Planning Committee: 09 May 2017

Planning Application Reports – <u>Additional update Note</u>

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:
17/0105	LAND REAR OF 71 MOSS HOUSE ROAD	Additional representations have been received from – **Ms D Clark 28 Harold Avenue –** I wish to object to the plan - Formation of attenuation basin with associated outfall structures, vehicle access from Moss House Road, temporary vehicle access off Florence Street and landscaping and boundary treatments. I have several concerns. I am worried about the long term disruption, vibration, dirt, the risk of vermin and overall safety of the basin. The site and access is not suitable for the construction as planned. The constant noise is already depressing me. The workers make lots of noise and also chat right outside my house, this disruption makes my dogs bark constantly. I am very worried about the disruption. My home shakes when the builders' vehicles pass right by my doors and window, they are using the alley way at the side of my home throughout the day, my nerves are shot with all the disruption and trying to keep my dogs quiet and calm. I already feel trapped within my home, I am keeping the blinds and windows closed trying to blot out the noise and dirt. I am disabled and spend all my days

		usually at home, I can no longer enjoy sitting in my garden, this construction is already negatively affecting mine and my daughters quality of life. My daughter works at night, she cannot now get any proper sleep as the noise keeps her awake all day. I hope you will take my concerns into full consideration and refuse the current application. **Gordon Marsden –** My constituents in Florence Street have just brought to my attention the proposal regarding United Utilities basin application 17/0105 which members will be considering at Committee this evening. I have read all the documents relating to this and it is clear that my constituents continue to have real worries and concerns about the impact as at present outlined of this proposal on their daily lives. I see from the documents that there have been strong concerns both about access and the need to mitigate the impact of access to this area in the short term coming to the Committee from the Head of Highways and Traffic Management. I understand that Joanne Mattin from No. 3 Florence Street is going to speak to the Committee this evening with her deep concerns about how this will affect her and her neighbours and in particular in the short-term while construction is taking place. I would urge the Committee to listen strongly and sympathetically to what she has to say. In conjunction with this there have been reservations about further things needing to be done by the Head of Traffic and Highways Management. Because of this can I urge the Committee that the strongest possible mitigation is agreed with United Utilities by the council and also with the residents before this work begins (if that is the committee are minded to grant permission at this stage). If the committee is not so minded then I would hope a deferment from today's meeting would perhaps be helpful in strengthening those proposals and assurances.

		Ms Mattin of 3 Florence Street - The following additional comments have been received with the appended photographs: Thank you for your copy of the supplementary update. I was not saying the contractors' personal vehicles were regularly accessing the site via Florence Street, my concern is the large non domestic vehicles. Please see the photographs taken this afternoon by myself, they show large heavy vehicles accessing the site by passing down Florence Street and using the alley for access. The lady who lives at 28 Harold Ave told me she is at her wits end with the noise, disturbance and stream of vehicles. She seemed visibly distressed, which I found a great concern! The visit this morning clearly did not see any vehicles passing this way but I assure you they regularly do. I would like the photographs added to the agenda. Further pictures of plant/building machinery using Florence Street and side alley access, these were taken after 5pm this afternoon 8.5.17. I spoke to the gentlemen who were very pleasant and clearly just doing their job, they confirmed they could feel the ground shaking but had been directed to use this access to the site. I would like these images to be seen by the Planning Committee tomorrow as the information following today's site visit is quite misleading and appears not fully factually accurate. A large JCB has just driven very quickly past my window at 18.34, they seem to be working late this evening. Furthermore to my emails showing heavy vehicles up and down Florence Street during the afternoon passing over the alley way to gain access, I have just confirmed with the Land Registry office this morning that half the alley is in fact owed by 28 Harold Ave as the resident there thought. This means that access has to be given by right of way for residents of Harold Ave, there are similar covenants in place on the alley ways behind Midgeland Road, it is my understanding the access is for **residents only**. My own title deeds state similar for the alley way at the

		end of our terrace, that is why a patch of land behind my property which is now part of the plan was unused as there were no rights of access down the alley at all for non-residents. I therefore would like you to verify what rights of access United Utilities have please as non-residents, I would expect it to be no vehicle access at all. The unmade road/alley is being destroyed, the disabled resident at 28 is beside herself with worry, stress and wants an end to large vehicles passing about 2 metres away from her windows and front door. For your ease in obtaining the title documents and plans I have added the document numbers: • 28 Harold Ave - LAN 161999 • Land to side of 28 Harold Ave - LAN 82353 The matters have been drawn to the attention of United Utilities but given the short timescale no response has been received at the time of preparing this update **Officer Comment** -***Whilst the concerns of residents are noted it needs to be borne in mind that members are considering whether the proposed development is an appropriate land use in this location. Issues to do with damage to property, rights of way and covenants are private matters. Issues to do with construction could be conditioned through a construction management plan but given the location of the site and the only points of access being adjacent to residential properties there is bound to be some short term impact on local residents.***
17/0193	585-593 New South Promenade and 1 Wimbourne Place	**Additional comments have been received from Mr P Hyatt of 23 Clifton Drive -** **Policy CS23**. If and when Blackpool Council decides to officially change the designation for the area, I would have no cause to question your recommendation. If policy CS23 was reworded to remove the primary condition of safeguarding existing holiday accommodation I would, again, have no cause to question your recommendation. As I understand it, neither has changed.

		I have checked the *Blackpool Local Plan Part 1, Core Strategy 2012-2027,* I can find no change to the designation of the area so I assume it remains as given in the '*Holiday Accommodation SPD of 2011'.* And Policy CS23 is re-stated as safeguarding existing holiday accommodation. It adds that proposals for change "would need to comply with the requirements of the SPD." - so it confirms no change. The '*Blackpool Local Plan Part 1, Core Strategy 2012-2027'* was adopted in January 2016. I find it hard to accept the case for change has materialised in the last 18 months and the content of the *Local Plan 2012-2027* is somehow considered to be out of date already. Also, I have been told that the first planning application for redevelopment of the Waldorf site was made in 2008 (can you confirm the date?) so presumably this would have been taken in to consideration when the 2011 SPD was produced? Progress with the Hampton By Hilton hotel shows marked improvement in the situation and your comments on the appearance of the area are somewhat out of date. It is well known that the Council made a financial contribution to the Hilton development and this shows the Council's confidence in the area as a holiday location. Indeed Councillor Simon Blackburn has praised the Council's investment strategy. Council policy is to support designated holiday areas - not undermine them. I am surprised that you have dismissed the '*Building by Design 12'* recommendations for the car park. It was not suggested that these were mandatory. I tried to make it clear that it is government-endorsed organisation and its recommendations are based on the new National Planning Policy Framework. This should be consistent with the Council's policy of improving the standards of design in all aspects of planning and development. Its recommendations are consistent with the advice from Lancashire Constabulary. Could you comment on this? <u>Bin Store</u> A minor point. I am sure the bins will fit in theory in

		the allocated space. It still does not seem like a lot of capacity for waste and recycling for 88 dwellings. I do not know if they would work in practice. What space is allowed for doors to open and for residents to enter the bin area to deposit rubbish. <u>Numbered disabled/mobility spaces.</u> I do not think it has been explained clearly how mobility/disables spaces can work in a car park with numbered bays (1 per flat). How would you know which flats would contain residents in need of these spaces in advance? What happens if an able-bodied resident moves in to a flat previously owned by a disabled person. Alternatively, what happens if a disabled person moves into a flat previously owned by an able-bodied person? I would welcome your comments. **Officer comment** – *an oral update will be given on these points at the meeting*