

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:
16/0750	LAND BOUNDED BY FISHERS LANE, COMMON EDGE ROAD AND ECCLESGATE ROAD, BLACKPOOL	<p>Objection from 8 Fishers Lane regarding building on green belt land, flooding, potential structural damage and increased traffic/access onto this busy road.</p> <p>Objection received from 12 Greenheys Crescent, Bury:</p> <p>I have stayed at the cottage on Fishers Lane several times over the last few years. It was a delight to stay in a grade 2 listed cottage! It's the oldest thatched cottage in Blackpool and therefore is of huge historical importance. One of the beauties is the outlook of the cottage to the front and knowing that it is part of its heritage. If the land was used to build houses on, this heritage would be lost as outlined in the rejection in February 2016. I visited last December around Christmas time and the road was almost flooding and precautions needed to be put in place to stop the cottage flooding. The risk of flooding would be increased if the land was not able to drain the water properly due to having building on it. The dyke would be further compromised and would not drain the water away effectively.</p> <p>The exit from Fishers Lane to Common Edge Road is already dangerous due to the blind bend and traffic coming along it very fast. Another junction would compromise everyone's safety. I cannot understand why another application has been made when the secretary of state rejected it earlier this year. As the years go by, the importance of our heritage increases and the cottages are a perfect example of how our ancestors lived.</p> <p>In response, in considering the appeal on this site, the Inspector</p>

		<p>dismissed any concerns over flooding; and there are no highway safety issues raised by the Head of Highways and Traffic Management.</p> <p>Consultee comments received from Head of Highways and Traffic Management: This application is an amendment to the previous refused application 14/0723, but with a reduction from 8 proposed properties to 6. The internal road layout is also amended to suit the change in property number and type. I have no objection to this revised layout, and would like to note the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The site to be formally adopted under a S38 agreement, details relating to limits of adoption, construction and materials to be discussed and agreed in the first instance with Highways & Traffic, Transportation, Blackpool Council. Lighting (existing and new) to be discussed with Eon - PFI Street Lighting Contractor for Blackpool, and drainage with (United Utilities).2. The access road leading from plots 1 to 3 and 4 to 6 will not be adopted by the Highway Authority due to the width of the road. I would advise though that it is constructed to highway adoptable standards. A Management company should be set-up to deal with future maintenance of these 2 roads.3. There is no footpath link between the edge of the public highway and the proposed houses. The footpath wraps around the radius at the access point and terminates soon after entering the site. The development should provide good pedestrian connectivity and in order for this to be done a continuous footpath should be provided.4. The parking provision is considered acceptable as two spaces are available on the driveway of each property, with one in each garage. Garages to be conditioned for this use only.5. The bin drag distance is quite significant for future occupiers of Plots 1 and 6. It would be advisable to discuss future bin collection arrangements with the Head of Waste Services, Blackpool Council.6. The properties will require formal postal addresses.7. A Construction Management Plan should be conditioned, if permission is granted.8. With regards the creation of the new access into the site including the dedicated right-turn lane, this should be done as part of a S278 agreement. Given the small number of vehicle movements associated with the development, the Highway Authority is happy to accept the sub-standard lane widths for the right-turn lane facility. There is no requirement to re-locate the pedestrian refuge and there is stacking space for up to 2 possibly 3 vehicles. The "No
--	--	--

		<p>Waiting At Any Time" restriction to remain but these should follow the new kerb-line into the site - these works should be implemented prior to main construction activities commencing.</p> <p>9. There is a lighting column in the vicinity of the proposed access; this may have to be re-positioned. Lighting columns can be re-positioned in either direction but the maximum distance is 1m. If this particular column has to move more than 1m, it may have a knock-on effect for the lighting levels in the area. The developer should contact blackpoolpfi@sustainable.eon-uk.com in order to undertake a review of the lighting should it be affected.</p> <p>The majority of points are post planning and relate to works within the highway. With regard to point 3 requesting a formal footpath alongside the road within the site; the preference is for no footpath (pedestrians can use the carriageway in this low density development) as aesthetically, a softer, more rural feel is preferable to additional hard surface.</p> <p>Amended plans have been received reinstating the pond to the south west portion of the site in order to increase biodiversity and help keep an open aspect across to the listed cottages. The elevation to the dwelling closest to Ecclesgate Road (on plot 1) has been improved as suggested so that it is now longer a blank façade, and the 1.8 m high fence has been pulled away from the site boundary here to open up Ecclesgate Road slightly and make it less hemmed in. The materials have been swapped to primarily a smooth red brick with grey slate tiles (with a thin leading edge) and red ridge tiles to better reflect the Blackpool palette of materials; and the houses have been simplified to reflect the semi-rural character of the area. The house on plot 6 facing Fishers Lane has been further simplified by removing the fussy pikes on the roof and its context now responds much better to the simple nature of the listed cottages. The recommendation is for approval.</p>
16/0643	170 PRESTON NEW ROAD, BLACKPOOL	<p>Consultee comments received from Head of Highways and Traffic Management: “The principle of development is acceptable however I still have concerns in connection with the size of the development and potential trips by this proposal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The layout is not a conventional layout for a residential estate. 2. The width of the carriageway at 5 metres is sub-standard, it must be 5.500 metres in line with design standards. 3. The footways are sub-standard at 1.2 metres 4. Visibility will be poor for drivers exiting the proposal site, the landscaping and trees from neighbouring properties may impede forward visibility, vehicles parked on street

		<p>will do so as a matter of certainty.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. No proper turning area proposed resulting in large vehicles having to reverse a significant distance in conflict with other road users. 6. No tracking plans provided. 7. What is the Waste Collection Strategy for this development? 8. No lighting shown. 9. The parking layout is odd with only 3 proper car parking spaces shown – How will the parking be managed? 10. Access is proposed by creating a new access point on Carson Road, a residential road linking Newhouse Road with Preston New Road. Residential units typically generate 8 vehicle movements per day resulting in potentially 80 vehicle trips for this site. Rat running occurs along Carson Road and the additional trips generated by this development will only intensify the use of the road and create additional conflict. <p>Due to the poor layout and concerns with highway safety, I wish to object to this proposal. A less intense scheme with a standard layout for the highway may be considered acceptable and could gain the support of Traffic and Highways Team.”</p> <p>In the circumstances, I recommend that the application is deferred for negotiations with the agent regarding a less intensive scheme which is acceptable in both highway and amenity terms; then report it back to the next appropriate committee meeting for your consideration. The applicant would also like to defer the application to the February committee meeting so that the Head of Highways and Traffic Management’s concerns can be properly addressed in the scheme, as there has been insufficient time to address them prior to this meeting.</p>
--	--	---