

Blackpool Council

2 November 2018

To: Councillors D Coleman, Humphreys, Hutton, Jackson, O'Hara, Robertson BEM, Stansfield and L Williams

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Update Note

Please find attached an Update Note for Tuesday, 13 November 2018 meeting of the Planning Committee.

Please note that the information in this Update Note replaces the Consultations section of the Planning Officer's Report at Agenda Item 6, Application 18/0384 – Anchorsholme Methodist Church, North Drive, Blackpool, FY5 3PG.

Agenda No	Item
-----------	------

6a	Update Note - Consultations (Pages 1 - 4)
----	---

This page is intentionally left blank

CONSULTATIONS

Environment Agency: We have reviewed the revised Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and it addresses the points raised in our previous response. As such, we withdraw our objection to the application as we are satisfied that the FRA demonstrates that the proposed development will not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding nor exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. The proposed development must proceed in strict accordance with the FRA and the mitigation measures identified as it will form part of any subsequent planning approval. Any proposed changes to the approved FRA and/ or the mitigation measures identified will require the submission of a revised FRA as part of an amended planning application.

Head of Highways and Traffic Management: No objection to the principle of the development proposal although there are various details that need addressing. The Transport Assessment however is considered acceptable.

I note the service vehicle access/egress can work perfectly well. However, the swept paths show access from the north and vehicles leaving that way. The northern footpath crossing, at the proposed width, would appear to preclude an articulated vehicle approaching from the south. Can the applicant either demonstrate that the swept paths work or provide an indication of vehicle route management? I am acutely aware that drivers of large HGVs will approach the site from a direction that works once they know the site.

There is no connection between the refuse room and the rest of the building or the service yard. How is the refuse collected? I also note that there is no trolley park. Are the trolleys to be coin operated and returned to the store as it is a long way from the northern end of the site back to the store entrance. The radius on the north eastern corner of the service area would appear to be an option. The residents' spaces seem somewhat removed from their entrance which would present a security issue when the store is closed and after dark. They may be better re-sited. A lighting scheme is needed to avoid subsequent installation of excessive flood lighting. The disabled spaces are closest to the shop door which is logical and drivers looking for these spaces would have to turn in a tight space if they are not available. The end space is up against the end of the car park. It would be preferable to allow a clearance to make the turn easier.

Having considered the roundabout and its history and the various aspects of the parking layout it would be preferable to use the proposed access (North Drive) as an access only and to have an exit onto Luton Road past the disabled spaces. This would simplify movements and conflicts at the proposed access (especially if the car park is full) and remove the somewhat enclosed blind alley at the back of the store.

Amended plans - At present the proposal still doesn't work with typical service vehicles, regardless of the routes intended. In one case it is proposed to chisel a piece off a footway to accommodate the swept path. None of this is acceptable.

If a Service Management Plan is capable of dealing with this then a condition should be imposed. It would need to include swept paths, vehicle types and dimensions. I would expect the prospective store and delivery operators to be able to illustrate the plan with

examples of sites and the specific vehicles used to service them. They should also provide references to or examples of accepted plans in the region.

We have fairly extensive footway crossings to accommodate large vehicles with little discussion of detailed design/appearance/construction. We could impose a condition requiring highway works to be agreed. However, unless we know how the servicing works we don't know what the crossings' dimensions need to be. If the crossings are sized to a smaller vehicle and a larger one turns up it will result in damage, which needs to be designed out or unloading will take place on the highway.

It has become common practice, at a number of sites with which I am familiar, for outgoing things, like cardboard on trolleys, to be routinely stored outside pending collection. Given the very limited space available this needs to be prevented by condition. We have a trolley store at the northern end of the car park but not at the other end. That will lead to dumped trolleys at the southern end. The cycle store is somewhat remote from the door although cycle users tend not to have full trolleys. I don't understand the small refuse area and have assumed that it is for residents. It would be helpful to understand the size and number of container/ wheelie bins to be stored. The local authority refuse vehicles are 11m rigid vehicles. Swept paths are required in and out for access or an indication of how the containers are to be retrieved if it is not to enter the site.

***Further amendments** - They appear to have dealt with the issues raised. However, we would need to be sure that a workable condition can be applied. They need to amend the plan to show the footpath crossings reduced to accommodate only this size of vehicle and any potential overrun protected by some physical means. This matter can form part of a highways agreement with fine detail to be agreed later within those parameters. I raised a question about the refuse collection from the rear and the type of vehicle and its manoeuvres. I also mentioned trolley parking at the southern end and whether the cycle park is best positioned at the northern end.*

However taking all matters into consideration the amended plans are considered acceptable.

Service Manager Public Protection: A noise survey should be completed for the proposed site, which includes weekends and evening monitoring, as this is a quiet residential area that will be adversely affected by the extra traffic visiting the new site and premises, thereby having an adverse effect on residents' enjoyment of their own homes and gardens.

The noise assessment and the area where the measurements have been taken are on the wrong side of the building, (away from gardens) nearest to the main road. If we are looking at the potential impact on neighbours behind the car park we need measurements to be taken on the other side (east side). I can imagine that measurements taken adjacent gardens may be significantly lower? Can we request additional monitoring to be carried out so this is taken into consideration?

***Agent's response** - "We do not believe additional measurements should be necessary for this site. There are two potential external noise sources at the site, noise from deliveries*

and noise from fixed plant. The delivery noise assessment has considered the residential windows of the proposed development directly above the delivery area (worst-affected windows) and the measurement position should be representative of ambient noise levels at these receptors during delivery periods. The areas referenced below to the rear of the site are much further from the delivery area and would also be mostly screened from any deliveries.

In terms of plant noise assessment, this has been carried out considering the background noise level (LA90) during the quietest periods of the daytime (typically just before 23:00 hours) and the night-time (typically around 03:00 hours). The background noise level during these periods is typically from extremely distant sources (i.e. distant motorways) and would generally be fairly equal across a site such as this. We therefore deemed the measurement position to be representative of background noise levels across the site during these quietest times."

Revised comments -They haven't considered the noise from patrons coming to and from the proposed development, as this is a residential area, I think this needs to be considered, especially as we don't know the opening times as yet (Co-op stores are usually open at 6am)

Agent's response -*"In our experience of over 300 Co-op stores, this would be an unusual assessment for a development of this nature. We would assume that in comparison to noise from deliveries, plant and the surrounding noise climate, noise from customers entering/exiting the store would be insignificant. Any arrivals by car would not be out of character with the local noise climate which is dominated by the surrounding road network, particularly traffic along North Drive."*

Any further officer comments will be reported via the Update Note.

Environmental Protection: (Contaminated Land) 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.

United Utilities (Water): in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the development should be drained on a separate foul and surface water system with appropriate conditions attached.

Electricity North West Ltd: We have considered the above planning application and find it could have an impact on our infrastructure. The development is shown to be adjacent to or affect Electricity North West operational land or electricity distribution assets. Where the development is adjacent to operational land the applicant must ensure that the development does not encroach over either the land or any ancillary rights of access or cable easements.

Waste Services 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.

County Archaeologist: have requested a condition relating to a photographic record being carried out prior to demolition of the building. This condition was imposed on planning permission 17/0042.