

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:
15/0228	6-8 Carlin Gate	<p>The applicant’s agent has responded regarding suggested conditions 7, 10 and 11 as follows – Condition 7 – accepted</p> <p>Condition 10 - there is a potential issue that fencing may not be necessary all the way round the garden area, or full extent of the boundaries, and consequently we should also agree the location and extent of the fencing pursuant to the condition. I suggest the condition should read (additional words in bold and underlined):</p> <p>Before the flats are first occupied an acoustic wall or fence of a <u>location, extent</u>, height and type to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall be erected on the northern boundary of the garden area/car parking area for the flats and shall thereafter be retained.</p> <p>This amendment to the condition is considered acceptable</p> <p>Condition 11 - I should be clear here that my client has no overriding intentions for these flats to be used in association with the nursing home, but equally I can see no objection in planning and land use terms if some of the flats were occupied by staff who happened to work at the nursing home. There would be nothing to prevent the current dwellings being occupied in that way, and indeed nothing to prevent my client purchasing other properties in the vicinity so that they could be occupied by staff. I stress that this is not the intention, but there is no reason why we should accept a limitation which seems to me to be entirely</p>

15/0229	Rear garden area to 6-8 Carlin Gate	<p>arbitrary, and in terms of the test of planning conditions, unnecessary. If the fear is that the property will become some sort of residential annex to the nursing homes, this would require planning permission, and consequently there is no need for this condition.</p> <p>The applicant's agent has responded on the wording suggested conditions 5 and 6 as follows –</p> <p>Condition 5 - there is no objection to this proposed condition as that is the purpose for which the garden is intended.</p> <p>Condition 6 - there is a potential issue that fencing may not be necessary all the way round the garden area, or full extent of the boundaries, and consequently we should also agree the location and extent of the fencing pursuant to the condition. I suggest the condition should read (additional words in bold and underlined):</p> <p>Before the garden area is first brought into use an acoustic wall or fence of a <u>location, extent</u>, height and type to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall be erected on the northern and eastern boundaries of the garden area and shall thereafter be retained.</p> <p>This amendment to the condition is considered acceptable</p>
15/0394	138 Stony Hill Avenue	<p>Additional representations have been received from –</p> <p>Mr and Mrs Marshall 134 Stony Hill Avenue - All our previous objections/comments on the above planning permission still apply and the amended plan is still unacceptable.</p> <p>Mr Oxley 108 Stony Hill Avenue -Our objections remain as before and would still like the development to remain in keeping with the rest of Stonyhill Avenue without undue impact to neighbours</p> <p>Mr Pickup 101 Stony Hill Avenue -This development will make the dangerous parking situation even worse, as we already have-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Garage Removal Firm Sandwich Shop Two Takeaways Two Hairdressers

		<p>It is unsafe to turn from Squires Gate Lane onto Stony Hill Ave due to the parking at present. It will be impossible after the proposed 9 houses are built. It is still used as a 'rat run' from Lytham Rd to Squires Gate.</p> <p>Ms Riley 123 Stony Hill Avenue -Having looked at the amended plans for the above property I would like to repeat my objections on the grounds that despite the amended plans the site will still be overdeveloped for its size. In particular the drive through to the proposed properties at the rear of the site is totally out of character for the area.</p> <p>Further comments have been received from the Head of Transportation in response to the applicant's agents comments on highway matters – comments in bold/italics (see page 51 of the agenda)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Car Parking. In the approved scheme for six house the loss of 3 car parking spaces is already accepted. Ergo it is alleged that there is a further loss of 2.5 car parking spaces. 0.5 spaces cannot exist by reason of practicality therefore your consultant alleges there is an additional loss of 2 spaces. The previous use had a demand for 53 car parking spaces, the majority of which were on road. Furthermore, the letters of objections from residents acknowledge that when charges were introduced to staff parking this number significantly migrated to the road. Therefore the proposal is a net reduction in demand for on street parking from previous use. Furthermore, all car parking likely to be generated by the dwellings is contained on site with at least two spaces per dwelling, and mostly 3 plus spaces. The potential loss of 1-2 spaces is not significant. <i>The response fails to mention the current on-street parking demand created by the small cluster of shops on Squires Gate Lane and from the businesses that operate from the former filling station. This is an inconvenience and nuisance to existing residents. The loss of existing available on-street parking in and around the proposal site is likely to push the problem further along Stony Hill Avenue.</i> 2. The "large unit" is a 2 bed bungalow. This has dedicated driveway and can accommodate up to 3 cars 3. I refer your consultant to Manual for Streets. This guide requires that the access roads have shared usage as exhibited in Blackpool Council's own adopted highways on Oxford Road and Cambridge
--	--	---

		<p>Road. Indeed this proposal was actually stated as a preference in your committee report. I therefore consider these comments are incorrect. Reference is made to the Homezone scheme, off Church Street, which covers a number of streets, The principles of a Homezone scheme are slightly different to a shared scheme. This proposal is an in-fill development and cannot be classed the same.</p> <p>4. There is no requirement for a fire vehicle to enter site. Clarifying should be sought on this comment. The requirement is indeed that a fire appliance should not reverse more than 20m and this proposal would be compliant. This is a Scottish Standard and not part of English standards/requirements. Again your consultant would appear not to be aware that if the entire perimeter can be accessed with 45m from a public highway there is no requirement for the appliance to enter site (Part B Building regulations). In this manner the highway layout is compliant and your consultant is incorrect. Part B5 (Fire Safety) of the Building Regulations (which is for use in England) clearly specifies the need for a turning facility in the event Fire and Rescue Services require access. No proper turning facility is shown, therefore Turning facilities should be provided in any dead end access roads longer than 20m in length. The access road is approximately 42m long. Should any rescue vehicles have to attend and enter the site in forward gear, they may have to reverse a distance greater than 20m the layout is not in accordance with standards.</p> <p>5. I refer to item 1, notwithstanding that policy is set as a maximum and therefore no spaces would be compliant; there is adequate parking provided. It is unclear to what point your consultant is referring.</p> <p>6. Not an issue for your consultant, however in response it is not intended to seek adoption of the access road. Private estate roads are managed and maintained by the land lord. The site will be lease hold basis and home owners pay an annual maintenance charge/ ground rent. Again this is common practice and not a planning issue</p> <p>7. This comment is wrong. Illuminated bollards are shown. Illuminated bollards do not provide the same illuminance as street lighting columns.</p> <p>8. There is no requirement for refuse vehicles to enter site. All bins will be placed in temporary bin collection point at end of access road, which is compliant with 25m drag distance. There is no</p>
--	--	--

		<p>requirement to consult with council refuse contractor as this will not provide any additional benefit.</p> <p>9. It is unclear what your consultant is referring to on this point. There is not such terminology with Highways and transportation. Perhaps your consultant could clarify this point. The visibility splay from the junction is fully compliant with all current legislation and guidance. <i>The visibility splay may be compliant but parked vehicles in between the driveways and proposed access road will hinder forward visibility.</i></p>
--	--	--