

Planning Committee:

13 June 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:
17/0011	WINDMILL SERVICE STATION, PRESTON NEW ROAD	<p>Head of Highways and Traffic Management</p> <p>- Comments on the amended plans</p> <p>The internal layout is better and improves connectivity between the existing and proposed site.</p> <p>The controlled right-turn into the site is acceptable and the scheme proposed can be supported in principle, obviously the scheme will have to undergo a detailed design, technical approval etc which can be dealt with as part of the S278 process.</p> <p>In response to the table detailing staff travel modes to and from sites of this nature, this does not take into account potential pedestrian movements of customers to the proposal site. Preston New Road is a key corridor in and out of Blackpool, and due to its connectivity with the Motorway network and volume of traffic that uses the road, the junction with Clifton Road is difficult to negotiate by foot. This is about the safety of future staff and customers (whose mode of transport will be by foot) and due to this I consider it necessary to introduce formal pedestrian facilities on the southern arm, at least, which is where the desire is likely to be. If this can be incorporated as part of the proposed controlled right-turn scheme, together with a review of the staging of the junction and junction validation, the scheme can be supported by Traffic and Highways.</p>

		<p>The drawing will need to be amended and agreed prior to the item being considered by the Planning Committee.</p> <p>Something that has been flagged by a colleague is the forced left-turn for the neighbouring site, where the car boot sales takes place. The layout proposed will restrict movements and this element of the scheme will need to be reviewed. Also, what discussions have been had with the owner/occupier of the adjacent land in relation to this scheme?</p> <p>Agent's response</p> <p>Our project team has now reviewed the response and we are pleased that you are able to accept our revised access arrangement into the site.</p> <p>However, the comments set out in regard to the requirement for a formalised pedestrian crossing are not welcomed and we do not agree with the conclusion that has been reached.</p> <p>It is considered that the evidence we have provided adequately demonstrates that there will not be significant staff pedestrian movements to a development of this type. In addition, as the proposal is for a drive-thru coffee shop, which will function as a part of a roadside service area in conjunction with the existing Petrol Filling Station, it is clear that the proposal will not attract significant pedestrian trips, and we have not seen any evidence to suggest otherwise.</p> <p>In this context, it is not considered that the Council's request for a formalised pedestrian crossing adheres to the requirements of paragraph 204 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; • Directly related to the development; and • Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. <p>The formalised pedestrian crossing is not deemed to be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, given that it has been evidenced that staff pedestrian trips to the facility will be minimal and given that the proposal is for a drive-thru coffee shop, which will</p>
--	--	--

		<p>function as part of a roadside service area in conjunction with the existing Petrol Filling Station. In this context, it is not considered that the provision of a formalised pedestrian crossing is directly related to the development, given its role and function, which is designed specifically to attracting car borne trade.</p> <p>Furthermore, our Highways Consultant has advised that the costs associated with providing such as crossing, are likely to be in excess of £50,000. This would result in the development becoming unviable for my client to progress given that these costs are in addition to those that they will already be incurring in re-configuring the right hand turn into the site. In addition, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal would attract significant pedestrian trips. This in turn, clearly demonstrates that the provision of a formalised pedestrian crossing is not fairly and reasonably related in scale to the kind of development proposed.</p> <p>The provision of a formalised pedestrian crossing in conjunction with my client's proposal, therefore fails all three tests set out within paragraph 204 of the NPPF. On this basis, my client is not willing to provide a formalised pedestrian crossing as part of their proposal.</p> <p>In light of my client's position, it is obviously now down to the Council to advise as to whether they still feel able to still support the application and this in turn, leads to the question of whether the crossing is ultimately needed to make the proposal acceptable in planning terms.</p> <p>We would suggest that this is not the case, and that any reason for refusal of the application forwarded on the basis that the proposal requires a formalised pedestrian crossing would not be upheld at appeal.</p> <p>Head of Highways and Traffic Management – recommends refusal of the application in the absence of a pedestrian crossing being provided</p> <p>Planning response- whilst the request for a pedestrian crossing facility at the existing traffic lights is understood, the payment and provision of any off site highway works as part of a planning permission is required to be proportionate and directly related to a need arising from the development itself to accord with the NPPF as set out by the agent above. In the absence of any quantification as to how many pedestrians may be attracted to this development, which is designed as a car borne facility</p>
--	--	---

Blackpool Council

		<p>without a pedestrian link through the site from Preston New Road, requiring the provision of pedestrian crossing facilities from the applicant is not considered to be justified. It is also considered that if the application is refused and goes to appeal the Council will have difficulty in defending its position. Therefore on balance the recommendation to Committee remains one of approval.</p> <p>Separately, a letter has been received in objection to the application by Mr Steven Gratrix on behalf of the Windmill Park Residents Association. This document has been circulated by Mr Gratrix to all Committee members but is also appended to this Update Note to ensure all parties are aware of this representation.</p>
17/0118	LAND TO REAR OF CHAPEL HOUSE, CHAPEL ROAD, BLACKPOOL, FY4 5HU	<p>A letter outlining concerns from John Ashworth of Runnell Farm, Chapel Road was submitted by hand at the Planning Committee meeting on the 09 May 2017.</p> <p>The concerns raised are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic calming measures should be within the scope of the application (and a future application for a basin to the north of the application site) • The traffic must be slowed down as the road is used by children and there are three riding schools within the vicinity. <p>The Head of Highways and Traffic Services has confirmed that the road isn't suitable for traffic calming measures. In addition it is felt that the scheme does not warrant traffic calming given the anticipated vehicle movements when constructed and we could not insist on them for the duration of the construction period.</p>