Blackpool Council

13 March 2017

To: Councillors Elmes, Humphreys, Hutton, Matthews, Maycock, O'Hara, Stansfield and L Williams

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Update Note and Public Speakers List

Please find attached the Update Note and Public Speakers List for Tuesday, 14 March 2017 meeting of the Planning Committee.

Agenda No **Item**

Update Note and Public speakers list (Pages 1 - 16)

Yours sincerely

This page is intentionally left blank

Blackpool Council

Planning Committee:

14 March 2017

Planning Application Reports – Update Notes

Listed below are changes to the planning reports made as a result of additional information received since the publication of the agenda for this meeting.

Case: Year:	Address:	Update:
16/0443	LAND TO REAR OF 1 - 7 BROAD OAK LANE	Objection received from Cherry Trees, The Nook. "As this application is the third or possibly fourth such planning request in recent years, all declined, I would like to reiterate the overwhelming local objection to this application as previously. These are: increase in traffic, associated pollution and safety, increase in flooding as no improvements have been made or planned that will increase the drainage capacity on The Nook and Eddleston Close, existing poor road surfaces that will only worsen. The village of Staining has seen a large increase in new build properties recently although many remain empty or for sale. The increase in traffic in particular has seen an increase in accidents and congestion as only one road in and out. Two properties have been hit and owners moved out due to damage sustained. If the same planning issues remain as previously I cannot see how this application would see a different decision."
16/0810	256-258 CHURCH STREET	**CONSULTATIONS** **Head of Highways and Traffic Management:** Vehicle access onto the forecourt must be undertaken from Buchanan Street to reduce conflict with pedestrians who may be walking along Church Street - a key walking route into the town centre. I do have concerns that even if access onto the forecourt was restricted and conditioned, without any physical measures on sites, users of the site may be tempted to cross the footway from areas where they should not, in

		conflict with pedestrians. I would therefore advice that a small boundary wall (or other measures) is introduced to prevent this from happening. Furthermore, the redundant vehicle crossing on Church Street to be removed. **Director of Public Health**: The above application is to convert a property for a non-residential and alcohol advice and support centre within Class D1 use. This application is being made as the property is going to be utilised by a Blackpool Council commissioned service that has recently been awarded the tender to deliver drug and alcohol treatment services. The building will be a Health and Wellbeing centre for individuals who have completed their treatment journey and will be abstinent from substances. It will provide an environment to keep individuals motivated to remain abstinent and provide a hub for people to work out in the local community. In addition it will be a base for workers to complete their paperwork and prepare for working with clients in the community. D1 status has been requested in order for health promotion, delivery of stop smoking clinics and to be able to offer vaccinations and screening to individuals who are in recovery. There will be no medications or drugs stored on site. Public Health and Commissioning are supportive of this application. The rationale for this is due to it being a commissioned service and the fact the new provider is moving away from a traditional model of delivering drug and alcohol treatment from one building. The new model is about being based in the Community and offering a number of venues for clients to be seen in the Community. **Director Adult Services**: same comments as the Direct of Public Health **Adults Divisional Commissioning Manager**: No comments have been received at the time of preparing this report. Any comments that are received before the Committee meeting will be reported in the update note. **REPRESENTATIONS** **109 Elizabeth Street-** strongly objects to this application. As a local resident with a young daughter I usually walk on this side of the road as I am frightened of the clients that used the Salvation Army drug and alcohol services. Also we also have to avoid the streetwise clients, now this application

		wants to open in the middle of both these centres. More beggars drug /drunks and antisocial elements to avoid. This is a residential area; let them open in one of the many empty retail units in town. Please respect the community. Don't let this place open. **221 Church Street**- objects on the basis that there are already 2 existing drug and alcohol advice/ care centres within the old Grammar School and a third would have an adverse impact on the area. **192 Reads Avenue**- objects to yet another drug and alcohol support centre, which is just an easy option for them and a money making business. There are far too many in the area as it is, fetching even more trouble and anti-social behaviour with them. I often find syringes and beer cans and smashed bottles on the floor in the streets. Blackpool is never going to be cleaned up if more and more of these places keep opening up. Lots of residents are sick to the back teeth of these places, once we may have supported them, but now the balance isn't right, as there's far too many. It is not setting the right example to our children, as it is becoming the norm, to be an alcoholic or a drug user. **AMENDMENT TO CONDITION 3** Recommended hours of use to also include Sundays 09-00 to 17-00 **Informative** included re: removal of the vehicle crossing to Church Street prior to use commencing
16/0845	429-437 PROMENADE	**Head of Highways and Traffic Management** - The principle of development has been accepted here. Parking is provided at the rear which is good, however I do have concerns as to how future occupiers/users of the site will gain access due to the narrow width (approx.. 4000mm) of the access road. Conflict could occur if vehicles are attempting to access or egress the site at the same time. Also, the access road provides access to the rear of the neighbouring properties, some of which have a fire escape at the rear. If you are mindful to support this proposal, the car parking spaces to be allocated to future occupiers of the self-contained flats. How will the site be serviced? A dedicated loading bay maybe required in close proximity to the proposal site. Further discussions to be had with Traffic and Highways. Agreed scheme to be funded by the developer.

		Further conditions: • A Waste Collection Strategy, The bin drag distance is within the 25m threshold, however the poor condition of the rear access road may make it difficult for waste collection operatives to drag the large commercial waste bins from the bin store to the refuse vehicle. • A treatment scheme to improve the condition of the rear access road. • A Construction Management Plan, this to include a joint dilapidation survey with the Traffic and Highways team to inspect and record the condition of the public highway surrounding the proposal prior to works commencing on site. • A travel Plan condition (for restaurant and bar) • A contribution towards two bus stop upgrades, in order to promote travel by sustainable modes. Advice Notes: The bar/restaurant and flats will require formal postal addresses. Applicant to contact Head of Traffic and Highways.
17/0095	Land at Moss House Road, Marton Moss , Blackpool	Additional representations have been received from – **Gordon Marsden MP-**I have read through, carefully, the details of Kensington's proposals and your comments and recommendations. I have to say a number of the issues that arise from the changes are of sufficient significance, in my opinion, to merit the members of the Planning Committee having the chance to consider them in full before they make a decision on the revised Planning Application. I want to be very clear that this is not a letter of opposition to the revised numbers as such. Nor is it a re-opening of the principle of the development on what was of course a highly controversial application to the Council in 2009. The reduction in the number of dwellings with the effect of reducing density is welcome, even if they arise out of the developers' financial issues which are admitted in the Details of Proposal section and the acquisition of the site by United Utilities for works on Blackpool South Surface Water scheme.

		But there are four key issues from the Report and Recommendation that the Committee should have an opportunity to consider fully before any approval of the Revised Plan is made. 1) Introduction – Types of Housing The report from your office to the Committee members reveals that in the revision and reduced number of dwellings the type and balance of housing has been significantly altered. There are now proposed to be 85 four-bed detached (instead of 68) and 60 three-bed detached (instead of 2). Though this may be offset to some degree by reductions in two and three bed mews housing the net effect cost wise will inevitably I believe drive up the price range. This will affect their saleability and character but also reduce even further the potential for this being anything like affordable housing for many Blackpool residents. This is important in the context of the S106 contribution agreement on affordable housing where you are also proposing to reduce the sum of money that Kensingtons contribute. 2) Legal Agreement and Developer Financial Contribution for Affordable Housing In response to the email I sent to you on 24 February 2017 asking about the implications of the revised planning application for the Kensington development, you wrote - *'Kensingtons have committed to pay the original transportation, education and open space contributions and the revised affordable housing contribution agreed by a Planning Inspector in April 2014'.* That could give the impression that the total sum agreed by the Inspector in April 2014 of £9.184 million (which of course was itself a huge reduction in the original proposed S106 figure of £21.9 million in 2009) would stay as it is. But this of course we now learn as a result of your report to the Committee is not the case. The figure of £5.07 million – which you have outlined in your report to the Committee is the figure which the Inspector agreed in April 2014 on the assumption that 579 dwellings would be built and where of a number of 'payment installments' were agreed to be made as and when various stages of building were passed. But of course now the number of dwellings will not hit the targets for the final sets of payments which would have

		then produced the £9.184 million the Inspector had assumed when agreeing the payments points. If the S106 revision had been done on the basis of the reduction in the number of properties now proposed (from 579 to 422) – a reduction of 27.12% - the new figure should be £6.69 million. Instead of this you have stuck with the figure of £5.07 million - which is a reduction of 44.86% - from the original figure the Planning Inspector agreed in April 2014 – on the basis of the schedule then in place. That S106 schedule of money to come to the Council for affordable housing was set up on the basis of 579 properties – not the 422 now proposed. The result of not varying it to reflect the new situation will be to lose a further £1.62 million (for affordable housing). That for Blackpool and the Council would be the result if you continue with a payments schedule now rendered lopsided by the reduction in numbers. I believe in the comments on the recommendations a resident has already suggested that the planning and legal departments should revise, indeed provide a new S106 agreement given the major revision proposals. I have to say I have great sympathy with that view. At a time when council budgets are so tight, I think most people in Blackpool would think it fairly scandalous that the developers should now end up paying only just over half (55.2%) of the figure expected to come from the Planning Inspector's decision in April 2014 – and less than a quarter of the original figure of £21.9 million proposed in 2009. That figure of £21.9 million was to compensate the town for the lack of affordable housing in Kensington's proposal, and it was the basis on which the original Planning permission was then approved. To say, as the opening paragraph of your statement about Section 106 in the submission to councillors does, that 'it is not a matter for consideration as part of this assessment' is to disregard the fact that S106 agreements have always been cornerstones of development approvals by councils. Any settlement that proceeded on simply accepting the £5.07 million figure without a new S106 agreement would distort the original intention of the Planning Inspector in agreeing the process for 579 dwellings in April 2014 which would have yielded a sum of £9.184 million. It could also be viewed unfavourably in any subsequent challenge to the process of approval on the application.

		3) Drainage Strategy In your comments on this you state correctly this will 'form a key part of the site layout and would be central to the appearance and character of the estate'. But the report submitted to the Committee for delegated decision, has as I write, no commentary from Highways and Traffic Management and United Utilities. The sustainability of the roads and the effective piling of them is crucial to any revised plan. I have had for months a series of representations from existing residents on Moss House Road and nearby already complaining that the current operations on piling are affecting their property. It is also apparent that even with substantial piling there remain extreme difficulties with the nature of the site. In response to these concerns I made my own viewing of the site as it was being cleared and piled on February 10. As the photograph I have attached shows even after a relatively dry week the land remained damp and squelchy. Any long-term resident of the Moss area would confirm this. It is absolutely crucial therefore that there are objective, authoritative observations from external consultees for the Committee to consider before approval. You only need to look at what has happened elsewhere in the nearby area, with the housing development in the early 2000s on the Mere Farm Estate by Morris Homes covering Rosefinch Way and surrounding areas, to see what happens when piling for roads was inadequate. The situation there contributed to the major floods in the Marton area in 2012. 4) Highways and Transport Strategy Your commentary on this acknowledged the concerns – which are very real, as I know from representations my office have received – about Moss House Road becoming a 'rat run' between Midgeland and Common Edge Road. The commentary mentioned that 'officers are unaware of any proposals to introduce a bus route through the estate'. I note that Blackpool Transport do not appear to have been included in the list of consultees in the document. Had they been you might have been aware that there are currently proposals to discontinue their No.10 bus route along Midgeland Road from this April. This reduction of public bus services is likely to intensify challenges of congestion from cars and private vehicles to both existing and future residents of the Moss and is a material consideration in a

		highways strategy. **Conclusion-** These four issues and their implications are not made in order to reject the revised figure. But I believe they make a very strong case for the importance of a proper and full consideration by the committee of these issues before deciding on what is a substantially changed application. That could be accomplished by holding this matter over for a month. That allows members time to consider it carefully and what conditions members might wish to place on it – rather than having a summary and most unusual delegation of approval to officers which as the report admits is simply to accommodate the wish of the developers to rush their application through before the end of their financial year. **Mr Baggeley,Wychmead, Bennetts Lane** - concerned about impact on his amenity and the hedgerow on Bennetts Lane - there would be in excess of the minimum 21 metres between the rear of the proposed houses and his front balcony and the hedgerow does not need to affected as a result of the development (full response sent by officers) **Mrs Knott, 23 Moss House Road** - concerned about drainage. The proposal is for fewer dwellings - 422 and would have more onsite surface water storage - ponds and watercourses (full response sent by officers) **Mr Blundell, Dockypool Lane** - concerned about the process and land ownership - do not have to own all of the site to apply for the approval of reserved matters **Mr and Mrs Anderton, 61 Moss House Road** - Concerned about loss of property value, principle of residential development (already established) and character of revised layout. Approval of 579 dwelling scheme had 8 dwellings opposite them this scheme would have only 4 and only 2 would have direct access to Moss House Road and more space between the 4 properties (full response sent by officers) **Mr Young, 16 Mere Road -** concerned properties leasehold and not freehold. The planning system does not control the tenure of market housing **Mrs Hinds, 21 Moss House Road** – wishes to object to the application on the basis that the development would lead to a reduction in the contribution the Council would get for affordable housing . Originally set at £9.1 million in 2010 but reduced by a Planning Inspector to £ 5.07 million in

		2014. (Comment - *the application site is now 1 hectare less than the original site area and the re plan to reflect current sales has resulted in a reduced number overall 579 to 422 – the outline planning permission only set an upper threshold for development and not a minimum. Kensingtons have said they will pay the affordable housing contribution agreed by the Inspector and the original education, open space and highways contributions even though the dwelling numbers are 162 less than the outline (584-422). This would not be a legitimate reason to refuse an approval of reserved matters application)* **Head of Highways and Traffic Management:** I have no objection to this proposal. **Sustainability Manager:** A development of this size which has taken a large area of green space is required to provide alternative living spaces for some of the flora and fauna displaced. A precedent has recently be set by Barratt Homes (in association with the RSPB) providing a variety of features including orchards, hedgehog highways, newt ponds, tree-lined avenues, fruit trees in gardens, bat, owl and swift nest boxes and nectar-rich planting for bees. There is potential in this development for similar features to be installed, particularly bat, house sparrow and swift cavities. These are readily available from several manufacturers as off-the-shelf easy to install, as part of the general home construction, brick-coloured products. The positioning of such cavities should take the home-owners into account and position nesting cavities away from windows, doorways and car parking areas. The bat and house sparrow cavities could be placed on the garages. The most beneficial place for the swift nest boxes would be the three storey buildings. (*the Design and Access Statement submitted with the application shows what would be provided*) To assist any hedgehogs that may re-colonise the estate from neighbouring undeveloped greenspace 'Hedgehog holes' should be provided in the garden fences so that hedgehogs can access a wide foraging area. A 15cm x 15cm hole is required and small interpretive notices are available from www.hedgehogstreet.orgThe swales and drainage ditches should be planted with native wetland plants to encourage pollinating insects. The development is with 3km of a 'B-Line' a project by Buglife to provide links through urban and rural habitats for populations of bees and other pollinating insects to be able to move around. https://www.buglife.org.uk/b-lines-hubThe native shrub

		planting should include Alder Buckthorn Frangula alnus to encourage the current range expansion of Brimstone butterflies into the Fylde. **NATS Safeguarding:** The proposed development has been examined from a technical safeguarding aspect and does not conflict with our safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, NATS (En Route) Public Limited Company ("NERL") has no safeguarding objection to the proposal. However, please be aware that this response applies specifically to the above consultation and only reflects the position of NATS (that is responsible for the management of en route air traffic) based on the information supplied at the time of this application. This letter does not provide any indication of the position of any other party, whether they be an airport, airspace user or otherwise. It remains your responsibility to ensure that all the appropriate consultees are properly consulted. If any changes are proposed to the information supplied to NATS in regard to this application which become the basis of a revised, amended or further application for approval, then as a statutory consultee NERL requires that it be further consulted on any such changes prior to any planning permission or any consent being granted.

PLANNING COMMITTEE
14 MARCH 2017 – ORDER OF BUSINESS

APPLICATION No/Recommendation	DESCRIPTION	ORDER OF BUSINESS	DETAILS
Agenda Item 4 **Application 16/0443** **Officer's recommend:** Refuse **Pages 27 to 50**	Erection of seven detached bungalows with associated access road and car parking. **LAND TO REAR OF 1 - 7 BROAD OAK LANE, BLACKPOOL, FY3 0BZ**	**INFORMATION FROM OFFICERS**	
		OBJECTORS	Cllr John Singleton (Fylde Council) Cllr David Angel (Staining Parish Council) Ms Karen Grundy (Objector) Ms Pam Knowles (Objector)
		APPLICANT/AGENT/SUPPORTER	Mr Keith Beardmore (Applicant)
		WARD COUNCILLOR	
		• **DEBATE BY COMMITTEE** • **DECISION**	

PLANNING COMMITTEE
14 MARCH 2017 – ORDER OF BUSINESS

APPLICATION No/Recommendation	DESCRIPTION	ORDER OF BUSINESS	DETAILS
Agenda Item 5 **Application 16/0686** **Officer's recommend:** Grant Permission **Pages 51 to 62**	Use of premises as a 21 bedroomed care home. **262 QUEENS PROMENADE, BLACKPOOL, FY2 9HB**	**INFORMATION FROM OFFICERS**	
		OBJECTORS	
		APPLICANT/AGENT/SUPPORTER	
		WARD COUNCILLOR	
		• **DEBATE BY COMMITTEE** • **DECISION**	

PLANNING COMMITTEE
14 MARCH 2017 – ORDER OF BUSINESS

APPLICATION No/Recommendation	DESCRIPTION	ORDER OF BUSINESS	DETAILS
Agenda Item 6 **Application 16/0810** **Officer's recommend:** Grant Permission **Pages 63 to 72**	Use of premises as a non-residential drug and alcohol advice and support centre within Use Class D1. **256-258 CHURCH STREET, BLACKPOOL, FY1 3PX**	**INFORMATION FROM OFFICERS**	
		OBJECTORS	
		APPLICANT/AGENT/SUPPORTER	
		WARD COUNCILLOR	
		• **DEBATE BY COMMITTEE** • **DECISION**	

PLANNING COMMITTEE
14 MARCH 2017 – ORDER OF BUSINESS

APPLICATION No/Recommendation	DESCRIPTION	ORDER OF BUSINESS	DETAILS
Agenda Item 7 **Application 16/0845** **Officer's recommend:** Grant Permission **Pages 73 to 104**	Erection of five-storey building comprising two no. bar/restaurants at ground floor level (Class A3 and A4 uses) and 15 no. self-contained flats on the upper floors, with associated vehicular accesses from Bolton Street to car parking facilities for 16 vehicles, with refuse storage and cycle parking to the rear. **429-437 PROMENADE, BLACKPOOL, FY1 6BQ**	**INFORMATION FROM OFFICERS**	
		OBJECTORS	
		APPLICANT/AGENT/SUPPORTER	Mr Joseph Boniface (Agent)
		WARD COUNCILLOR	
		• **DEBATE BY COMMITTEE** • **DECISION**	

PLANNING COMMITTEE
14 MARCH 2017 – ORDER OF BUSINESS

APPLICATION No/Recommendation	DESCRIPTION	ORDER OF BUSINESS	DETAILS
Agenda Item 8 **Application 17/0095** **Officer's recommend:** Agree in principle and delegate approval to the Head of Development Management. **Pages 105 to 130**	Erection of residential development comprising 422 dwellings (two and three storey apartments and houses), with associated parking, village green/play area, water features and shop and formation of vehicular access to Progress Way (Reserved matters application) **LAND AT MOSS HOUSE ROAD, MARTON MOSS, BLACKPOOL**	**INFORMATION FROM OFFICERS**	
		OBJECTORS	
		APPLICANT/AGENT/SUPPORTER	
		WARD COUNCILLOR	
		• **DEBATE BY COMMITTEE** • **DECISION**	

This page is intentionally left blank