

Planning Committee

Wednesday 20 May 2020

Late Observations Schedule

Schedule Items

<u>Item</u>	<u>App No</u>	<u>Observations</u>
-------------	---------------	---------------------

1	19/0442	
---	---------	--

		<u>Summary to Officer Update</u>
--	--	----------------------------------

		As outlined in the conclusions of the main report, at the time that the agenda was prepared Officers were awaiting a full suite of revised plans to reflect the revised layout. These have now been received and confirm the movement of external storage racks 2.5m away from the landscaping area to the south of the site adjacent to existing dwellings. Whilst not referred to in the main report this was requested in order to give the proposed landscaping along that boundary space to grow. As such the Recommendation is revised to that set out below, with Condition 2 in the agenda revised to reflect the updated plan reference numbers.
--	--	---

		<u>Revised Recommendation:</u>
--	--	--------------------------------

		That Planning Permission be GRANTED subject to the conditions as listed in the agenda papers with the exception of condition 2 which is revised to the update references as below, and where specific references are made to plans in other conditions listed on the agenda paper which are also updated to the revised drawing reference .
--	--	---

2. This permission relates to the following plans:

- Location Plan - Drawing no. 00719-CCE-V1-XX-404001-C-80 0003 SO REV PO1.1
- Existing Site Plan – Drawing no. 000719-CCE-V1-XX-404001-C-80-0001 S0 02
- Proposed Site Plan - Drawing no. 000719-CCE-V1-XX-404001-C-80-0002 S6 05
- Proposed sections – Drawing no. 000719-CCE-V1-XX-404001-C-80-0004 S4 05
- Existing Flood routing – Drawing no. 000719-CCE-V1-XX-404001-C-5030-0001 S5 03
- Proposed Drainage layout -Drawing no. 000719-CCE-V1-XX-404001-C-5030-0001 S5 03
- Proposed Flood extent – Drawing no. 000719-CCE-V1-XX-404001-C-80-0003 S1 01
- Proposed Landscape plan – Drawing no. MH-060-01 REV A
- Detailed Planting sheet 1 – Drawing no. MH-060-02 REV A
- Detailed Planting sheet 2 – Drawing no. MH-060-03 REV A
- Planting detail – Drawing no. MH-060-04
- Landscaping sections – Drawing no. MH-060-05 REV A
- Site access as proposed – Drawing no. 000719-CCE-V1-XX- 404001-C-80-005- S5 01
- Proposed boundary fencing – Drawing no. 00719-CCE-V1-XX-404001-C-80 0006 SO REV PO1.1

Except as provided for by other conditions to this permission, the development shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved drawings.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of proper planning in accordance with the policies contained within the Fylde Local Plan to 2032 and National Planning Policy Framework

As outlined in the main report, at the time of writing Officers were still waiting the views of the Highway Authority, and Sport England to the revised scheme. The applicants have also submitted additional information in order to avoid and pre-commencement conditions that have been requested by the various consultees.

The consultation responses received are summarized below. However, the recommendation in the main agenda remains unaltered. This is to delegate the decision to the Head of Planning and Housing so that he may grant planning permission when these aspects have been further considered and a schedule of conditions has been drawn up.

Highway Authority's Consultation response

LCC's initial response to the application was to request that the applicants submit a Transport Statement (TS), the content of which is detailed on page 43 of the agenda papers. The views of LCC on this document have now been received and are summarised below:

- The TS does not address issues raised by LCC, including evidence of existing parking demand, evidence of peak traffic figures, evidence of access rights at the end of the access road, a parking accumulation assessment, consideration of future traffic movements, assessment of the proposed future access and layout arrangements.
- This may not have been provided due to survey information not being available and Covid 19, or that the applicants position is that the proposals will not change vehicle movements at the site access with Common Edge Road.
- LCC's view is that the proposals will mean increased traffic movements due to improved facilities. And that it is important to understand what any change will be, so that this information can be used to overcome operational and safety issues, internally and externally.
- In order to not delay the determination of the application LCC have undertaken their own assessment to enable them to reach an informed decision and a rationale for further measures and conditions, which will ensure a safe and suitable access for the proposals.
- LCC view is that the location of the pitches to the south will make the car park to the north less attractive, and thus place greater demand on the southern car park which is accessed off the airport access road. The applicants have not demonstrated that safe and suitable access can be achieved or that adequate parking can be provided.
- The northern car park will remain necessary unless otherwise demonstrated and agreed with clear evidence (through monitoring and a Car Park Management Strategy). LCC require the provision of a direct footpath link from the northern car park to the new pitches, to support a balanced use of car parks and to limit the impact of increased traffic movements on to the substandard access point.
- Any future application will require an evidence-based analysis to support and changes and uplift in movement on the Airport Access Road or parking provision with direct access off this sub-standard highway.
- LCC have undertaken a broad analysis of the proposals in regard to car parking demand, location and availability. They have found the current distance from the northern car park to centre of existing pitches to be 260m and proposed to be 700m. They state that this could lead to on street parking in the area as they would provide shorter walking distances.
- They therefore suggest a marked footpath that could provide a route of less than 450m, which whilst more than existing would be favourable over parking in the surrounding streets. The existing southern car parking will be under greater demand. The airport access road is adopted highway up to the entrance to the southern car park.

- LCC consider that when the demand from all potential existing land users are taken into consideration then there could be an under provision of car parking if it is not managed properly and therefore suggest mitigation in order to ensure that safe and suitable access can be maintained at all times, and that an appropriate level of parking is available to limit any impact on the adjacent highway network.
- They therefore offer no objections but request a number of conditions, which they state they consider acceptable to require details to be agreed prior to first use, so as to not delay the preliminary pitch seeding work. The conditions they request are with regard to the following;
 - An interim scheme of highway improvement that facilitates two way access and egress from the site;
 - The delivery of a footpath to provide direct connection between the northern car park and proposed sports pitches;
 - No more than 8 of the 12 pitches approved be used at once until a Car Parking Management Strategy is developed and agreed with the LPA and LCC;
 - None of the car parking shall be charged for;
 - No use of the site for seasonal motorhome/caravan parking;
 - Submission of a Travel Plan; and
 - Submission of a Construction Method Statement

Officers view on Highways Response

LCC Highways requested additional information that has not been provided by the applicants. Due to their concerns they have therefore requested a number of conditions so that they are not preventing the development from going ahead, but can be reassured that the conditions will control the development so that it does not have an impact on highway safety or capacity. The recommendation to delegate the determination of the application to Officer's gives the opportunity for Officers to discuss these conditions with the applicants, Blackpool Council.

Sport England Consultation response

Sport England (SE) were consulted on the revised plan, as detailed in the main agenda, which moves two pitches so that none of the existing pitches are impacted upon by the proposed development. They make the following comments;

- It is noted that the applicant has removed the two proposed pitches from the existing rugby league pitch and relocated them within the site.
- It is clear that the new playing fields will be used to mitigate and provide justification for the future loss of playing fields as part of the wider EZ proposals.
- Any future application to re-develop the wider site will need to be considered against SE playing field policy. The applicants are taking a risk that they will be able to meet those policy requirements, and that would meet an objection from SE.
- Strongly advise that the applicant considers the whole scheme in order to eliminate any potential future objection.

Officer view on Sport England Response

As the proposed development results in the provision of 12 new pitches and the loss of no existing facilities then there is no statutory objection from SE to the current application. The concerns raised above and in the main report are matters for the applicants to address as part of the wider EZ application. In isolation this scheme proposes 12 new pitches and is therefore acceptable, and in accordance with the Development Plan.

Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) Update

The LLFA had no objections to the development but requested a condition which required details of the surface water drainage system to be submitted for approval, and that prior to the first use of the pitches that the system be installed.

The applicants are proposing an addendum to the submitted drainage strategy and FRA to include additional details requested by the LLFA. The details will include details of how the pitches will self-attenuate and soak away. The LLFA have confirmed that they are happy with the details in principle, with a drainage plan illustrating the location of drainage channels required. Once this is received a condition requiring compliance with the submitted details, and the systems full installation prior to the first use of the pitches can be placed on any permission.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU) Consultation Update

Whilst GMEU had no objections to the proposed development, they requested a condition that required the submission of a Biodiversity Construction Environment Management Plan, prior to the commencement of development. The applicants have since provided this document, and GMEU have confirmed that it is acceptable, and that a condition can be used that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with this plan.

4 20/0226 Applicant Comments

The applicant has provided additional comments to respond to the comments received on the application, in particular those of the Town Council. These are summarised and quoted in italics below:

- Existing/previous business classification and businesses – The report highlights that the building has previously been in a business use. Most recently this was a Class B1 office where 3 registered business were operated out of it including one which operated car boot sales and another which dealt in antiques with some of these stored and sold from the garage on site and so would have involved vehicle trips to the property.
- Positioning of proposed clinic- *the right place for this type of facility is within the community rather than in the town centre; this is a healthcare facility not a retail or hospitality business (indeed, podiatrists are designated as front-line health workers in the current COVID-19 crisis). The proposed facility is within walking distance of the large health centre in Durham Avenue and St Annes Pharmacy in St Annes Road East/St Patricks Road South. (As noted in the report) it is served by a number of bus services and the train station. Our patients tend to be in the older demographic and need to access healthcare facilities which do not necessarily entail going into town.*
- Car Parking and access – The area is not a particular accident spot and as buses turn in and out of St Patricks Road South and St Annes Road East and so traffic tends to be relatively slow. They also advise that two staff do not drive to work, preferring public transport or cycle, one walks. They also refer to the recent closure of the Poplar House surgery which reduces on-street parking pressures.
- Back Glen Eldon Road – There is no door to this road only a window which will be obscurely glazed. The only access point to the building is the front door.
- Construction – the intention is that the extension will have a dark wood (or good quality wood synthetic) cladding which would effectively put the building in the ‘shadow’ of the original building; the existing, large, rhododendron would be relocated to the front of the site and it would therefore offer some cover from the front. The height of the proposed building would be only marginally higher than the existing building and the appearance will be an enhancement on the existing and others on Back Glen Eldon Road. They also refer to the property directly opposite

the site (no 2a St Patrick's Road North) also falls within the Conservation Area and is of no particular style.

- Neighbourhood Design Guide – They advise that this was considered in the formulation of the proposal and refer to the support provided for 'Commercial' buildings to offer "*contemporary designs with mix of traditional materials including steel, brick, wood*".

Officer Response

The comments do not raise any additional planning issues beyond those addressed in the report.