

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:
15/0523	THE SANDS VENUE, PALATINE BUILDINGS, PROMENADE, BLACKPOOL, FY1 4TQ	<p>A response has been received from Historic England: We have received amended proposals for the above scheme. We do not wish to comment in detail, but offer the following general observations.</p> <p>Historic England Advice We have received amended plans informing us that the nature of the application for the redevelopment of the site has changed to be an outline application, with the matter of the appearance of the new build now reserved. However, the scale of the building is still able to be considered.</p> <p>In our comments dated the 1st February 2016, we set out that the height of the proposal was now considered to be acceptable, but detailed that concerns regarding the form of the building remained. As the matter of appearance is no longer to be considered as part of this application, our comments regarding this element of the proposal are no longer relevant. It would be our preference to consider the scheme as a whole, including the structures appearance, as this would allow the full impact of the proposals on the Tower to be fully established in line with paragraph 57 and 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework. However, as this is no longer possible and we believe the height of the proposals to be appropriate, we raise no objections to the application.</p>

		<p>Blackpool Civic Trust comments have been received:</p> <p>This version doesn't look as tall as the previous one. We seem to remember that the earlier one had the elevation of the new hotel being above the roof of the adjacent Woolworths building and at a level half way up the tower of that building. We previously objected because the new height would obscure the view of the Tower for traffic travelling northwards up the Promenade. We see that this revision includes lots of photos showing how the new plans would impact on the nearby former Woolworths building and also the Tower. From most angles there is now only a little of the base of the Tower obscured by the development. There is still some impact on the Grade 1 Tower shown from viewpoints 6 and 7, which were our previous concerns. But from most viewpoints the Sands Hotel is in line with the roof of its neighbour and has a minimal impact on the Tower.</p> <p>Photos 023 and 024 show the gap between the Palatine building and Coral Island as of today. As you will see there has recently, presumably agreed by the Council, a raised patio area has been installed for a fish and chips outlet on the side of Coral Island thus reducing the width, however at present on the Palatine side it is fairly open to walk through other than the double steps leading up to the above walkway along the first floor level.</p> <p>The application clearly shows that the proposed retail units on the side extension will extend outwards to the same level as the outside edge of those steps i.e. exactly 10 feet from the patio mentioned and that overall the open feeling will be considerably removed by the full retail premises, so personally I feel the area will become very narrow, probably a dark shady area not conducive to a feeling of modernity and openness as portrayed by the front corner angled shot show in the plans. In short a dark alley. I also wonder about the area already within the line of the steps to the wall of the Palatine building as to who exactly owns the land and what restrictions had previously been put on it for the very reasons above, as it seems a large area presumably previously with no trading allowed or building allowed!!!!</p> <p>The next issue is with the drop off point for customers which is to be on the corner facing MacDonalDs where access would be from the Promenade into Adelaide St West and turning right into the tail of Bank Hey St and then into a new layby road by the reception.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>The plans show this as "taxi drop off point" but others will also use it and that the public seeing non buses or taxis using that turning off the Promenade would be further encouraged to do so, even more than at present where the restriction is widely ignored. The current very well used taxi rank will need to be removed and reassigned. More alarming is that in the recent "Access and Heritage statement" traffic is clearly shown as being two-way on Albert Rd which as far as we are aware is definitely not in the plans for the changes connected to Coronation St !!!!! and we wonder if those drawing up the plans have actually visited the site or if they have some inside secret knowledge of a change of highway plans.</p> <p>The design is still rather "boxy" but they are adding additional greenery. We weren't happy with the original architectural design and we are not sure this goes far enough but they do seem to be making an effort to improve the appearance. They go to greater lengths on environmental, anti-crime issues, using local materials etc. It is certainly a better design than last time and will address some of the eyesores around the Sands.</p> <p>An objection has been received from Mr Garnham of 104 Cherry Tree Road:</p> <p>I and (others I know) are concerned about the proposed side extension as this will impact considerably on both the visual open aspect and pedestrian movement which currently exists and where there is wide access alongside the Palatine building wall past the double stairway. The plans show that the extension is to extend out as far as the line of the current double staircase effectively blocking that access. Additionally fairly recently a raised patio has been established on the side of Coral Island for the fish and chip outlet. The end result will be that the passageway will be restricted to just 10 feet between a shop front and the patio and will also cause the area to become a dark alleyway hardly in line with the open friendly aspect the plans try to portray. It should also be noted the raised patio is NOT SHOWN on the artist impression in the plans giving a misleading impression.</p> <p>I would also question as to whether restrictive conditions on that area were put in place when the Palatine Building was rebuilt in the mid-1970s as it seems strange that no retail opportunity was taken or made since and was that possibly due to who actually owns that land.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Additionally for the record I wonder if those compiling the document Access design and Heritage dated 1st March 2016 have actually checked the area. Section 5.4 shows the traffic flow on Albert Rd as being Two-way which it is NOT nor allegedly in any plans.</p> <p>Furthermore where the reception/drop off point is proposed is currently a very well used long taxi rank which will need to be moved and presumably those arriving not by taxi will be tempted to drive off the Promenade into Adelaide St West further encouraging others who already blatantly ignore the access restrictions to pick up shopping friends etc.</p> <p>Case Officer response:</p> <p>The proposed extension to the retail unit on the south side of the building would result in approximately 7m of pedestrianised space between the extended retail unit and the north elevation of Coral Island. There is currently an unauthorised raised decked area on the Council owned land adjacent to a fish and chip shop associated with Coral Island and this matter is being pursued. The retail unit would not result in a more narrow pedestrianised area as it would not project beyond where the existing external staircase is sited. Currently, there is pedestrian access to the north of the staircase, under the walkway, but this is a dark and not particularly pleasant or attractive and its loss is not considered to be detrimental to amenity in the streetscene.</p> <p>The wording of proposed Condition 2 has been changed to read the following:</p> <p>Notwithstanding Condition 1 and the submitted details, whilst this permission approves the scale/ maximum height of the building shown on drawing numbers 5415_L115 Revision P2 and 5415_L114 Revision P2, it specifically does not give permission for the massing/ building outline shown on those plans and consequently the layout of the top floor.</p> <p>Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a good quality design which will minimise the impact of the development and protect the setting of neighbouring listed buildings and the Town Centre Conservation Area and to ensure their significance is sustained and enhanced in accordance with paragraphs 7-10 and 14 and Part 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS7 and CS8 of the Blackpool Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy and Saved Policies LQ1, LQ4, LQ9 and LQ10 of the Blackpool</p>
--	--	--

Blackpool Council

		Local Plan 2001-2016.
15/0420	DEPARTMENT FOR NATIONAL SAVINGS AND INVESTMENTS, MYTHOP ROAD	<p>Amended plans have been received seeking to address the highways issues discussed in a meeting with the applicants and their agents. There are some further minor amendments needed and these can be resolved whilst the Section 106 Agreement is being actioned.</p> <p>Condition 2 cannot be updated at this stage until the amendments to the plans have been made (page 53)</p> <p>Condition 6 for the full element of the application (the housing part) is no longer needed as site investigation has been undertaken and the details provided. A condition would be required to ensure the actions of the site investigation report are implemented (page 57)</p> <p>Condition 11 for the full element of the application should be amended to say no development shall be commenced until a revised plan for the access has been received (incorporating the minor amendments needed) and there should be an additional condition saying none of the approved dwellings should be occupied until the agreed access has been provided. (page 61)</p>
15/0451	585-593 NEW SOUTH PROMENADE AND 1 WIMBOURNE PLACE	<p>Description should read -Erection of part 5 /part 7 storey block of 99 self-contained permanent flats with car parking for 84 vehicles, access and associated works following demolition of existing hotels (page 71)</p> <p>Head of Transportation – With regards to car parking, the description for the proposal mentions 94 car parking spaces. Drawing no A715/1C, the latest drawing I have in my possession only shows 84 car parking spaces, a short fall of 15 if applying a ratio of one car parking spaces per unit. The area suffers from demand for on-street car parking during the summer months. Requests have been received in the past from residents in the area requesting residents parking, The shortfall in the number of spaces provided in comparison to the number of units may place extra pressures in this area and supporting this proposal may make it warrant a scheme in the future. I accept the shortfall is only small however the impact of this could be quite significant for the area. On this basis, I consider it necessary to seek a contribution to deal with parking problems in future years; a realistic timescale to address any problems would be 5 years from first occupation.</p>

File name: \$1ietmwyr.doc

Updated:

<p>15/0820</p>	<p>ANCHORSHOLME PARK ANCHORSHOLME LANE WEST</p>	<p>In terms of pedestrian access, front and from the rear. It is advisable to widen the paths at the front to a width greater than 100mm, this is allow better access for people with a disability or mothers with young children – 1500mm is considered acceptable.</p> <p>Pedestrian access will also be available at the rear though the car park at the rear. The street is unadopted highway; therefore responsibility lies with the frontages. As the use will intensify a lighting scheme to be implemented for the benefit of future occupiers.</p> <p>On Wimbourne Place itself (between the Crescent and in terms of pedestrian access); the footway widths are sub-standard as the public highway is landlocked. There is regular footfall between the Promenade and the residential area behind the development and the lack of a standard footway creates conflict between pedestrians and drivers. The use of Wimbourne Place could intensify with future residents requiring access to the car park. Is there any scope to dedicate land currently within the landscape strip for highway purposes?</p> <p>The demolition of the existing buildings and construction of the new units will require some consideration and management. A Demolition Plan and separate Construction Management Plan to be conditioned.</p> <p>Head of Transportation- Extensive discussions have taken between council officers and United Utilities in connection with this proposal. I can only assume that agreement is in place with regards to the actual works and scope, therefore no further comments.</p> <p>I would however like to request a Construction Management Plan for the works due to the longevity of the scheme and a plan (s) detailing the layout of the vehicle access points on Anchorsholme Lane West and Princes Way in line with discussions which took place on the 27th November 2015 with the Project Teams tasked with delivering the Seawall Project and the above proposal. The plans to show the detail for the works associated at the pedestrian access point on Fleetwood.</p>
----------------	---	--

<p>16/0047</p>	<p>SITE OF FORMER PROGRESS HOUSE, CLIFTON ROAD</p>	<p>Head of Transportation –</p> <p>The principle of the development is accepted. The main issues relevant to Traffic and Highways are that of access and car parking provision.</p> <p>With regards to access, this remains unchanged with the access continuing to be from Clifton Road, a shared access with Transco who occupy the neighbouring site. There were very little issues with the shared access for the previous use as the Transco site and the former Council offices co-existed with little or no impact of the public highway, hopefully this can continue. The site is likely to operate 24/7 with peaks and troughs throughout the working day and the trip generation is anticipated to cover a greater period than the traditional am and pm peak periods to extend over various shift patterns. It should be more spread out compared to the previous use and on this basis I have no significant highway safety concerns with this proposal. I would advise though that a dedicated right-turn lane be provided on Clifton Road at the access point, a simple lining scheme contained within existing carriageway limits. I would not impose this on the proposal but would recommend that one is provided.</p> <p>The level of car parking provision is being increased to cater for the operational requirements of the end use, and on paper this appears acceptable for the intended use. Accessibility parking is underprovided, 10% is the norm, the Council normally asks for 6% and even applying a lesser %, the proposal does not provide an acceptable provision for accessible spaces. I am happy to accept a lesser provision on the condition that the no. of spaces is increased should the need arise in the future.</p> <p>A further point I would like to highlight is the fact that the nearby residential estate is unrestricted and parking is available 24/7. I would expect the proposal to have calculated the parking provision to meet the operational requirements for the end use with little or demand for on-street parking. Should problems materialise in the future which could be a nuisance to local residents, Blackpool Council as Highway Authority will be unable to address this or mitigate the issues. I would expect the Constabulary and the Councils Estates Department to seek a solution to any problems that may arise in the future.</p> <p>A Construction Management Plan to be conditioned. A Travel Plan condition to be included.</p>
----------------	--	---