

COMMITTEE DATE: 01/12/2015

Application Reference: 15/0425

WARD: Layton
DATE REGISTERED: 17/07/15
LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATION: No Specific Allocation

APPLICATION TYPE: Full Planning Permission
APPLICANT: Dr R Clark

PROPOSAL: Erection of two storey rear extension to existing medical centre with amended layout to car park and erection of two metre high palladin fencing to part of site boundaries.

LOCATION: LAYTON MEDICAL CENTRE, 200 KINGSCOTE DRIVE, BLACKPOOL, FY3 7EN

Summary of Recommendation: Grant Permission

CASE OFFICER

Mr Mark Shaw

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

It is considered that, on balance, given the health benefits and need for the extension to the Practice including the increase in patient numbers by approximately 2000 due to a retirement of a local GP, that the application can be supported. This is notwithstanding the significant reservations expressed by the Head of Transportation regarding the reduction in off street car parking facilities from 16 to 12 spaces to accommodate the extension and the resulting additional potential for on street parking on both Onslow Road and Kingscote Drive.

INTRODUCTION

The proposal would involve a third extension to the medical centre since it was built in the 1990's. The previous two extensions were built following planning permissions granted in 2006 and 2009 reference 06/0272 and 09/0514 respectively, adding the pharmacy, three managers rooms and a consulting room in 2006, and in 2009 adding six consulting rooms. As a result of these extensions the car park was re-configured and reduced in number from 19 spaces to 16 spaces.

SITE DESCRIPTION

Layton Medical Centre is a single storey purpose built facility with its own car park providing 16 spaces and is located close to St Walburgas Road within a residential area. The building is brick built with a hipped roof and is accessed on foot from Kingscote Drive and the car park is accessed from Onslow Road to the rear. There are houses close by to the front and rear on both Onslow Road and Kingscote Drive although the centre itself is bounded to the north and south by public open space designated within the Blackpool Local Plan under Policy BH5. There is on street car parking both on Onslow Road and Kingscote Drive.

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

The application involves the erection of a two storey rear extension creating an additional 344 sqm of floorspace which would give a total floorspace of 811 sqm. The extension would be attached to the rear of the Medical Centre facing the car park which would be reduced in size from 16 to 12 spaces. The proposed extension is shown to provide three additional GP's offices, three mental health consulting rooms and a staff room, administration area, manager's office and wc's. The car parking area will also be enclosed by a two metre high palladin fence.

An amended plan has been submitted making some relatively minor design alterations and also providing further details of the window recesses on the main elevation of the extension overlooking the car park. The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement, a Patients Transport Survey and supporting letters/ statements from the applicants' highways and planning consultants, and from the Medical Centre Group Practice Manager, The NHS Foundation Trust and Paul Maynard MP. The supporting letters are appended to this report.

MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main planning issues are considered to be:

- Principle
- Need for the Extension
- Design
- Residential Amenity
- Highway Safety/ Car Parking
- Other Issues

These issues will be discussed in the assessment section of this report.

CONSULTATIONS

Head of Transportation: I wish to object to this proposal and recommend refusal on the basis that the existing use and additional use does not and will not cater for the trips that are being generated by the Practice.

Each consultation/treatment room should provide a maximum of four car parking spaces. For the existing use, there are 10 consultation/treatment rooms (five GP, three nurse, one practice pharmacy, one actual treatment room) which equates to 40 car parking spaces. The proposed changes seeks to create an additional three consultation rooms and some of the existing rooms have been re-allocated for different uses, so a further 12 car parking spaces should be provided. The scheme actually proposes a reduction by four spaces (16 to 12) and this is unacceptable.

Clearly the parking is underprovided and does not meet the current needs of staff, patients and health professionals, resulting in overspill parking onto Kingscote Drive and the surrounding streets. There are instances where patients are being brought to the site by taxis or other modes resulting in vehicles stopping for short distances on the restricted section of Kingscote Drive creating conflict between other road users. Vehicles stopping for short periods on Kingscote Drive reduce the width of the available carriageway leading to conflict and on occasions sudden stopping manoeuvres, to the detriment of highway safety. The pharmacy which is attached to the practice has its own parking and access requirements which is adding to the issues in the area. The application site is in close

proximity to two schools and the area is busy with parents and children at the start and end of the school day. Kingscote Drive is also used as a rat-run between St. Walburgas Road and Grange Road.

Traffic and Highways will only support this proposal if car parking provision is increased, not necessarily to meet maximum standards but a reasonable increase from existing levels.

Up-dated comments following the submission of the traffic survey:-

I have reviewed the history of the site and have the following further comments:

05/0910

- five Consultation rooms, one treatment room and 1 Health Visitor and Pharmacy.
- 28 spaces required for seven rooms (Maximum Parking standards) plus 1:16 (low accessibility) or 1:22 (high accessibility) for Pharmacy - dependant on size of pharmacy.
- 17 car parking spaces available/proposed in 2005.

06/0272

- five Consultation rooms, one treatment room and one Health Visitor and Pharmacy.
- 28 spaces required for 7 rooms (Maximum Parking standards) plus 1:16 (low accessibility) or 1:22 (high accessibility) for Pharmacy - dependant on size of pharmacy.
- 19 car parking spaces available/proposed in 2005.

09/0514

- 12 Consultations rooms, one treatment room and Pharmacy.
- 52 spaces required for 12 rooms (Maximum Parking standards) plus 1:16 (low accessibility) or 1:22 (high accessibility) for Pharmacy - dependant on size of pharmacy.
- 16 car parking spaces provided – a reduction by three from 2006.

15/0425

- 14 Treatment/Consultation rooms and Pharmacy
- 56 Car Parking spaces required in line with Maximum Parking Standards plus 1:16 (low accessibility) or 1:22 (high accessibility) for Pharmacy - dependant on size of pharmacy.
- 12 car parking spaces provided (a reduction by four).

Clearly, the Practice has grown over the years, with subsequent expansions with lack of car parking provision. Whilst I accept the results of the survey commissioned by the Practice between the 16th and 22nd October 2015 and the fact that some space is available within the car park, I fail to understand why the use of unrestricted parking areas in the immediate vicinity for parking is considered acceptable. The existing car park may be adequate for the current use but parking does take place on-road and will continue. This is likely to increase with the further expansion of the Practice. Added to this is the fact that the Practice will be increasing in patient numbers due to the impending retirement of a GP from the nearby Grange Park Estate. The figure quoted was in the region of about an additional 1900/2000 patients. Whilst the housing estate is within walking distance, there will be a percentage of patients who will rely on the use of the car, further increasing on-street parking demand in and around the Practice, possibly leading to additional highway safety issues and conflict between road users.

Parking figures quoted are maximum standards, a reduction could be applied dependent on the submission of an accessibility questionnaire. Even if this was done, supply may not meet demand, especially with the Practice increasing physically in size and in numbers. I am not comfortable in supporting this proposal for the reasons given, and if permission was granted with subsequent

parking and access issues, there will be nothing the Highway Authority can or will do to improve the situation as it is the responsibility of the Practice to ensure the site is adequately catered for in terms of parking.

On this basis, I recommend refusal.

Further comments in response to the supporting letters and statements:-

The supporting letter fails to mention the likely increase in patient numbers by a further 2000 due to the impending retirement of a Grange Park GP. New patients may travel by sustainable modes but some will rely on the use of a car and a reduction in car parking spaces will lead to an increase in on-street demand transferring a problem from Onslow Road onto Kingscote Drive.

The car park is tucked away and even if users are aware of the car park it is convenient for them to park on street which is why the car park is never full. The same cars appear to park on Onslow Road each day which are likely to be staff and visiting health professionals. Kingscote Drive is 6.75m wide and allowing for a car two metres wide parked opposite the site would leave an available carriageway width of 5.75m. This would be considered acceptable however there are times when the available width is restricted further which creates conflict between different users. An increase in this instance could be detrimental to highway safety. Accident data currently does not imply this but it could change. Concerns remain and I am not comfortable in supporting this proposal.

Lancashire County Council (Archaeology): the extension falls on the site of a series of buildings from the mid to late 19th century, including a farmstead, which formed part of the hamlet of Little Layton. These buildings appear to have been demolished between 1948 and the late 1960's but it seems improbable that all the foundations have been cleared and that some buried remains will still be present on site. These remains need to be assessed and recorded and an appropriate condition is recommended.

PUBLICITY AND REPRESENTATIONS

Two site notices displayed : 24 July 2015

Neighbours notified: 17 July 2015 and 20 October 2015

Two letters of objection have been received from 84 and 96 Onslow Road on the following grounds:

- there are not sufficient parking spaces, the congestion and scarcity of parking space is bad now and will only increase if the surgery gets bigger. There are cars and vans parking on the pavement now.
- there are constantly cars parking on street outside nearby residential property making it difficult to get in and out the driveway.
- the noise and disturbance will increase in a supposedly residential area.
- there will be a loss of privacy, a loss of light and overlooking from the two storey building.

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute towards sustainable development. There are three strands to sustainable development namely economic, social and environmental. Proposed development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved and proposed development that conflicts should be refused unless

other material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions.

The document confirms the presumption in favour of sustainable development and set out 12 core planning principles which include building a strong competitive economy; promoting sustainable transport; delivering a wide choice of high quality homes; requiring good design; promoting healthy communities and meeting the challenge of climate change.

In terms of its economic role planning can contribute towards building a strong, responsive and competitive economy by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation, and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure. In terms of its social role planning will support strong, vibrant and healthy communities by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being.

Section 7- Requiring good design

Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. High quality and inclusive design for all development is needed with poor design being refused.

Section 8- Promoting healthy communities

The planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy inclusive communities and involve sections of the community in planning decisions. Decisions should support community facilities such as shops, and services.

SAVED POLICIES: BLACKPOOL LOCAL PLAN 2001-2016

The Blackpool Local Plan was adopted in June 2006 and the majority of its policies saved by direction in June 2009. The following policies are most relevant to this application:

The relevant policies are as follows -

LQ1 Lifting the Quality of Design

LQ2 Site Context

LQ3 Layout of Streets and Spaces

LQ4 Building Design

LQ8 Energy and Resource Conservation

BH3 Residential and Visitor Amenity

BH4 Public Health and Safety

BH19- Neighbourhood Community Facilities

AS1 General Development Requirements

AS2 New Development with Significant Transport Implications

EMERGING PLANNING POLICY

The Core Strategy Proposed Submission was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in December 2014 and an Inspector conducted an examination of the Core Strategy in May 2015. Consultation has taken place on modifications to the Core Strategy arising from the examination and the results of this consultation have been forwarded to the Inspector for him to consider. The Council has now received a copy of the Inspector's draft report for fact checking only to 'identify any factual errors and seek clarification on any conclusions that are unclear'. The Council have to respond to the

Planning Inspectorate with any issues in 10 days by 26 November 2015. Following which the Inspector will issue the Final report and it is at this stage that we make the final report available to the public.

Paragraph 216 of the NPPF allows relevant policies to be given weight in decision-taking according to the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given); the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF. Overall, a limited number of representations were received to the Proposed Submission document. Of those representations made expressing concern with the proposed policies, it is not considered that the issues raised justify the need for modifications to be made to the policies prior to submission (other than minor modifications to improve clarity for example). Therefore, the Council considers that, due to the advanced stage of the Core Strategy all relevant policies to this development should be given considerable weight in decision making.

Emerging policies in the Core Strategy Submission version that are most relevant to this application are:

- CS7 Quality of Design
- CS12 Sustainable Neighbourhoods
- CS15 Health and Education

None of these policies conflict with or outweigh the provisions of the adopted Local Plan policies listed above.

ASSESSMENT

Principle- The medical centre has been extended twice within the last 10 years approximately doubling the size of the practice, the proposed extension would add a further 344 sqm of floorspace. There are no objections in principle to further additions to the Practice further improving the level of service and as a result improving the health and well-being of its patients subject to other development management considerations being satisfied or those considerations being outweighed by the need for the development. These considerations include the satisfactory provision of off street car parking, the design of the extension and also ensuring that the extension will not cause significant residential amenity issues for its neighbours due to its size or location.

Need for the Extension- It is stated by the Practice Manager that the future of the General Practice is in the development of 'multi-speciality community providers' (MSCP) where one location can deliver the full range of physical, mental and social services to the local population. The proposed extension is critical to achieving this end as at present there is not sufficient space to provide an expanded range of services to current and expected future patients. Therefore the immediate benefit is the availability of an enhanced range of healthcare services. Without the extension MSCP status is doubtful bringing the long term viability of the medical centre into question. It is important that planning permission is received on 1st December 2015 as any delay is likely to result in the withdrawal of £500,000 plus funding. In addition to the expansion of the health services provided by the Practice, a local Grange Park GP is understood to be retiring and approximately 2000 additional patients are also being taken on by the Practice.

The health inequalities within Blackpool are well documented and the extension will also help to tackle this ongoing issue and improve the all-round health of new and existing patients. Therefore

the need for this extension and resulting benefits are accepted and weigh heavily in favour of the application.

Design- the proposal involves a two storey addition to a single storey building. The design of the extension appears fairly contemporary and is similar to other modern medical buildings and is fairly functional in design though it does include some detailing and a mixture of materials, namely glazing, render and brickwork with a shallow pitched roof. The architects have attempted to marry the existing solid brick single storey building to the proposed two storey extension by adding some of the detailing of the extension onto the existing building. The proposal, with some additional amendments, is considered acceptable from a design perspective.

Residential Amenity- the extension is located to the rear of the Practice facing onto the car park and Onslow Road and therefore does not impact materially on Kingscote Drive. The nearest house on Onslow Road, no. 96 is located some 25 metres from the existing building and the proposal would take the Practice within 16 metres of 96 Onslow Road. This distance and the relationship between the two buildings is considered acceptable given that the two buildings would be partially offset from one another and also given that it is the side elevation of 96 Onslow Road which faces towards the application site containing mainly non habitable windows e.g. landing window.

There is however a residential amenity issue concerning the on-street parking generated by the Practice both on Onslow Road and Kingscote Drive at present which would be expected to increase as a result of the proposed extension and with the corresponding growth of the Practice taking on additional patients. Because the car park is to the rear of the building on Onslow Road and the Practice entrance is from Kingscote Drive to the front it may be more convenient for some patients to park on street rather than the use the car park and there is also capacity to park on street particularly on Onslow Road. Given the stated need for the extension it is not considered that the residential amenity impact is the overriding factor in this instance.

Highway Safety/ Car Parking- the reduction in the number of on site car parking spaces from 16 to 12 and the increase in the size of the Practice by some 340 sqm with the corresponding additional traffic generation to be expected from this increase is considered to be the main concern with the application. Assessing the proposal against the adopted maximum car parking standards the application falls way short by over 40 spaces. Given that this is the third addition to the Practice in less than 10 years and the building has more than doubled in size whilst having seven less parking spaces (from 19 to 12 spaces) these factors would usually be expected to warrant a refusal of planning permission, particularly given the Head of Transportation's ongoing concerns with the proposal and the expected additional on street parking. However the Practice serves a primarily local population many of whom do not use a car to visit the Practice, a recent traffic survey indicated that 45% of patients arrived by car and 34% walked. It is also worth noting that there are a number of on street spaces available on Onslow Road directly opposite the Practice and its car park where parking on street would not cause any residential amenity concerns, not being outside houses, nor posing any apparent highway safety concerns given the relatively quiet nature of Onslow Road. As stated elsewhere in this report the need for the extension and the benefits to be had is considered to be the overriding consideration.

Other Issues- the archaeological comments from Lancashire County Council refer to the application site being the location of some old farm buildings which were demolished 50 plus years ago and the potential presence of some remnants of the farm buildings. A condition is recommended to assess and record any findings as part of any approval of the planning application.

CONCLUSION

The recommendation on the application is considered a balanced one weighing the highway and car parking concerns expressed by the Head of Transportation and by two local residents, who have objected to the application, against the stated needs and benefits of the extension in improving the health service to the patients and enabling the Practice to accommodate a large influx of new patients. Given the well documented health inequalities within Blackpool compared to the north west and national averages on many indicators of health and well-being, the benefits to be gained locally from the extension and the stated need and support for the application it is considered that the granting of planning permission can be supported. It is also considered that the application complies with the relevant sections of the NPPF particularly in relation to Section 8 'Promoting Health Communities'

LEGAL AGREEMENT AND/OR DEVELOPER FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION

Not applicable

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

Under Article eight and Article one of the first protocol to the Convention on Human Rights, a person is entitled to the right to respect for private and family life, and the peaceful enjoyment of his/her property. However, these rights are qualified in that they must be set against the general interest and the protection of the rights and freedoms of others. It is not considered that the application raises any human rights issues.

CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998

The contents of this report have been considered in the context of the Council's general duty, in all its functions, to have regard to community safety issues as required by section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Planning Application File(s): 15/0425, 09/0514, 06/0272 and 05/0910 which include the representations referred to in the report and all other information relevant to the application. The files can be accessed via the link below:

<http://idoxpa.blackpool.gov.uk/online-applications/search.do?action=weeklyList>

Recommended Decision: Grant Permission

Conditions and Reasons

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. Details of materials to be used on the external elevations shall be submitted to and

agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the development being commenced.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the locality, in accordance with Policy LQ14 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.

3. Prior to the development hereby approved being first brought into use the car parking provision shown on the approved plans shall be provided and shall thereafter be retained.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the locality and highway safety, in accordance with Policies LQ1 and AS1 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.

4. No works shall take place on the site until the applicant, or their agent or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work. This must be carried out in accordance with a written scheme of investigation, which shall first have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: The site is within an area where there may be important features of archaeological interests and so appropriate investigation and safeguarding is necessary in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

(To ensure and safeguard the recording and inspection of matters of archaeological/historical importance associated with the site. This recommendation is in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 141. Local planning authorities should make information about the significance of the historic environment gathered as part of plan-making or development management publicly accessible. They should also require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible.)

5. Development on the approved extension shall not be commenced occupied until a travel plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such travel plan shall include the appointment of a travel co-ordinator and a format that consists of surveying, travel audits, a working group, action plans with timescales and target setting for the implementation of each element.

No part of the extension shall be occupied prior to the implementation of the Approved Travel Plan (or implementation of those parts identified in the Approved Travel Plan as capable of being implemented prior to occupation). Those parts of the Approved Travel Plan that are identified therein as being capable of implementation after occupation shall be implemented in accordance with the timetable therein and shall continue to be implemented as long as any part of the development is occupied.

Reason: In order to ensure appropriate provision exists for safe and convenient access by public transport, cycle, and on foot as well as by car, in accordance with Policy AS1 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001 – 2016.

Advice Notes to Developer

Not applicable