

**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:
15/0394	138 STONY HILL AVENUE	<p>Representation from Gordon Marsden MP received –                      “As you know I have previously written to you to underline the concerns and objections that constituents have raised with me about the above application, and in particular about the behaviour and activities of the applicant, Moore Homes , 'particularly since the incident on the 9th October when a man was interviewed by the police for cutting trees down late at night on the boundary of the land , which aroused the concerns of neighbours already unhappy at the application submitted.</p> <p>There was confusion about the identity of the man interviewed at the time by the police but I was told in a subsequent email from Mark Morley of Blackpool Police that 'we did attend the address and speak to Mr Moore. He was present and admitted to felling the trees'. Mark Morley said that though it was 'a civil and not a criminal matter' he understood 'the frustrations of the neighbours as Mr Moore appears to have blatantly disregarded a preservation order'.</p> <p>As you know some twenty objections have been submitted to this application from my constituents bordering or nearby the property for which Moore Homes and Mr Moore have submitted this application. In my experience that is a very high number for this relatively small area, but I think it reflects the concern , distrust and anger felt at the behaviour and attitude of the applicant.</p> <p>One constituent has written to me to say how concerned he has been about the safety of the site , which he says has been left unsecured and open to potential accidents with children or others entering it. Others have complained about the eyesore that the applicant's actions in chopping down the trees has left and what they see as a premeditated series of actions to</p>

<p>15/0425</p>	<p>LAYTON MEDICAL CENTRE, KINGSCOTE DRIVE.</p>	<p>disregard the planning application process and act in a completely unneighbourly fashion. I think those views are summed up by the views expressed by my constituents Mr and Mrs Lavelle of 136 Stony Hill Avenue , who have written thus</p> <p>'The developer has made things much worse by the way he has chosen to operate from the very start, this began from the initial application form where a blatant lie was told- the question on the form asked if any trees on the site needed to be removed and the developer ticked 'No' , along with the most recent event involving the Police '.</p> <p>I have to say I entirely understand those concerns and of course they inevitably raise the question as to whether the future bona fides of this applicant can be trusted , either on his original application or this expanded one which he has submitted. If I were a neighbour of Mr Moore s property I think the answer would be 'no' and I think members of the planning committee were they his neighbours might be inclined to agree.</p> <p>I am really concerned that approval might send a message out generally to the public that applicants who take action to destroy trees and behave in an underhand and antisocial way attempting to pre-empt a decision by the Committee are rewarded by a blind eye being turned to that behaviour.</p> <p>I ask the Planning Committee therefore to consider refusal of Planning Application 15/0394 or any variant thereof until they and the objectors have obtained cast iron assurances from Moore Homes that they will respect their neighbours' concerns and boundaries , obtaining agreement from the neighbours concerned , that Moore Homes apologise for their previous actions of October 9th and take immediate action to make secure and safe from intruders or children the existing site to the satisfaction of their neighbours."</p> <p>Appended to the up-date notes are the supporting letters and statements as mentioned on page 54 of the Committee agenda</p> <p>Statement from ward councillors – Councillor Martin Mitchell and Councillor Kathryn Benson received –</p> <p>“As Layton’s councillors we support the proposed extension of Layton Medical Centre.</p> <p>What is proposed in Layton is the implementation of the extensivist model with a greater emphasis on the prevention of ill health and the expansion of community services. It is not merely that more people will be treated, it is that the range of</p>
----------------	--	--

		<p>services and treatments will be expanded. Physical and mental illnesses will be tackled much closer to their inception which should lead to fewer and shorter hospital stays. We believe that a wider range of treatments under one roof will benefit both staff and patients.</p> <p>We were particularly pleased when we learned that this facility was intended to be located in Layton. Apart from the obvious benefits to our constituents we believe the practice is ideally situated so as to enable the maximum amount of people in surrounding areas to use the services.</p> <p>We would like to thank residents and the Highways Officer for their keen interest in the proposals. However, we do not believe the parking problems are insuperable. We believe the benefits of the greatly enhanced medical services outweigh any potential problems.”</p>
15/0457	CO-OPERATIVE SPORTS AND SOCIAL CLUB, PRESTON NEW ROAD.	<p><b>The Head of Transportation’s comments were received on 20<sup>th</sup> November 2015:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The trip generation and the method and assumptions have been reviewed and appear to be accurate and reasonable. It has been compared with a development of approximate 164 dwellings which have 209 peak hour trips. This site projects 62 peak hour trips for 53 dwellings, simplistically divisible by 3, give or take.</li> <li>2. Carriageway and footway widths to be clarified, difficult to determine from the Illustrative Masterplan drawing, (7340_102).</li> <li>3. A pinch point in noted within the development immediately after the access point, this to be designed out.</li> <li>4. Cul-de-sacs do not have suitable turning facilities. Distance from the end of the cul-de-sac to the main road exceed recommended reversing distances for large vehicles(fire tenders) – 20m. Refuse vehicles must be permitted to drive-in and drive out in forward gear - <u>tracking plans to be provided to aid this process. Ones provided with the Transport Assessment are not legible.</u></li> <li>5. A Waste Collection Strategy to be formulated with agreement with Blackpool Council Waste Services.</li> <li>6. The development will be subject to a S38 agreement.</li> <li>7. A plan denoting extents of areas being put forward for adoption by the Highway Authority to be submitted. The drawing(s) must specify palette of materials.</li> <li>8. A lighting scheme to be provided ensuring it meets the PFI specification.</li> </ol>

9. 102 car parking spaces are proposed for 54 dwelling, which would equate to 2 per property. How is this split between different house types?
10. Cycle Parking to be provided.
11. A Residential Travel Plan to be conditioned.
12. A Construction Management Plan condition to be included.
13. A separate condition to be included requiring a hard standing area for wheel washing facilities. 15m is considered acceptable.
14. The development will require naming and numbering. Applicant to contact Highways and Traffic, Blackpool Council, 3rd Floor, Bickerstaffe House, Blackpool, FY1 3AH, 01253 477477.
15. With regards to the existing access and reinstatement for use by this development, we did discuss this at the meeting last year. Guidance states 'that the spacing or frequency of junctions along key routes is often an important determinant of the ease of traffic flow and the ease with which drivers may proceed at a constant speed safely and without interruption. Generally, the closer the junction spacing, the more frequent the hold-ups and accidents occurring'. The absolute minimum spacing should exceed the safe stopping sight distance appropriate for the 85th percentile speed of the major road. I made this point via an email dated the 28<sup>th</sup> May 2015. Appreciate that this may be a comment but it was part of the pre-application response and if there is scope to move the new access point away from the existing junction (Ribchester Avenue), this to be done to ensure that additional delays are not introduced during peak periods along this key corridor. The signal junction does operate near capacity and moving the access slightly may not solve this but may help.

A scheme for off-site highway works to be agreed to cater for and simplify access for the development and Ribchester Avenue. These works to include upgrade of the nearest bus stops.

In response, the majority of the points can be addressed at Reserved Matters stage as they relate to works inside the site. The Head of Transportation has suggested that the vehicular access point into the site is moved. An assessment of accident records in the applicant's Transport Statement did not identify any safety issues in the vicinity of the existing site access and Ribchester Avenue. Moving the access to the west would restrict right turning movements out of the site access and potentially encourage unsafe U-turn movements via Chiswick Grove. Any change in location of the site access would have negligible benefit in terms of traffic flow. This is an existing

access point and unlikely to result in any additional impacts over and above when the premises operated as a club/sports grounds. In view of the marginal viability of the site and the limited monies available for S106 works, it would not be practical to request the upgrade of the bus stops and I do not consider that the scale of the development is such as to justify an upgraded provision.

**Further comments have been received from the Lancashire Football Association:**

“Further to my letter dated 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2015, I think I may need to be a little more specific and confirm our priorities in the Blackpool area. Obviously we are now involved with the Playing Pitch Strategy and as such that process and the finished document should enable us to make better informed decisions but what we already know is currently Blackpool are short of full size 3<sup>rd</sup> generation pitches. Additional 3<sup>rd</sup> generation pitches are a key part of our National and County strategy and we have spoken previously about ensuring the clubs that currently play on Common Edge are sustainable moving forward by looking to attract funding to that site and to develop a new 3<sup>rd</sup> generation pitch which the clubs themselves will manage along with other key partners such as Blackpool Council and the Lancashire FA sitting on the steering committee. I hope this clarifies our priorities and where we would ideally see Section 106 funding being assigned.

**Additional comments have been received from Sport England:**

“The Council has determined that Sport England is a statutory consultee on this application in accordance with Part 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (SI 2015/595) which states:

*‘18. Before granting planning permission for development which, in their opinion, falls within a category set out in the Table in Schedule 4, a local planning authority must consult the authority or person mentioned in relation to that category....’*

On that basis Sport England has assessed the application and lodged an objection.

Is the Site Surplus to Requirement?

The Council does not currently have an up to date and robust Playing Pitch Strategy as required by paragraph 73 of NPPF. Although the site might be surplus to the needs of the current user there is no evidence before me that shows an assessment of need has been undertaken that clearly demonstrates the site is surplus to requirements i.e. is not required to meet an identified current or future demand for pitch sports (not necessarily football). This means the requirements of

		<p>paragraph 74(i) of NPPF cannot be met: <i>'An assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements.'</i></p> <p>As the first criterion of paragraph 74 of NPPF cannot be met then the second criterion of paragraph 74 must be met. <u>Is an Equivalent or Better Quantity and Quality Replacement Proposed?</u></p> <p>I understand that a commuted sum of £100,000 is proposed to make qualitative improvements to the site known as Common Edge Playing Fields.</p> <p>The second criterion of paragraph 74 of NPPF requires: <i>'The loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by <u>equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality</u> in a suitable location.'</i> (underlining and bold my emphasis)</p> <p>As the mitigation package only proposes qualitative improvements and no quantity replacement the proposal cannot meet paragraph 74(ii). As my colleague Paul Daly clearly set out in his objection letter of 17<sup>th</sup> August 2015 a replacement to meet the quantity and quality requirement of paragraph 74(ii) is around £600,000. I attach a recent appeal decision which concluded that a qualitative improvement mitigation package does not meet paragraph 74(ii) or the Council's Local Plan Policy.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b> There is no evidence the site is surplus to requirements and the qualitative improvements package does not meet the equivalent quantity and quality test. For that reason I am unable to withdraw the objection. However, as set out at the beginning of this email the objection may be withdrawn if the provision of a 3G Artificial Grass Pitch at Common Edge with an appropriately calculated commuted sum agreed by the FA and Council can be agreed on. This requirement would have to be drawn up in a S106 agreement."</p> <p>In response, the applicant has offered £100,000 towards provision of these facilities. Any requirement for additional contributions towards the same would result in the scheme not being viable. The Head of Leisure and Catering Services and Lancashire Football Association consider that the amount offered towards the improvement of the Common Edge Road facilities is acceptable.</p>
--	--	---

15/0625	UNIT A, PRESTIGE HOUSE, CORNFORD ROAD.	<p><b>Representations have been received from the Head of Transportation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On street parking is restricted and oversubscribed.</li> <li>• Proposal increases the number of available off street parking spaces to 56 from the existing 44.</li> <li>• The parking standards are 1:23 / 1:26 for this usage. Area is 3522m<sup>2</sup>, therefore the number of spaces required is 153 / 135. This proposal does not meet the standards.</li> <li>• Opening times are after the peak periods so should not contribute to congestion in this locality.</li> <li>• Good transport links to motorway, arterial routes and via public transport.</li> </ul> <p>The main issue is that although additional parking spaces are proposed, it would be inadequate for the proposed leisure use. As such, it would exacerbate the on street parking problem, which is already oversubscribed. An additional reason for refusal is proposed:</p> <p>“The proposed development provides insufficient / unsatisfactory car parking facilities and would therefore result in on-street parking, which is already oversubscribed in the surrounding area to the detriment of pedestrian and highway safety. As such it would be contrary to Policies AS1 and BH3 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.”</p>
---------	--	---