The application site is the vacant Belmont Bull Public House, including its associated curtilage, located to the west of High Street, in the village of Belmont. The building is a detached two-storey, elevated from the street, featuring stone and render elevations with a double hipped roof. A car park is located at the front of the site, accessed directly from High Street. A secondary vehicular access is taken from Naylor's Terrace to the south which served a general outdoor amenity space for the public house. The site is flanked by residential terraces and the area in general is defined by its rural residential form.
- 3.1.2 The site is served by the local road network and benefits from convenient pedestrian and cycling links. Unrestricted on street car parking exists along Naylor's Terrace and on the opposite side of High Street. A limited bus service operates along High Street, into Bolton Town Centre, which is located circa 6 miles to the north west of the site. A bus stop is within easy walking distance.

3.2 Proposed Development

- 3.2.1 Planning permission is sought for conversion of the Public House into 6no. self-contained apartments, demolition of a single storey rear extension and erection of a new single storey rear extension. Provision of 8no. off-street parking spaces is included with the proposal. The application site currently consists of a vacant public house at ground floor, including a small single storey extension to the rear, a cellar, a five bedroom landlord's flat at first floor, storage rooms in the roof space and associated external parking / servicing areas. Details are set out in the submitted drawings.

- 3.2.2 Members are advised that the application follows refusal of planning permission (on 20th July 2018) for a proposed conversion of the property into a single dwelling. The reason for refusal was as follows:

The proposed development would result in the loss of a facility considered to be of importance to the sustainability of the community which it serves. The application has failed to provide substantiated evidence that there is no longer a need for the use and the facility cannot be retained by enabling development or diversified use, contrary to the objectives of Policy 35 of adopted Local Plan Part 2 (Site Allocations and Development Management Policies) (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3.3 Development Plan

- 3.3.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

3.3.2 Core Strategy

- CS1 - A Targeted Growth Strategy
- CS5 - Locations for New Housing
- CS6 - Housing Targets
- CS7 - Types of Housing
- CS16 - Form and Design of New Development

3.3.3 Local Plan Part 2

- Policy 1 - The Urban Boundary
- Policy 7 - Sustainable and Viable Development
- Policy 8 - Development and People
- Policy 9 - Development and the Environment
- Policy 10 - Accessibility and Transport
- Policy 11 - Design
- Policy 18 - Housing Mix
- Policy 19 - Apartment Development and Houses in Multiple Occupation
- Policy 35 - Protection of Local Facilities

3.4 Other Material Planning Considerations

3.4.1 Houses in Multiple Occupation and Residential Conversions and Sub Divisions SPD.

3.4.2 National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework)

The Framework sets out the government's aims and objectives against which planning policy and decision making should be considered. The following

sections of the Framework are considered relevant to assessment of the proposal:

- Section 5 – Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- Section 11 – Making effective use of land; in particular paragraph 188 d) which advocates that decisions should promote and support the development of under-utilised land and buildings, especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing.
- Section 8 – Promoting healthy and safe communities.

3.4.4 Technical housing standards – nationally described space standards

3.5 **Assessment**

3.5.1 The key issues in relation to this application are:

- Principle
- Amenity
- Drainage
- Highways
- Design

3.5.2 Principle

Policy CS5 supports new housing in accessible locations within the urban area of Blackburn and Darwen, where it cannot be delivered within the inner urban areas. Policy CS7 supports a range of new housing, including meeting the needs of those on lower income. The proposal in this regard is considered to be consistent with these policies.

3.5.3 Consideration as to the loss of the community public house should be afforded proportionate weight in the assessment. In this regard, Development Plan Policy 35 is of relevance. It sets out the principles of guarding against loss of facilities that are identified as being an asset of value to the community or otherwise considered to be importance to the sustainability of the community which it serves. Whilst the premises are accepted as not having formal protection by way of *Asset of Community Value* status, they may be considered to be of sufficient importance to the sustainability of the local community that they serve.

3.5.4 The Framework reinforces the need for LPA's to; *guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs* (para. 92).

3.5.5 Accordingly, it is important that the proposal is supported by sufficient evidence to justify loss of the public house.

3.5.6 A letter from Lamb & Swift Commercial Property Consultants confirms that the property has been on the market continually since July 2018; initially by way of a direct marketing campaign aimed at clients with a requirement for such a property. An expanded campaign followed, but still limited to clients taking on the property as a going concern. Despite some interest, no offers transpired

and the property was then subject to an open market campaign which resulted in significant interest in uptake for a range of uses. Throughout the marketing campaign, the property was reduced from an initial £425,000 to £395,000. To date the property is marketed and remains available.

- 3.5.7 A comprehensive (confidential) list of interested parties has been provided, including contact details. The list includes those that viewed the property and their intended use thereof. It is further stated that there were countless other parties who made general telephone enquiries.
- 3.5.8 Although the Council has no information to corroborate this representation, it has no evidence to the contrary. Accordingly, the statements made are accepted as accurate and they are considered to demonstrate that the property has been offered for sale, through appropriate channels, on the open market, at a realistic price and that no reasonable offers have been refused, for a period of at least 12 months; in accordance with the requirements of Policy 35.
- 3.5.9 Additional supporting information in this regard has been provided, as follows:
- A letter from the brewery indicating the downturn in business;
 - The pub's accounts / trading history for the year ending March 2017 – showing a profit of £317;
 - The pub's final accounts to December 2017 – showing a loss of £3023;
 - Copies of letters of support which speak of the proprietors struggle to maintain a viable business.
- 3.5.10 In response to public objection as to the loss of the public house as a valued community facility, the aforementioned representations are considered to carry significant weight in support of the application. An independent (Case Officer) check of TripAdvisor revealed mainly positive reviews, particularly with regard to the quality of food. Of 59 reviews from between October 2015 to May 2018, an average rating of 4.5 was achieved. This appears to reinforce the view that the business was not viable, despite the quality on offer and would also contradict suggestions of a deliberate run-down; as cited in a number of objections.
- 3.5.11 The nearby Black Dog Public House and San Marino's restaurant are also recognised in the assessment. The impact of their apparent success is considered to add additional weight to the notion that the application site is no longer viable, within the context of the village setting and its ability to sustain three similar community uses. Moreover, its loss would not reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs.
- 3.5.12 The Local Development Plan reaffirms NPPF's principles of sustainability which includes support for sustainable economic development and encouragement of effective re-use of land; subject to the principles of high quality design and securing a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. In this regard, the benefits of bringing the redundant site back into use, is afforded significant weight.

3.5.13 The Core Strategy sets out the principle of housing locations, targets and types. Local Plan Part 2, Policy 19 guides the principle of conversion to apartments. The policy sets out that:

3.5.14 The Council will only exceptionally support the development of bedsits, bed and breakfast and hostel accommodation, either through new build or through the conversion of existing buildings. These forms of development will only be acceptable where all the following criteria are met:

i) the proposal does not, in isolation or in conjunction with other planned, committed or completed development, erode the amenity of neighbouring properties, the physical, social, environmental or economic character of the surrounding area, or the supply of family housing;

ii) in the case of conversions, the property is suitable for conversion without the need for any substantial extensions which would have an unacceptable effect on residential amenity and the character of the area;

iii) the site can accommodate the necessary parking and manoeuvring areas in a way which preserves residential amenity and the qualities of the street scene; and

iv) adequate refuse / recyclable waste collection facilities are provided.

3.5.15 Addressing each of the above in turn:

As a proposal for self-contained apartments and not for HMO provision, neighbouring amenity and the physical, social, environmental or economic character of the surrounding area is appropriately safeguarded; and the supply of family housing is unaffected. Moreover, the proposal will have economic and social benefits by way of generating additional revenue from a range of new homes for present and future generations; as advocated by NPPF's sustainable development principles.

3.5.16 The building is accepted as suitable for conversion, on account of its robust structure and sufficient internal space to accommodate the 6no. apartment's proposed. The modest nature of the single storey extension, being contained within the rear of the site, maintains acceptable levels of neighbouring amenity and safeguards the character / appearance of the area.

3.5.17 The Council's parking standards require 1no. car space per C3 dwelling. 6 no. spaces are provided on the site layout, within the existing parking area to the front of the building, in a manner that preserves amenity levels and the quality of the street scene.

3.5.18 The proposed layout demonstrates that adequate refuse / recyclable waste facilities can be provided within the site.

3.5.19 Policy 18 sets out that apartment development for the general market will only be acceptable where it is the most appropriate form of housing, given the local context or the characteristics of the site. The conversion is considered to be an appropriate form of housing given the characteristics of the site and the need to secure an effective and viable alternative use.

3.5.20 Accordingly, having due regard to the above circumstances, the proposal is considered acceptable in principle; in accordance with the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should proceed without delay, unless impacts which significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of a proposal are identified; subject to assessment of the following matters:

3.5.21 Amenity

Policy 8 requires a satisfactory level of amenity and safety is secured for surrounding uses and for occupants or users of the development itself; with reference to noise, vibration, odour, light, dust, other pollution or nuisance, privacy / overlooking, and the relationship between buildings.

3.5.22 The proposal is considered to demonstrate satisfactory levels of amenity with regards to noise, vibration, odour, light, dust and other nuisances, as a less intensive use from that of the existing public house.

3.5.22 It is considered that mutual levels of adequate privacy are achieved, having regard to the relationship of proposed habitable windows and habitable windows to the side of no. 99 High Street and to the rear of 1 – 5 Chapel Street, on account of the existing relationship between the properties being maintained; with particular regard to the pre-existing public house use at ground floor and residential use of the upper floor.

3.5.23 Internal space standards are considered acceptable, in affording an adequate standard of living, whilst having regard to all other material considerations in support of the application. Adequate outdoor amenity space is also provided. It should, however, be recognised that internal modification of the proposed layout may be necessary from a fire safety perspective; in accordance with Building Regulation requirements.

3.5.24 In accordance with the Council's commitment towards improving air quality,, 2no. electrical vehicle charging points are recommended; provision of which can be secured by condition.

3.5.24 Accordingly, compliance with Policy 8 and supporting SPD policies is achieved.

3.5.25 Highways

Policy 10 requires that road safety and the safe and efficient and convenient movement of all highway users is not prejudiced and that appropriate provision is made for off street servicing and parking in accordance with the Council's adopted standards.

3.5.26 As a proposal for 2no. 2 bed and 4no.1 bed apartments, an off-street parking provision of 9 spaces is required; in accordance with the Council's adopted standards. Submission of an amended site plan demonstrates that 8 parking spaces are proposed – 6 within the existing car park to the front of the building and 2 to the rear. Notwithstanding a single space shortfall, the existing public house use is recognised as having a greater off street parking allowance than that of the proposal. In view of this fall-back position and the availability of limited on street parking to the south of Naylor Terrace and High Street, the proposed parking allowance is considered to be acceptable.

3.5.27 Parking spaces sizes and manoeuvrability in between the 2 rows of 3 adhere to the adopted minimum standard of 2.4 x 4.8 and 6m respectively. Despite a modest shortfall in this regard with the spaces to the rear, their provision is considered to appropriately support the proposal, on account of the concern raised by local residents around on street congestion.

3.5.28 Support from a highways perspective is otherwise offered in the context of the existing public house use, which is considered to be more intensive and capable of generating greater local traffic movement; as would be the case if it was a busy and viable establishment.

3.5.29 Design / Character and Appearance

Policy 11 requires a good standard of design and will be expected to enhance and reinforce the established character of the locality and demonstrate an understanding of the wider context towards making a positive contribution to the local area.

3.5.30 No material alteration is proposed to the front of the building. Demolition of the rear single storey extension and replacement with a larger one, across the full width of the building, projecting 3.5m is appropriately sympathetic to the host building and the street scene; consistent with good design principles advocated at local and national level.

3.5.31 Compliance with Policy 11 and supporting SPD policies is achieved.

3.5.32 Planning Balance

Notwithstanding the single space shortfall identified in the proposed parking allowance, the proposal is considered to be acceptable, in the context of the existing public house use and having regard the economic, social and environmental benefits of bringing a redundant building back into use; as advocated by Section 11 of The Framework, thus:

Planning decision should promote and support the development of under-utilised land and buildings, especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained and available sites could be used more effectively (for example converting space above shops, and building on or above service yards, car parks, lock-ups and railway infrastructure).

Members are also respectfully advised of the importance of consistency in planning decision making. A recent high court decision - R (Midcounties Co-Operative Limited) v Forest of Dean District Council [2017] EWHC 2050; emphasised the importance. Singh J confirmed (at paragraph 107) that: “A local planning authority is not bound by its earlier decision, nevertheless it is required to have regard to the importance of consistency in decision-making.”

In this regard, recent approvals for the conversion of the Hindle Arms (ref. 10/19/0289) and Hamilton Arms (10/19/0120) should be considered; both of which involved similar issues to those addressed in this assessment.

3.5.33 Summary

This report assesses the full planning application for the residential conversion of the Belmont Bull to six self-contained apartments. In considering the proposal, a wide range of material considerations have been taken into account to inform a balanced recommendation that is considered to demonstrate compliance with the aims and objectives of the Local Development Plan and The Framework; thereby overcoming the previous reason for refusal set out at paragraph 3.2.2.

4.0 RECOMMENDATION

4.1 Approve subject to:

Conditions which relate to the following matters:

- Commence within 3 years
- External walling and roofing materials to match existing
- Implementation of the parking layout, prior to first occupation of the approved apartments
- Limited hours of construction / renovation works
- Development in accordance with submitted details / drawing nos.

5.0 PLANNING HISTORY

5.1 10/18/0291 – Conversion to single dwelling house.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

6.1 Public Protection

No objection subject to the following condition:

- Provision of 2 electric vehicle charging points.

6.3 Highways

No objection, subject to parking provision.

6.4 Housing Standards

No objection whilst citing the need to comply with Building Regulations and Lancashire Fire & Rescue.

6.5 Public consultation has taken place, with 27 letters posted to neighbouring addresses and display of a site notice. In response, 25 objections and 2 general comments were received which are shown within the summary below.

7.0 CONTACT OFFICER: Nick Blackledge – Planner, Development Management.

8.0 DATE PREPARED: 25th July 2019.

9.0 SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

Obj – Mr and Mrs Brown – 1 Ward Street, Belmont- Rec 3.7.19

I wish to object to Belmont bull being turned into six flats ,due to parking problems we have in the village.Also it could be used for the community as a village hall.

Mr &Mrs Brown,

Obj – Malcolm Carr – 7 Ryecroft lane, Belmont – Rec 3.7.19

Firstly my name is Malcolm Carr and I live at 7 Ryecroft Lane Belmont.

May I strongly object to the application for planning for the site known by many as the Belmont Bull.

We have lost the hub of the village through the closure of the Bull, a pub which was seen as the village pub .Although there is another pub , the Back Dog it does not offer the opportunity for socialising that the large bar area of the Bull offered, it is run as a pub restaurant and at weekends for example there is seldom a couple of tables left for villagers to sit at or bar room for people to interact. The Dog offers 2 for one meals which brings in lots of visitors but there is little regard for locals .

Having drank in and enjoyed the company of many in both i can say with conviction that the Bull was the Belmont Pub, everybodys local.

Having supplied the landlady .Mrs Bluer with meat from my butchers inAstley Bridge,Carr's Scotch Beef Shop from her taking over I can say that with every conversation we had about the pub being a pub she made it obviously clear that she was not interested in the pub side of it . This was made clear to all by the complete lack of interest shown in service , quality of beer etc, one could see the place being run down all of the tenency.

We now have a situation where residents have lost their meeting place and the camaradie enjoyed by all has been lost . Quite a few have now moved away and more are planning to do so , the village is now in danger of becoming an empty place with no soul.

I feel no attempt at all was made to sell the pub as a going concern , made obvious by the fact that the bar area was ripped out straight away ,the sign take down and the accelerated way in which the exterior of the pub was allowed to fall into a state of disrepair even though the tenant and family still resided there.

Lastly what is the point of 6 apartments crammed into this space, more people just to come and sleep in the village, the parking plans are ridiculous as every body knows how little parking there is and already any resident in that area struggles to park now and there is no room at all for visitors.

The conclusion of my letter is that the planning application should be turned down and that some form of meeting place ie. a bar should be more ideal. Thank you for taking in my considerations
Regards Malcolm Carr

Obj – from local resident – Rec 3.7.19

Good Afternoon Nick,

We are strongly opposed to the request for planning permission at the Belmont Bull Pub, Belmont.

The building is directly facing our property and would have an adverse affect on many things:-

We are extremely concerned about the traffic congestion that would be caused by adding so many new properties into the village. There are already cars parked everywhere outside our houses, so to add to this, would be a nightmare for us all.

We are not convinced that the car park would even be able to accommodate the number of cars that would accompany the flats, before visitors to the residents are even brought into the equation. The only place that they could go, would be outside people's houses and all the way along, the already severely congested roads.

There is a Primary School within a couple of minutes walk ,and there have been issues with cars and the potential for accidents previously. Once again, adding extra cars to the equation, is a recipe for disaster.

We are extremely concerned about the noise associated with potentially 18 people in a building , that is being extended even closer in our direction. When the building was a public house, there was sometimes live music, and it was extremely loud. We did not mind at all before as it was only a very occasional thing, but now, if any of the potential residents chose to play loud music on a regular basis, it would be a massive disturbance as we are so close. We have two children; one of which will be starting college and one beginning his GCSE's, and would not want their potential future to be ruined due to lack of sleep impacting on their grades/ exam results.

We would also be massively overlooked, and the flats on the top floor, would look directly into our bedrooms, and we would lose any element of privacy.

Another concern, is Belmont really suffers when the weather is bad. Traffic constantly gets stuck, and usually causes mayhem getting in and out of the village. There are usually cars strewn at the roadside, causing huge potential for car accidents once again. To further add to an already big problem, seems irresponsible.

There are no facilities to support any further residents in the village, the public transport is minimal, and adding flats would certainly go towards taking away the village feel.

Hand-in-hand with additional traffic, is additional pollution and rubbish. This would impact negatively on local wildlife, that is a very big part of the area.

Please note that I would like to request that our details are kept private.

Thank you and Kind Regards,

Obj – Mrs Norma Roebuck – 22 Brookdale, Belmont – rec 3.7.19

3 July 2019

Re.: Belmont Bull, Planning Application Number 10/19/0528

Dear Sir/Madam

I wish to comment on the above Planning Application

1. According to Lamb and Swift the property is still marketed and available, borne out by the Supporting Statement from PlanitWright which states that the property is unsold, unused and empty. One would assume from this that the property is still owned by Heather Bluer, however the Applicant is Ian Winrow, a director of the Belmont Bull LLP, although I have been unable to find any information regarding this person.
2. The Application states quite rightly that there are Bus Stops within easy walking distance of the property and goes to the trouble of providing a map of said Bus Stops. What it omits to say is that the bus service itself is quite limited, running at approximately every 2 hours, and finishing at around 6:00pm. A little inconvenient for those wishing to commute via public transport, which brings me to point 3.

The proposal is to convert the property into six self-contained flats, three to have one double and one single bedroom and three with one double bedroom. I think that one can safely assume, given the inadequacy of public transport, that there are likely to be a minimum of two cars per flat, six car park spaces short then. According to the Supporting Statement there is some unrestricted parking nearby, however, it might surprise you to learn that these spaces are actually used by existing residents who, understandably would like to park their cars outside their homes! Cause for ill-feeling do you think?

I would actually like to see the property used for the benefit of the village as a whole. However, should the property be converted to residential accommodation, more thought and consideration for the existing residents must be put into the development.

Yours sincerely

Mrs Norma Roebuck

Obj - Jan Carr – 7 Ryecroft Lane, Belmont – Rec3.7.19

Dear Sir/Madam

I strongly object to this application on the following grounds.

Objection to change of use as the Black/ Belmont Bull has been the social centre of the village for many years, has been a meeting place for many societies and has hosted many celebrations. If planning permission is granted we will lose our village hub.

The planning application does not take into account the parking problem that we already have and would definitely create chaos.

I would like the application to be rejected

Yours faithfully

Jan Carr

Obj – Gerard Pearce – 10 Ward Street, Belmont – rec 3.7.19

Dear Sir

Objection to Planning Application 10/19/0528

I am writing to you to object to the above Planning Application.

OBJECTIONS

- Nuisance

I appreciate that planning officers must make decisions based on evidence rather than speculation and hearsay and with that in mind, it should be noted that the evidence is of a viable, indeed successful (i.e. profitable!) public house having operated on the site which is the subject of this Planning Application, for many years (indeed decades). The business has had various owners and names and ambiances and service provision (i.e. including a shop and a restaurant with waiter/waitress service) throughout this period however, the undeniable fact is that in the hands of professional landlords and landladies, a business capable of sustaining livelihoods has flourished on this site.

Given the above, it is highly regrettable, genuinely so, that the most recent publicans (Heather and Neil Bluer) were unable to run the business successfully however, I do not believe this lack of success has any bearing on the viability of a public house on this site, but is much more a reflection of a lack

of experience on their part and, put simply, the well trod and genuinely held view that a public house is a community asset, should not be casually ignored and given less weight in this Planning Application, given the stark reality that this business has failed regrettably as a result of, rather than despite, their efforts.

Accordingly, proposed change of use must be rejected as to do otherwise would bring about the permanent loss of a community asset in circumstances in which the evidence is that professional publicans can make this business succeed and such loss, due as it would be, to the inexperience of the incumbent publicans, would bring about significant inconvenience and nuisance to local residents who do not have a viable alternative place to meet and share experiences

- Disturbance and noise

If granted, the implication of the Planning Application is that potentially 15 additional vehicles would be in need of parking provision, yet parking is already a problem for existing residents, with parking restrictions on both the High Street and other nearby streets bringing significant congestion, making the prospect of significant additional car park requirements an unacceptable and aggravating disturbance for neighbours, including raising the prospect of increased noise pollution as increased numbers of cars flood into the small streets surrounding the site

- Increased risk of road traffic collisions and incidents

If granted, the implication of the Planning Application is that increased car usage would also bring increased danger as more vehicles would be trying to navigate the small streets close to the site, trying to emerge into the fast-flowing A675 through the village, whilst also trying to leave sufficient clearway for access by emergency vehicles, all of which brings additional challenges bearing in mind that some of the streets close to the site are 'unadopted'

I trust you will give careful consideration to the objections given above.

Yours faithfully

Gerard Pearce

Obj – Ant Redfern – 37 High Street, Belmont – Rec 2.7.19

Dear Sir/madam

My name is Ant Redfern and I reside at 37 High Street in Belmont. I've lived here for 15 years.

I am writing to you to offer reasons why I feel the proposed development of the Black Dog pub should be rejected.

The proposed change of use for the building is I feel a poor suggestion as it would deplete the residents of a centre for social purposes and have a negative impact upon the community. Whilst the previous custodians of the pub failed to make it profitable I feel this was due in the main to their distinct lack of knowledge or experience of running a business. Their ego was writing cheques their abilities could not cash and the place was doomed to fail before it started. They took over the

building believing success would be straightforward but from customer service point of view they were absolutely clueless.

I feel you only need to look up the road to see what the Lottie's coffee shop has achieved to witness what a well organised business with expertise can achieve. They have put the efforts of Mrs Bluer to shame.

I urge you to allow the building to remain as it is. A business will take over the building and make it a success and something that future generations of villagers can enjoy. The building has been a cornerstone of village life for too long simply to allow it to now be lost.

Changing the property into apartments is a move that will appeal to a developer but do nothing for the crippling parking problems that are already experienced by residents. I am sure it will not take planners long to agree that 15 people will need more than 6 parking spaces.

I very much hope I am not a lone voice in asking you to think very carefully about the impacts your decisions can mean for future generations.

Many thanks and kind regards.

Ant Redfern

Obj – Adam Booth – 44 Makinson Avenue, Horwich (previously 5 Brookdale & 4 Ward Street, Belmont) – Rec 2.7.19

To whom it may concern,

I would like to strongly object to the planning application that has been made in regards to The Belmont Bull, Belmont Village. Planning ref # 10/29/0528.

There are more important things that that building can be turned into other than luxury flats. The Bull was and should always be a building for the community. Whether that be as a renewed public house or as village store and post office.

I strongly believe that the previous tenants systematically ran the pub business down with a view to turning the Bull into their own 6 bedroom home and I'm thankful that their planning application was refused. Any further application that is anything like that should be flatly refused.

I was brought up in the village from the age of 2 in 1977 and the Bull and the Dog have always been a part of the village.

I strongly feel that there is no reason that the Bull could not be turned into a village amenity and vehemently oppose any application for anything else.

Dear Sir/Madam

Thank you for notifying me of planning application reference 10/19/0528.

I strongly object to this application on the following grounds.

1. Objection to Change of Use

- The Black Bull Public House, which traded in recent years as 'The Belmont Bull' was a significant cultural asset for the village. It benefited the community greatly as a social centre. The value of that to the community is not diminished by any lack of profitability for the company which owned it.

- The Black Bull/Belmont Bull has been a central part of the community for over 100 years. A social network grew up around the pub which wouldn't have existed in its absence and which is now torn apart.

Over the last ten years, for example, regular and popular entertainment at the Black Bull has included nationally renowned musicians such as Boo Hewerdine, Clive Gregson, Mike Sweeney and Radio Two's Mike Harding and others, international recording stars from the USA, Canada and Australia, local art exhibitions, ex-Bolton footballer Frank Worthington, frequent local bands, a well supported weekly quiz and inter-pub quiz. The monthly Open Mics usually filled the room (although not always the till). Socially it was used for meetings of Belmont Primary School PTA, Belmont Village Residents' Association, Bolton Mountain Rescue Society, The annual Fell Race, Belmont Gardeners and Growers' Club and others. No charge was made for these benefits to the community and with the exception of Bolton Mountain Rescue members, they were of little commercial benefit. The value of community assets to the community cannot however be judged by how much profit they generate for a landlord.

- If change of use is granted then the council is likely to receive applications to replace the lost facility with a community centre.

- With the closure of the pub, several regulars have already left the village and others are planning to follow. Although there is an alternative pub, its function room is dedicated to dining and not suitable for entertainment and village events.

- I submit that the loss of the pub is indeed an unnecessary loss of a community facility which has had an impact on the community's ability to meet its day to day needs.

- The application claims that "efforts have been made to sell the pub as a going concern" and yet the For Sale sign reads "Former Public House" and the pub signage was taken down during the sale period.

- After the building was purchased by the last landlady, Heather Bluer, the exterior of the pub was deliberately left in a state of disrepair in order to discourage purchase as a going concern and to ride out the statutory time period for sale, in the knowledge that more profit could be made by change of use.

Mrs Bluer discouraged a neighbour from removing weeds growing along the side of the building on Naylor's Terrace. Weeds were left to grow at the front of the pub and signage left to collapse. After purchasing the property, Mrs Bluer applied to the council to change the use of the pub to a "residential dwelling" so clearly that is not compatible with the claim that "efforts have been made to sell the pub as a going concern." That claim in section 6.1 of the supporting statement must be disregarded as untenable. As such the application should be refused since insufficient effort to sell the pub as a going concern has been made.

2. Inadequate Parking

- There are already insufficient parking spaces in the village. Section 2.7 of the Supporting Statement to the application misleadingly refers to existing "unrestricted parking on one side of High Street and unrestricted parking along Naylor's Terrace" but these parking spaces are already in use by existing residents.
- The addition of double yellow lines along the length of the Black Bull on Naylor's Terrace has exacerbated lack of parking in recent years.
- The current Black Bull front car park is fully used each morning by parents whilst they take their children to Belmont Primary School and each afternoon whilst they collect them - a long established practice. The loss of this parking capacity under the planning proposal will cause congestion, remove an important safe parking option and therefore create potentially life-threatening danger during the school drop.
- The planning application offers space for six medium-sized cars, yet the proposed accommodation is designed to sleep 15.

Ground floor sleeps 7

First floor sleeps 6

Roof space sleeps 2

It is naive to assume that 15 people will only require 6 parking spaces. If the rear extension were disallowed and 6 further parking spaces created at the back it would be nearer to being tenable.

The application should be rejected for the above reasons.

Yours faithfully

Philip Yorke

Obj – Jack Smith – 28 Whisters Hollow, Smithills – Rec 3.7.19

I fully support the comments left by Philip York regarding the planning application number ...10/19. 0528 and object to this application being granted...Jack Smith

Obj – Mr and Mrs Adams – 71 High Street, Belmont Village – rec 2.7.19

Dear Sir/Madam

Thank you for notifying me of planning application reference 10/19/0528.

I strongly object to this application on the following grounds.

1. Objection to Change of Use

- The Black Bull Public House, which traded in recent years as 'The Belmont Bull' was a significant cultural asset for the village. It benefited the community greatly as a social centre. The value of that to the community is not diminished by any lack of profitability for the company which owned it.

- The Black Bull/Belmont Bull has been a central part of the community for over 100 years. A social network grew up around the pub which wouldn't have existed in its absence and which is now torn apart. Photos below illustrate this, plus this short YouTube video https://youtu.be/co9_Jc-Lxbw

- Over the last ten years, for example, regular and popular entertainment at the Black Bull has included nationally renowned musicians such as Boo Hewerdine, Clive Gregson, Mike Sweeney and Radio Two's Mike Harding and others, international recording stars from the USA, Canada and Australia, local art exhibitions, ex-Bolton footballer Frank Worthington, frequent local bands, a well supported weekly quiz and inter-pub quiz. The monthly Open Mics usually filled the room (although not always the till). Socially it was used for meetings of Belmont Primary School PTA, Belmont Village Residents' Association, Bolton Mountain Rescue Society, The annual Fell Race, Belmont Gardeners and Growers' Club and others. No charge was made for these benefits to the community and with the exception of Bolton Mountain Rescue members, they were of little commercial benefit. The value of community assets to the community cannot however be judged by how much profit they generate for a landlord.

- If change of use is granted then the council is likely to receive applications to replace the lost facility with a community centre.

- With the closure of the pub, several regulars have already left the village and others are planning to follow. Although there is an alternative pub, its function room is dedicated to dining and not suitable for entertainment and village events.

- I submit that the loss of the pub is indeed an unnecessary loss of a community facility which has had an impact on the community's ability to meet its day to day needs.

- The application claims that "efforts have been made to sell the pub as a going concern" and yet the For Sale sign reads "Former Public House" and the pub signage was taken down during the sale period.

- After the building was purchased by the last landlady, Heather Bluer, the exterior of the pub appears deliberately to have been left in a state of disrepair, one might reasonably surmise in order to discourage purchase as a going concern and to ride out the statutory time period for sale, in the knowledge that more profit could be made by change of use.

Mrs Bluer discouraged a neighbour from removing weeds growing along the side of the building on Naylor's Terrace. Weeds were left to grow at the front of the pub and signage left to collapse. After purchasing the property, Mrs Bluer applied to the council to change the use of the pub to a "residential dwelling" so clearly that is not compatible with the claim that "efforts have been made to sell the pub as a going concern." That claim in section 6.1 of the supporting statement must be disregarded as untenable. As such the application should be refused since insufficient effort to sell the pub as a going concern has been made.

2. Inadequate Parking

- There are already insufficient parking spaces in the village. Section 2.7 of the Supporting Statement to the application misleadingly refers to existing "unrestricted parking on one side of High Street and unrestricted parking along Naylor's Terrace" but these parking spaces are already in use by existing residents.

(We have had meetings just recently between the School, Police, Blackburn Council representatives and the local community regarding the parking problems that already exist in the village.)

- The addition of double yellow lines along the length of the Black Bull on Naylor's Terrace has exacerbated lack of parking in recent years.

- The current Black Bull front car park is fully used each morning by parents whilst they take their children to Belmont Primary School and each afternoon whilst they collect them - a long established practice. The loss of this parking capacity under the planning proposal will cause congestion, remove an important safe parking option and therefore create potentially life-threatening danger during the school drop.

- The planning application offers space for six medium-sized cars, yet the proposed accommodation is designed to sleep 15.

Ground floor sleeps 7

First floor sleeps 6

Roof space sleeps 2

It is naive to assume that 15 people will only require 6 parking spaces. If the rear extension were disallowed and 6 further parking spaces created at the back it would be nearer to being tenable, especially if the ground floor remained as social space in some form (community centre, restaurant, bar).

The application should be rejected for the above reasons.

Yours faithfully

Mr & Mrs Adams

Obj – Nicola Lomax and Brendan Bostock – 14 Naylor's Terrace – Rec 2.7.19

FAO: MR M KELLY

I am writing with regard to the full planning application submitted for the Black Bull Public House (Belmont Bull) at 101 High Street, Belmont, reference above.

This application is for a change of use from a former public house to six self-contained flats with a single storey rear extension and associated car parking.

As a resident living on Naylor's Terrace (no. 14) at the rear of the Black Bull Public House I have reservations and some serious concerns about the potential impact on the surrounding area.

Having studied the plans I can see that there is potential for a maximum adult occupancy of up to 15 individuals in the total bedrooms (mix of double and single), depending on the configuration of private individuals who purchase the flats. In addition there will be a requirement for access for services, deliveries, visitors etc. The supporting document acknowledges that this is a 'high density' residential area, mainly of small cottages.

There is already pressure on parking in the adjoining streets, with overspill from other residential streets which have no parking (eg Waterfall Terrace) and single-side parking on high street. There have been significant issues concerning the nearby school and disputes with local residents (on Ryecroft Road) due to congestion and safety issues at the busiest times of the day. Some of this is currently alleviated by parents parking on the vacant front of Belmont Bull Car Park (again this will be lost as a parking space increasing congestion in the surrounding streets).

Allowing for only 6 small car parking spaces at the front of this development appears to be insufficient for the accommodation being planned, in particular the proposal is to build on a significant section of the current rear car park and lose this parking space. It seems the developer has not made adequate provision for potential vehicle parking and assumed this can overflow into adjacent streets, which are already under pressure given the nature of the nearby housing.

The village has very limited access to a regular bus service and it can be assumed that the majority of residents will continue to be reliant on personal cars unless plans are made to improve public transport.

Kind regards

Nicola Lomax & Brendan Bostock

Obj – Tony and Sandra McGuinness – 26 Naylor's Terrace – Rec 2.7.19

Dear Mr Blackledge,

I wish to object to the planning application to change the use of the closed Belmont Bull public house to six flats.

There is only six parking spaces allocated to the flats but accommodation for 15 people. Insufficient parking for residents is an ongoing problem for residents. Granting planning permission to accommodate 15 new residents cars, not forgetting visiting friends and relatives with their vehicles, will undoubtedly cause untold problems.

Just an example of the trouble caused through lack of parking space - Earlier this year the police had to be called to deal with an incident on Ryecroft Lane near the school due to a parking issue. This has now lead to an employee of the school standing outside the school gates instructing people not to park when dropping off / collecting children. This leads to people parking in other streets around the village and it is not unusual to find them parked in front of peoples driveways. Needless to say this causes obstruction problems and arguments.

It is also important to take into consideration that the streets surrounding the Belmont Bull only access is from High Street and are very narrow and usually have cars parked on both sides. Emergency Vehicles such as ambulances find it difficult to pass and should a fire engine be called it would not be able to access at all. This is the present situation, so how can adding a substantial amount of vehicles not be a health and safety issues?

I am aware that there is a short length of double yellow lines along the side of the pub on Naylor's Terrace, unfortunately this does not stop people parking and as it is not policed and there are no traffic wardens, so there is no one to stop them parking. The double yellow lines were put there for good reason, especially in frequent icy winter conditions when cars were parked on either side of the terrace. Trying to steer your car up a steep hill between two cars with only just a cars width space in between was not an experience residents on Naylor's Terrace want to experience again, so removing the Double yellow lines is NOT an option.

The planning application states in great detail that Belmont is well served with public transport and shows numerous bus stops, unfortunately the bus service is almost none existent and in considering the planning application I ask that you look at a bus time table for Belmont Village. Also please note the only route the bus takes is from Bolton center to Belmont Village if you wish to travel anywhere else i.e. Darwen -Blackburn - Edgworth - Egerton, in fact any surrounding area you would have to travel to Bolton to get public transport to any of these places. With a bus every 2/3 hours and last bus around 5.30 pm traveling by bus is hardly an option for working residents living in Belmont Village, but yes we have bus stops as your applicant points out.

I hope you will take into account the objections I have have made when you consider the application
10/19/0528

Kind regards,

Tony & Sandra McGuinness

Obj – Mark Turner – 99 High Street, Belmont – Rec 2.7.19

With reference to the above planning application i would make the following comments regarding this application :

Loss of a community facility.

In the Supporting Statement it is claimed that the community failed to support the pub, in reality some members of the community and visitors to the village used it extremely regularly, some not at all and some stopped using it because of the way it was being operated. Appendices 1,2 and 3 relate to the downturn in the performance of the business. This is only part of the story and there are other factors which should be taken into consideration when taking a view as to whether the business was viable or not. After an initial burst of enthusiasm by the last tenants the food offering was stopped, during the three years the last tenants had the pub the opening times were reduced on three separate occasions and were not kept to, with the pub being closed earlier than the published closing times if there was no-one in.

The evidence of a failing business is biased in the applicants favour and the timing requirement to market the property on the open market does not appear to have been followed, at the time of the application which appears to have been around 31/05/19 the property had not been officially on the market for the required 12 months, as such i would suggest that the requirement under Policy 35 - Protection of Local Facilities, as referred to in section 5.9 of the Supporting Statement, to provide evidence that the business was no longer economically viable and has been marketed appropriately has not been met.

Residential Need.

The Supporting Statement refers to the development providing residential accommodation of a type and specification that is much needed in the area. The suggestion here seems to be that one of the reasons approval of this application should be granted is that the development will provide lower cost accommodation, i would hope most people would like to see property available in Belmont that younger people in the village can afford, however, without knowing the price range that the properties will be offered at (and i have been unable to obtain any information on this) i fail to see how this aspect of the application Supporting Statement can be considered.

Parking.

The parking situation in Belmont and around The Belmont Bull Public House is very difficult at the best of times, should this application be successful and the re-development go ahead the problem will only be made worse as the proposal is for only 6 no. allocated parking spaces for this development. With 3 no. two bedroom flats and 3 no. one bedroom flats, even conservatively there could be 12 no. cars requiring regular parking provision, in addition there will be visitors vehicles, these additional vehicles will then be trying to park in an area that is already heavily congested with residents vehicles. There is a suggestion within the Supporting Statement that the local bus service would benefit potential residents of the proposed flats and therefore that 6 no. parking spaces is adequate, all this does is to illustrate the lack of investigation by the applicant, the bus service has been reduced dramatically in recent years to the point where it can barely be referred to as a service and with the last bus to Belmont leaving Bolton town centre at 5.30pm this is not conducive to working outside Belmont and commuting. Policy 10 - Accessibility and Transport as referred to in section 5.7 of the Supporting Statement has not been met as there is wholly inadequate provision for parking.

I do not feel that this application in its current form should be approved, and whilst i have no desire to see the condition of the property deteriorate further, a delay would provide the applicant time to put together a more imaginative proposal for the property that retains the asset for the community and provides additional income streams for the applicant to make the investment economically viable.

Mark Turner

Obj – Mr and Mrs Hodkinson – 10 Naylor's Terrace, Belmont – Rec 1.7.19

Dear Mr Prescott

I would like to object to the planning application to change the use of the former public house and landlord's flat at Black Bull Public House, 101 High Street, Belmont, Bolton, BL7 8AJ

Below are my objections together with some observations.

Please refer to the supporting statement for planning application:

2.4

The immediate surrounding area **does not** consist predominantly of fairly high-density residential properties

There are **no** commercial/retail uses along the High Street

2.6

The property does not have vehicular access to the north, this is to the east of the property.

The image used here is an extremely old image as there have been double yellow lines in place along this stretch of Naylor's Terrace for approximately 4 years.

2.7

Naylor's Terrace is **not** unrestricted, there are double yellow lines on one side of the road adjacent to The Bull.

4.0

The present application being in excess of 12 months since the last application to turn the building into a residential dwelling is making reference to the fact that the Belmont Bull is no longer a viable business and should not be relevant to this present application. This is documented throughout the application statement and does not bear relevance to what has gone before.

5.6

An apartment block is not in keeping with the current accommodation already in the village. The village is predominantly small cottage dwellings.

5.7

The proposed accommodation could present a requirement in excess of 6 car parking spaces as indicated in the proposal. Given that the application is for 4 x 2 bed flats and 2 x 1 bed flat there will most certainly be in excess of 6 car users in the property.

The immediate local area already has severe parking issues aggravated by residents from other nearby roads parking on Naylor's Terrace and the High Street. Given that the High Street only has practical parking on one side only and Naylor's Terrace has parking restrictions to one side this could cause further issues in the area. Currently the residents of Nos 1-7 who rely on parking in front of their property as they have no off-road driveways cannot on many occasions park in front of or near their own property.

Having looked at the measurements for the proposed parking at the front of the building I cannot see how 6 cars can be expected to park and manoeuvre safely. I would also like to point out that The Belmont Bull when it was a public house did in fact have 2 car parks, the second of which is proposed to be converted into a leisure space with bicycle storage.

5.14

This statement is irrelevant as the public house has already closed and has been for well over 12 months.

5.15 paragraph 2

There are no amenities at all in the village, public transport is minimal only and the village is not accessible unless you have a car at your disposal.

5.15 paragraph 5

I do not consider this statement to be true, there are currently 10 properties for sale in Belmont Village with half of them having been on the market for in excess of 12 months upwards.

5.15 paragraph 6

This is an irrelevant statement

6.6

The Wilton and San Marino are restaurants not pubs and again this is irrelevant to the application.

6.13

6 flats - potentially will need more than 6 car parking spaces, there will also be visitors coming to the building - quite clearly by any stretch of the imagination further parking would be needed and this is just not available in the location. As already mentioned Naylor's Terrace has parking restrictions as does the High Street. Parking has and will always be an issue in this location.

Obj – Mr and Mrs Smeaton – 2 Ward Street, Belmont – Rec 28.6.19

Sir

We feel that we must object to this application on the grounds of the amount of parking provided.

If these flats are sold to professional couples working around Bolton/Manchester etc. it will be nearly 100% certain that they have two cars per household.

It is difficult at times at the moment to park around the area without the addition of six more vehicles plus any visitor vehicles to the flats. In conclusion we would like to see the premises brought back to a public house and from information received it looks as though it is back on the market.

Mr & Mrs Smeaton

Dear Sirs,

20th June 2019

I would like to object to the planning of the building of six flats on the site of the former Black Bull, Belmont. My objections are the following reasons.

- A lack of amenities in the village, I would welcome the plans for a shop or re-conversion into a public house.
- Already a busy area with traffic, six flats would increase traffic up to Naylor's terrace.
- extra traffic on the road would add to the dangers of the A675.
- The idea of flats is totally out of keeping with the buildings of the area.

Please find my enclosed objections and please forward a detailed overview of the plans to myself, I have already asked to see these by leaving a voicemail. Please notify me of your receipt of this letter.

Obj – Kay Ashmore – 1 Naylor's Terrace, Belmont – Rec 24.6.19

FAO: Gavin Prescott

Dear Mr Prescott

I would like to object to the planning application to change the use of the former public house and landlord's flat at Black Bull Public House, 101 High Street, Belmont, Bolton, BL7 8AJ

Below are my objections together with some observations.

Please refer to the supporting statement for planning application:

2.4

The immediate surrounding area does not consist predominantly of fairly high-density residential properties

There are no commercial/retail uses along the High Street

2.6

The property does not have vehicular access to the north, this is to the east of the property.

The image used here is an extremely old image as there have been double yellow lines in place along this stretch of Naylor's Terrace for approximately 4 years.

2.7

Naylor's Terrace is not unrestricted, there are double yellow lines on one side of the road adjacent to The Bull.

4.0

The present application being in excess of 12 months since the last application to turn the building into a residential dwelling is making reference to the fact that the Belmont Bull is no longer a viable business and should not be relevant to this present application. This is documented throughout the application statement and does not bear relevance to what has gone before.

5.6

An apartment block is not in keeping with the current accommodation already in the village. The village is predominantly small cottage dwellings.

5.7

The proposed accommodation could present a requirement in excess of 6 car parking spaces as indicated in the proposal. Given that the application is for 4 x 2 bed flats and 2 x 1 bed flat there will most certainly be in excess of 6 car users in the property.

The immediate local area already has severe parking issues aggravated by residents from other nearby roads parking on Naylor's Terrace and the High Street. Given that the High Street only has practical parking on one side only and Naylor's Terrace has parking restrictions to one side this could cause further issues in the area. Currently the residents of Nos 1-7 who rely on parking in front of their property as they have no off-road driveways cannot on many occasions park in front of or near their own property, myself being one of them.

Having looked at the measurements for the proposed parking at the front of the building I cannot see how 6 cars can be expected to park and manoeuvre safely. I would also like to point out that The Belmont Bull when it was a public house did in fact have 2 car parks, the second of which is proposed to be converted into a leisure space with bicycle storage.

5.14

This statement is irrelevant as the public house has already closed and has been for well over 12 months.

5.15 paragraph 2

There are no amenities at all in the village, public transport is minimal only and the village is not accessible unless you have a car at your disposal.

5.15 paragraph 5

I do not consider this statement to be true, there are currently 10 properties for sale in Belmont Village with half of them having been on the market for in excess of 12 months upwards.

5.15 paragraph 6

This is an irrelevant statement

6.6

The Wilton and San Marino are restaurants not pubs and again this is irrelevant to the application.

6.13

6 flats - potentially will need more than 6 car parking spaces, there will also be visitors coming to the building - quite clearly by any stretch of the imagination further parking would be needed and this is just not available in the location. As already mentioned Naylor's Terrace has parking restrictions as does the High Street. Parking has and will always be an issue in this location.

Regards

Kay Ashmore

Obj – Annie O'Neill – 132 High Street, Belmont – rec 23.6.19

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to raise my concerns regarding the above planning application.

I am a long term resident of Belmont Village (over 35 years) and live at 132, High St.

My concerns are as follows:

The Black Bull has always been a village amenity and should be retained as such for the use of villagers. We have already lost both the shop and post office and have a severely reduced bus service. There is a distinct lack of social space as we do not have a village hall etc. The other public house in the village runs principally as a restaurant. A different use should be sought for it which would benefit residents.

Parking has always been a problem in the village and this situation has got considerably worse over the last few years. Cars are now much larger and most households have at least two cars - many have more as they have young people living at home who are unable to use public transport as the service is so poor (last bus from Bolton at 5.30pm). For example my new next door neighbours have four cars as they have two young adults still at home. It is impossible for most people to get to work and back using public transport or indeed for us to travel to Bolton or Blackburn to use the social facilities.

Most villagers live in cottages with no dedicated parking and endure a daily 'bun fight' to find a parking space on the main road. Creating six apartments with the size of car park proposed in the application (would hold no more than half a dozen cars) will create additional stress on a situation which is already close to breaking point. I was unable to view the full application but would like to know what the vehicle mitigation strategy would be for the number of cars envisaged plus additional visitors (assuming two cars per apartment plus at least one additional visitor per week per apartment, we are talking about 18-20 additional vehicles) at the top end of the village.

At present there are two long term vacant properties at the bottom of Chapel St which has helped neighbours and myself and may create an impression that parking is less of an issue. However we

have to work on the assumption that the owner will sell the properties at some point- with the result of more vehicles to be accommodated.

If there is, practically, no alternative but to develop this resource as housing then please reconsider the number of apartments (4 at most) and do not allow any extension at the rear of the building - this would accommodate additional parking space.

Kind regards,

Annie O'Neill

Obj – Susan Hudson – 97 High Street, Belmont – Rec 16.6.19

Dear Mr Blackledge

I am writing to object to the planning application of the above property to 6 flats. My reason for the objection is that the number of parking spaces to be provided is not enough. Each flat will more than likely have at least 2 cars meaning that 6 will need to park in the surrounding area. Parking is difficult now without a further 6 cars added. We also have the added problem of parents parking for school drop off and pick up and in this area traffic gets congested with cars and poor parking. My concern is that one day a child will be hurt, and that is one child too many.

People from Ward street Belmont, and the even numbers on High Street also park on Naylor's Terrace, so adding more cars is going to create more problems. People get very angry about being unable to park near their property

The application has an area at the back of the property for recreational use. Could this not be better used for car parking? Or reduce the number of flats.

I would suggest that someone visits this area around the time school finishes and starts, and in an evening when people are home, so that these problems can be observed.

Yours Sincerely

Obj – Jacqueline and Paul Bentley – 95 High Street, Belmont – Rec 16.6.19

Dear Sir

I write with reference to the Planning Application as detailed above re changing the Belmont Bull into 6 self contained flats. Whilst I do not object in principle to the change of use I wish to object to the plans that have been submitted as there seems to have been a complete lack of understanding of the parking problems that we already have in the village. To add another 6 properties and then only 6 parking spaces is in my opinion a joke, as most of the properties will have at least 2 cars, which will mean another 6 cars needing to park somewhere in the village and even more when they have visitors causing additional stress to the people who already live here - you need to come to the village either in the evening or when the school is opening/ closing to see just how difficult it is to

park. We objected to the double yellow lines at the side of the pub several years ago and this fell on deaf ears. I also attended a meeting only 6 months ago at Belmont School with regard to parking problems and various members of the Council were in attendance. Whilst I note the applicants comments with regard to public transport I regret to say that this again demonstrates a real lack of understanding of village life - we have a very limited bus service which doesn't run in the evening and is sporadic during the day. I would also refer to the applicants comments with regard to the need for additional dwellings - the cottages in the village when for sale can be on the market for months if not years as the lack of amenities on our doorstep puts people off buying here.

Jacqueline and Paul Bentley

Obj – Belmont Village Residents Association – 3 Waterfall Terrace, Belmont – Rec 1.7.19

Dear Mr Blackledge,

Ref 10/19/0528. Application to convert the former Belmont Bull public house into 6 apartments .

Following discussion of the plans for the above application with fellow members of the Belmont Village Residents Association committee the following representations are made.

Parking

The plans show 6 very tight car parking spaces on the former pub forecourt. One concern is that due to the very limited space for manoeuvre , this is likely to result in vehicles reversing on to the main road, which would be particularly hazardous at peak times. The application is misleading when it refers to the availability of public transport (bus routes) as there is only one bus service between Bolton and Belmont (535) . This is infrequent during the day and is non-existent the evenings and on Sundays. This increases the need for private vehicles and as the proposed apartments are not single occupancy it is envisaged the development would generate more than six cars. As there are double yellow lines down the side of the building the proposed car parking provision appears particularly inadequate in an already congested village and should not be dismissed. The plans reflect an overdevelopment of the site which aggravates the parking issues.

2) Local housing needs

The need for this type of development/ housing in Belmont is questioned. There are long standing and clear needs for more accessible housing for the elderly /disabled and for young families – neither of which would be met by this development- therefore the benefit to the village as a whole is questionable .

3) Additional queries

There is inadequate information in the application on a number of counts;

- a) There is no information at this stage relating to heating systems/ energy efficiency
- b) There is no information relating to safety measures (eg fire escapes)

c) There is very little information about the proposed use of the cellar space. In relation to this, there are suggestions that it might be possible to open the space up to allow additional parking or create a 'community space' or a business hub for local businesses, either of which would make this a more attractive and beneficial development for the village as a whole.

5) A final point relates to widespread concern over the deterioration of the building during the period it failed to sell. It is now an eyesore. It is hoped that if the application is approved there will be a clearly laid out timescale for the necessary work to be undertaken to avoid any further deterioration of the building and site.

It is hoped that the above representations and queries will be taken into account and explored fully before final decisions are made which will impact on the residents of Belmont.

Yours faithfully

Rosemary Newman

Chair – Belmont Village Residents Association

Obj – Mr Horridge – No address – rec 2.7.19

Hi I object to the change of use to the Belmont Bull, as one again you strip a community of an essential social element and replace it with more village residents with less places to socially interact. Sounds like a recipe for disaster.

Mr Horridge

Obj – Mr Horridge – 2nd Objection – No address – Rec 2.7.19

Dear Sir/Madam

Thank you for notifying me of planning application reference 10/19/0528.

I strongly object to this application on the following grounds.

1. Objection to Change of Use

- The Black Bull Public House, which traded in recent years as 'The Belmont Bull' was a significant cultural asset for the village. It benefited the community greatly as a social centre. The value of that to the community is not diminished by any lack of profitability for the company which owned it.

- The Black Bull has been a central part of the community for over 100 years. A social network grew up around the pub wouldn't have existed in its absence and which is now torn apart. Photos below illustrate this.

- Over the last ten years, for example, regular and popular entertainment at the Black Bull has included nationally renowned musicians such as Boo Hewerdine, Clive Gregson, Mike Sweeney and

Radio Two's Mike Harding and others, international recording stars from the USA, Canada and Australia, local art exhibitions, ex-Bolton footballer Frank Worthington, frequent local bands, a well supported weekly quiz and inter-pub quiz. The monthly Open Mics usually filled the room (although not always the till). Socially it was used for meetings of Belmont Primary School PTA, Belmont Village Residents' Association, Bolton Mountain Rescue Society, Belmont Gardeners and Growers' Club and others. No charge was made for these benefits to the community and with the exception of Bolton Mountain Rescue members, they were of little commercial benefit. The value of community assets to the community cannot however be judged by how much profit they generate for a landlord.

- If change of use is granted then the council is likely to receive applications to replace the lost facility with a community centre.
- With the closure of the pub, several regulars have already left the village and others are planning to follow. Although there is an alternative pub, its function room is dedicated to dining and not suitable for entertainment and village events.
- I submit that the loss of the pub is indeed an unnecessary loss of a community facility which has had an impact on the community's ability to meet its day to day needs.
- The application claims that "efforts have been made to sell the pub as a going concern" and yet the For Sale sign reads "Former Public House" and the pub signage was taken down during the sale period.
- After the building was purchased by the last landlady, Heather Bluer, the pub was deliberately left in a state of disrepair in order to discourage purchase as a going concern and to ride out the statutory time period for sale, in the knowledge that more profit could be made by change of use.

Mrs Bluer discouraged a neighbour from removing weeds growing along the side of the building on Naylor's Terrace. Weeds were left to grow at the front of the pub and signage left to collapse. After purchasing the property, Mrs Bluer applied to the council to change the use of the pub to a "residential dwelling" so clearly that is not compatible with the claim that "efforts have been made to sell the pub as a going concern." That claim in section 6.1 of the supporting statement must be disregarded as untenable. As such the application should be refused since insufficient effort to sell the pub as a going concern has been made.

2. Inadequate Parking

- There are already insufficient parking spaces in the village. Section 2.7 of the Supporting Statement to the application misleadingly refers to existing "unrestricted parking on one side of High Street and unrestricted parking along Naylor's Terrace" but these parking spaces are already in use by existing residents.
- The addition of double yellow lines along the length of the Black Bull on Naylor's Terrace has exacerbated lack of parking in recent years.
- The current Black Bull front car park is fully used each morning by parents whilst they take their children to Belmont Primary School and each afternoon whilst they collect them - a long established practice. The loss of this parking capacity under the planning proposal will cause congestion, remove

an important safe parking option and therefore create potentially life-threatening danger during the school drop.

- The planning application offers space for six medium-sized cars, yet the proposed accommodation is designed to sleep 15.

Ground floor sleeps 7

First floor sleeps 6

Roof space sleeps 2

It is naive to assume that 15 people will only require 6 parking spaces. If the rear extension were disallowed and 6 further parking spaces created at the back it would be nearer to being tenable.

The application should be rejected for the above reasons.

Yours faithfully

Simon Horridge

Obj – Mrs Horridge – No Address – Rec 2.7.19

Dear Sir/Madam

Please register that I am opposed to the development of the Belmont Bull Inn into another residential development.

The loss of this fabulous local meeting /social environment would be greatly missed.

This approach to facilitating the demise of such public houses as the Bull...with its events and popularity for both local and regular visiting clientele will rapidly create a community of increasingly isolated individuals there.

Without a non denominational/ membership exempt, truly local meeting venue to provide simply company , comfort and a place to communicate -the needs of many in the community who do not wish for such formalities will vanish.

Please consider this in your deliberations.

Yours sincerely

Mrs Horridge

Comments - Philip Konstam – no Address Rec 3.7.19

To whom it may concern,

I would like to comment on the above application to turn the Belmont Bull public house into flats.

The closure of the Belmont bull was a sad loss to the village. The current owners whilst enthusiastic at first had no previous experience of running a pub and implemented some poor business decisions, ultimately losing all interest.

The previous landlord ran a successful Bull for many years.

I believe that in the right hands the Belmont Bull can thrive.

I am aware of at least two offers that have been made on the property. One of these offers came from a friend of mine and was close to the asking price. I can offer more information on request. He was under the impression the current owners had no real intention on selling the property.

The Belmont Bull has served the village well for those villagers who prefer 'a local pub' to the brewery-run food pub, the Black Dog, at the bottom of the village.

Yours sincerely,

Philip Konstam

Comments - Roy Rhodes - The Rough Lee, Naylor's Terrace, Belmont – Rec 1.7.19

I have the following comments on

Planning Application 10/19/0528, Change of use at 101 High Street, Belmont

I have no objection to the overall proposal which is a worthwhile project and a good use for the building. However, some of the details give me cause for concern and I write to ask if you will review them and perhaps be able to suggest/require action by the applicant as appropriate. I disagree that there is no biodiversity interest involved.

1 - The bus service is not ideal for many Belmont residents who are without access to cars. The street parking arrangements around the building are close to capacity and it seems that 6 car parking places, while reasonable, may not be enough for potentially 9 occupants of the proposed flats in the longer term. The older section of Naylor's Terrace is often almost choked and occasionally there is not space for a fire engine to get through. I notice because I drive a 6m long motor caravan. The situation is worsened at school opening and closing times.

2 - In section 7 (Materials) of the application, the existing roofing is given as slate and the proposed roofing as tiles. It is not clear whether all of the building will be re-roofed or if the tiles will only appear on the new extension. It seems possible, however, that rooflights may be included in the work for the second floor Flat 6. Use of the roof space is a new activity as far as I can tell.

In Section 12 (Biodiversity) of the application it is asserted that there are no protected species present, but no information is mentioned in respect of surveys. Pipistrelle bats are specially

protected and are present nightly around the houses on Naylor's Terrace and more widely around the village. They may well be entering the application building, especially after the fairly lengthy period of little or no disturbance. I suggest that a survey by a qualified person is carried out prior to any work being started. July is a good time to do it. Much advice is available on line. Features to accommodate an existing number of bats or encourage new ones could be included in the building works. A licence is needed to handle bats or disturb them and finding them during building works would cause a delay.

3 - A second biodiversity concern is House Martins which have nested on the building in recent years, occasionally blocking the operation of windows. The birds, nests and eggs are protected. The current national situation with House Martins is a big reduction in numbers, especially following adverse weather in last two years, with other factors also involved. The Belmont population of this summer migrant has also collapsed but numbers may increase, especially if ready-made nest sites are available. A difficulty they face in Belmont is the lack of nearby mud from pools for nest building. House Martin nestboxes (there is much online information) could be included in the project. Best areas would be the north and east faces of the building. They are Amber-listed in terms of conservation status - medium concern.

Equally, Swifts have long been summer residents of Belmont (May to August only) in some of the older properties in the village, but as houses have been upgraded, the loose slates, wall crevices and gaps at eaves level where they were nesting have slowly been eradicated. If this development offers opportunities to use commercially available "nest bricks" for swifts, the specially adapted roof tiles that are available, or even external nestboxes on the high eastern and northern faces, I am sure it would be a worthwhile exercise. Boxes are best sited away from windows to avoid disturbance of the birds.

4 - Mention is made in the application text of the high stone wall which forms the western boundary of the project and it is emphasised that there will be little change to the visual amenity. The wall currently supports a mass of ivy used as a roost by House Sparrows (a declining Red-listed species in the UK) and every effort should be made to retain a sufficient amount for that to continue as there is a small but thriving population of House Sparrows which needs certain features within the communal territory in this part of the village. A section of high hedge in my garden is a key feature for them also in their daily routine.

Holly Blue butterflies, which are scarce in this area, occur in very small numbers around Naylor's Terrace each year. It's not known where they are breeding, but the ivy on this wall may play a part in their life cycle. The species is unique in that the eggs are laid on holly in the spring and on ivy for the second brood in summer. Gardens adjacent to Naylor's Terrace hold substantial growths of both those plants and are visited by the butterflies. Holly Blues have increased nationally in recent years, although we are towards the northern limits of their UK range at present.

I have heard in the village that the grass verge area on upper Naylor's Terrace which is against the outside face of the wall may be surfaced, perhaps for parking. It is currently mown by the council, having been established by Beazer Homes when they built the newest properties on Naylor's Terrace. If that is the case, every effort should be made to minimise interference with the ivy on the perimeter wall of the proposed development.

5 - BwD policies 5.6 and 5.8 look for positive contributions to the overall physical, social, environmental and economic character of the area and action on the possibilities outlined above could see such contributions achieved by this project.

Roy Rhodes
