

UPDATE REPORT 14th July 2017
FURTHER UPDATE REPORT 18th JULY 2017

FOR DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE MEETING OF 18th July 2017

Item No. B1 - 2016/0630 – Hurst Platt, Rawtenstall

Comments Received from Michael Pooler Associates

Since publication of the Committee report, a formal consultation response from Michael Pooler Associates has been received which reads as follows:

"I would confirm that the modified slope analysis previously requested by ourselves has now been received and checked and deemed to be satisfactory.

The slope stability referred to is from Sub Surface Consultants (13 June 2017) references 6300A Fig 5(A3).pdf, 6300A ltr rpt 13-06-17.pdf, 6300A Slope Stability Analyses (X1, 4, 5, 6 & 7).pdf, together with slope drainage as modified on James Crosbie drawing B14110-01 P5.

Note the retaining wall detail to the rear of plots 1 to 4 would appear satisfactory although we are awaiting calculations and bearing pressures in respect of this.

We would also confirm agreement with the sheet piling calculations submitted by Volker Ground Engineering, Drawing No C12538-PWO1-101 Rev 0 with regard to the 12 metre long sheet pile wall, Section AZ26-700, calculations sheets 1 – 15.

The application can be duly signed off for approval at the appropriate Planning Committee, issues regarding outstanding calcs for the retaining wall will be received from James Crosbie Associates and processed in due course.

The other issues regarding adoption, surface water discharge (Environmental Agency) and land issues are outside our remit."

Comments Received from United Utilities

Since publication of the Committee report, United Utilities has confirmed that it has no objection to the proposed scheme of surface water drainage.

Requirement for Environmental Permit to Discharge Surface Water to Water Course

The applicant has forwarded correspondence to officers indicating that they have liaised with the Environment Agency and believe that an Environmental Permit would not be required in order for clean uncontaminated surface water to be discharged from the development into the water course which is located to the south of the application site.

Whilst the requirement for such a permit would be a separate matter to the consideration of the planning application (to be dealt with by the Environment Agency), it is considered appropriate that the above information is brought to Members' attention.

No objection to the scheme has been received from the Environment Agency.

Drainage Connection

The proposed scheme of surface water drainage includes the connection of surface water drains from the site to a 300mm wide pipe leading to the south of the site, subsequently discharging into the adjacent water course. The 300mm wide pipe is understood to pass through land owned by a neighbouring resident.

The neighbouring resident in question has raised concerns about the proposed drainage arrangements and the right of the developer to connect the site's surface water drains into the 300mm pipe which runs through the resident's land.

The applicant has stated in response that they understand that they have a legal right to connect to the existing pipe in question.

In any case, matters of connection to the drain in question would be a private matter between the relevant parties.

Rear Walls of Houses on Plots 1-4

Since publication of the Committee Report, the applicant has submitted a method statement detailing the steps they intend to take to ensure that the land immediately to the rear of the houses on plots 1-4 is properly retained. An amended drawing has also been submitted which includes details of the proposed retaining structure.

The submitted method statement reads:

"Our intention is to fill between the rear retaining wall with hard core compacted in 150mm layers as specified. At present the rear wall of the houses comprises of 2 no 450mm thick concrete block walls with a concrete filled 100mm cavity. We will also renew the bitumen tanking to the rear of plots 1-4 where necessary. Prior to any works being started we will consult with a structural engineer to ensure that the current rear walls of the houses are sufficient to retain the filled ground which will make up the new garden space. If this is not the case we will implement any measures deemed necessary by the structural engineer and building control to ensure the long term stability and effectiveness of the rear walls of the houses."

Whilst it will be necessary for the developer to demonstrate the adequacy of the rear walls of the houses on plots 1-4 to retain the land immediately adjacent to them at Building Regulations stage, it is nevertheless considered necessary to include the submitted method statement above in the list of approved plans / documents to ensure that the structural stability of the rear walls of the houses is appropriately addressed by the developer.

Amendments to Proposed Conditions

Amended plans and documents have been received since the publication of the Committee report, and as such it is considered necessary to amend conditions 1 and 2 accordingly so that the most up to date plans are included.

The amended condition 1 would read as follows:

“The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following:

- *Application Form date stamped 12th April 2017 by the Local Planning Authority.*
- *Site Location Plan (Croft Goode Architects Drawing Number 16-2218-EX001 Revision B) date stamped 25th April 2017 by the Local Planning Authority.*
- *Site Layout (James Crosbie Associates Ltd Drawing Number 01 Revision P5) date stamped 7th July 2017 by the Local Planning Authority.*
- *Proposed Floor Plans (Croft Goode Architects Drawing Number 16-2218-PN101) date stamped 12th April 2017 by the Local Planning Authority.*
- *Sections Through Site (James Crosbie Associates Ltd Drawing Number 02 Revision P2) date stamped 12th April 2017 by the Local Planning Authority.*
- *Detailed Landscape Proposals (Margaret Twigg Landscape Architects Drawing Number 452.01) date stamped 2nd June 2017 by the Local Planning Authority.*
- *Proposed Elevations (Croft Goode Architects Drawing Number 16-2218-003) date stamped 1st June 2017 by the Local Planning Authority.*
- *Proposed Site Sections (Croft Goode Architects Drawing Number 16-2218-PN301) date stamped 12th April 2017 by the Local Planning Authority.*
- *Property Management North West Ltd arrangements for future management and maintenance of the proposed streets within the development (date stamped 12th June 2017 by the Local Planning Authority).*
- *Permanent Sheet Pile Wall (Volker Ground Engineering Drawing Number C12538-PW01-101 Revision 0) date stamped 7th July 2017 by the Local Planning Authority.*
- *Method Statement Relating to Rear Walls of Houses on Plots 1-4 (date stamped 6th July 2017 by the Local Planning Authority).*

Reason: *For the avoidance of doubt.”*

The amended condition 2 would read as follows:

“No development in respect of the construction of the dwelling houses hereby permitted shall take place until the slope stability and drainage works as shown on approved James Crosbie Associates Ltd drawing numbers 01 (Revision P5) (date stamped 7th July 2017 by the Local Planning Authority) and 02 (Revision P2) (date stamped 12th April 2017 by the Local Planning Authority) have been completed in full.

Reason: In the interests of land stability and to ensure adequate drainage of the site.”

Additional Comments from Members of the Public

Since publication of the Committee report, comments have been received from Mr Craig Sharpe raising the following issues:

“I understand that the main site entrance will be via Union Rd and Green St and wanted to know what plans have the Owners made with regards to the cobbled St as it was my understanding that it was due to tarmacked?”

I would also like to know if double yellow lines and no parking signs will be displayed along Green St as the Residents at number 6, 8 & 10 Union St park their vehicles along Green St opposite my properties, i.e. on the side of the plumbers work shop and along the left hand side of Green St when coming from the Union St entrance making it impossible for this to become a Road for around 16 cars.

I would also like your attention drawn to the very tight entrance from Newchurch Rd, to Green St at the side of 66 Newchurch Rd (Green St that runs in-front of the Church). There may be an issue with this entrance and exit which will be used as there is no view of the traffic coming up Newchurch Rd without leaving a large part of your bonnet in the Rd and my concern is that traffic travels up Newchurch Rd with some speed (above 30) as they are at the start of the hill and therefore the chance of an accident due the larger amount of traffic is greater.

There is also a culvert which the Council had to repair around 2 years ago on Green St approaching the exit onto Newchurch Rd as above and wanted to know if a Surveyors report had been issued into this as the Culvert will have extra weight transferred onto it and runs under our building.”

Officer Response

The Local Highway Authority (Lancashire County Council) has been consulted on the proposed scheme and has no objection on highway safety grounds subject to the inclusion of two conditions (proposed conditions 8 and 9 as included in the Committee report).

The Local Highway Authority has not identified a need for a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) at this stage. The Local Highway Authority would be able to consult on the feasibility of a TRO under the relevant process in future should a need for it be identified.

In respect of the culvert, officers have not been made aware of any surveys that have been carried out to investigate its condition – though any requirement for work to the culvert is likely to be a separate civil matter between the relevant parties / owner outside the planning process.

Environment Agency Comments

Since publication of the Committee report, further comments have been received from the Environment Agency requesting that the Council considers the inclusion of a condition restricting the surface water drainage discharge from the site into the watercourse to the south, to a greenfield rate of runoff.

However, the Environment Agency has not suggested what would constitute an appropriate greenfield rate of discharge for the site despite being provided with the submitted drainage plans and calculations. Other consultees (Michael Pooler Associates and United Utilities) have no objection to the proposed drainage scheme for the site.

Officer Response

Officers are not experts in drainage matters, and in the absence of an appropriate discharge rate being provided by the Environment Agency it is not considered that it would be appropriate to include a condition restricting surface water discharge from the site, as such a condition would have no justifiable basis. None of the statutory consultees (including the Environment Agency) have objected to the proposed drainage scheme or suggested any specific restriction on the rate of surface water discharge from the site.

Land Ownership / Drainage Rights

Since publication of the Committee report, questions have been raised as to whether the applicant has a right to connect to the drainage pipe beneath land located immediately to the south of the site (within the garden of the dwelling at 16 Hurst Platt), and whether the applicant has a right of access through the access road to the site.

The applicant has signed Certificate B to confirm that they served notice of the planning application on the owners of the land in question. Issues relating to the right of the applicant to connect to the drainage pipe running beneath land which is outside their ownership, or to access the site over land outside their ownership, would be a private civil matter which would need to be addressed outside the planning process.

In any event officers have raised the above issues with the applicant, who has provided the following response:

“The 300mm drain which we are connecting to is already in situ beneath Mr Stansfield's land and therefore we are not actually going to be accessing Mr Stansfield's property or land. We will simply be connecting to an existing manhole that's within our own site boundary. This is on the drainage plan supplied (and approved by Michael Pooler) as part of the application.”

Mr Stansfield has no legal right to object to any planning application relating to the site. I've attached a copy of the Official Land Registry Title. If you look at Section B part 4 the document clearly states: “11.1 The Transferor covenants not to object to any new or existing planning applications relating to whole, or any part of, the Property as defined in panel 1.”

Linked to the above Land Registry title is the fact that we also have a legal right of way across Mr Stansfield's land which was again part of his original sale agreement to the previous owners (Prestige Homes) and was clearly inserted to enable them to access this drain at any time deemed necessary.”

A copy of the Land Registry Title referred to above (as forwarded by the applicant) is shown below for information.

Official copy of register of title

Title number LA887084

Edition date 26.10.2015

- This official copy shows the entries on the register of title on 27 JUN 2016 at 16:55:41.
- This date must be quoted as the "search from date" in any official search application based on this copy.
- The date at the beginning of an entry is the date on which the entry was made in the register.
- Issued on 27 Jun 2016.
- Under s.67 of the Land Registration Act 2002, this copy is admissible in evidence to the same extent as the original.
- This title is dealt with by Land Registry, Fylde Office.

A: Property Register

This register describes the land and estate comprised in the title.

LANCASHIRE : ROSSENDALE

- 1 (19.04.2001) The Freehold land shown edged with red on the plan of the above Title filed at the Registry and being Land Lying To The East Side Of, Union Street, Rawtenstall, Rossendale.
- 2 (19.04.2001) The land was formerly copyhold of the Manor of Accrington New Hold and the rights saved to the lord by the 12th Schedule of the Law of Property Act 1922 are excepted from the registration.
- 3 (11.08.2003) A new title plan based on the latest revision of the Ordnance Survey Map has been prepared.
- 4 (11.03.2008) The land edged and numbered in green on the title plan has been removed from this title and registered under the title number or numbers shown in green on the said plan.

B: Proprietorship Register

This register specifies the class of title and identifies the owner. It contains any entries that affect the right of disposal.

Title absolute

- 1 (19.03.2015) PROPRIETOR: PRESTIGE DEVELOPMENTS (GLOBAL) LIMITED (Co. Regn. No. 07668236) of Acorn House, Wrigglebrook, Kingsthorpe, Hereford HR2 8AW.
- 2 (19.03.2015) The price stated to have been paid on 23 February 2015 for the land in this title and in titles LAN162991 and LAN163530 was £360,000.
- 3 (19.03.2015) A Transfer dated 23 February 2015 made between (1) Raymond Stansfield and Marie Stansfield (Transferors) and (2) Prestige Developments (Global) Limited (Transferee) contains purchaser's personal covenant(s) details of which are set out in the schedule of personal covenants hereto.
- 4 (19.03.2015) The following are details of the personal covenants contained in the Transfer dated 23 February 2015 referred to in the Proprietorship Register:-

Title number LA887084

B: Proprietorship Register continued

"11.1 The Transferor covenants not to object to any new or existing planning applications relating to whole, or any part of, the Property as defined in panel 1."

NOTE: The Property as defined in panel 1 referred to includes the land in this title.

- 5 (19.03.2015) RESTRICTION: No disposition of the registered estate by the proprietor of the registered estate is to be registered without a written consent signed by the proprietor for the time being of the Charge dated 23 February 2015 in favour of Goldcrest Finance Limited referred to in the Charges Register.

C: Charges Register

This register contains any charges and other matters that affect the land.

- 1 (19.03.2015) REGISTERED CHARGE dated 23 February 2015 affecting also other titles.

NOTE: Charge reference LAN162991.

- 2 (19.03.2015) Proprietor: GOLDCREST FINANCE LIMITED (Co. Regn. No. 03320726) of Fifth Floor, Centurion House, 129 Deansgate, Manchester M3 3WR.

End of register

Item No. B2 - 2017/0260 – Golf Rossendale

Part of the access road to the site is owned by Rossendale Borough Council and the applicant has served notice on the Council as part of the planning application. The Council currently has a lease arrangement in place with Rossendale Golf granting access over the land to serve the golf driving range. In the event that planning permission is granted for this scheme a new lease will need to be entered into to include this development as well as the driving range. This process is separate to the planning process and discussions in regard to the lease will commence in the event that planning permission is granted for this development and the applicants choose to implement the permission.

Additional Comments and Objections Received

Since publication of the Committee report, additional comments and objections to the scheme have been received. The content of the comments and objections is summarised below.

Rossendale Triathlon Club

Wish to object on the grounds that the access road to the proposed development is inadequate to accommodate increased traffic. Double parking is already a major problem on the access road and the Club fears that access to a public garden centre on such an unfit road will increase the risk of an accident to Club members and other people using the Marl Pits complex.

The Triathlon club organises an annual event for the wider community and the Club believes that this may be in jeopardy should this application be approved.

Increased traffic to an already congested access road presents a significant increase in the risk of accident.

Marl Pits Leisure Centre

Bringing more people into the Marl Pits complex could be beneficial to promoting the leisure facilities.

However, there is very little parking at the driving range and doesn't appear to be any additional parking on the plans. This could lead to people using the car park at Marl Pits which can already get full at peak times. The car park is for users of the public facilities on the Marl Pits site and not for commercial ventures.

The road between the pool and pavilion can get quite congested particularly at a weekend when people park near the rugby club and can make the road dangerous particularly if there are a lot of children around using the pavilion, rugby club and 3G pitches. This irresponsible parking would likely worsen with increased use around the golf site if additional parking is not part of the plan.

For a commercial venture, we would anticipate that there would be a need for a Section 106 Agreement with monies ring fenced for development of sport and leisure on the Marl Pits site.

Ken Masser, the Executive Director of Rossendale Leisure Trust, has added to the above comments as follows:

1. Access to the site is very limited at the moment with the narrow entrance and access road that has led to several accidents already. The site is busiest at evenings and weekends which I suspect will be the busiest time for the new business.
2. The Trust are collectively working with site users to enhance the sites facilities and reputation as a centre for sport and physical activity. Diluting this offer by adding businesses that do not compliment the exisiting provision will damage the long term strategic placement and viability of the site.
3. If the business grows and increase in size and offering in future years access to the site, and the safety of participants will become completely unmanageable and damage existing site users viability.

It is purely a matter of access for me. The access road is too narrow, the entrance to small and dangerous. As other site users continue to expand this is becoming increasingly problematic. Adding an additional business to the site would be catastrophic

Rossendale Harriers and Athletic Club

Wish to object on the following grounds:

The existing access road to the golf driving range is not adequate as there are several pinch points all the way from the entrance to Marl Pits to the proposed Nursery. The stretch alongside the sports pavilion for the athletics track is a single track road and the Club feels that an increase in traffic flow will present a potential danger to its members.

Parking is a problem at the site at times and parts of the access road are often used as overflow parking for rugby and soccer when matches and training are scheduled. Any additional activity at the top of the site will put an additional strain on an already inadequate road. It is noted that traffic management isn't mentioned in the application.

Club members, with ages from 8 years old and upwards, use the access road to run on the various rights of way, including a bridleway, linking the site to the surrounding countryside. Any additional traffic flow could present a potential danger to Club members.

The Club feels that a retail outlet is totally inappropriate for Marl Pits, which enjoys a unique countryside setting and a commercial development will compromise this.

Mrs Katy Stephenson

The planning application will affect the leisure amenity at Marl Pits and surrounding area.

Vehicles travelling to the golf driving range already ignore the speed limit and this can only get worse if there is a commercial development. The area around Marl Pits is used by dog walkers and families. The applicants will expect the garden centre to attract a significant customer base (otherwise it would not be financially viable) which will increase traffic along the lane to the site.

Traffic will also increase at the junction with Newchurch Road. There are certain days when the Sports Area is buzzing with activity and a commercial enterprise would clash with this atmosphere. I would also be concerned that this is the first step towards a wider commercial development of the area.

Mr Mark Nelson

As a local business man, father and owner of a local Garden Centre, I have a broad understanding of the overall dynamics of the running of a garden centre. I am therefore writing to you to express my concerns through my own experience and expertise.

In the first instance, the initial groundwork/landscaping work to set up the garden centre will require large diggers, dump trucks, etc. and large wagons to import materials to the site, which in my opinion will create chaos on the narrow access lane; this lane is not designed to be used by such vehicles.

Furthermore, the proposed site and plans state that it will be a nursery that will grow the vast majority of the stock that it retails to the general public, suggesting that because of this, deliveries of stock will be infrequent, however having looked at the plans I can honestly say that there is no way a nursery of that size can grow anywhere near the quantities or range of plants needed to sustain itself.

One polytunnel is simply not enough in our climate to grow much stock. My site has three large polytunnels and a large greenhouse and I still cannot grow even a half of what I need. It is my belief that this proposed centre will be taking deliveries at least 3 times a week, sometimes more including the large double wagons from Holland (pictured below) and articulated wagons to deliver compost and pots which require moffats for unloading. Again the access lane is not big enough to accommodate such traffic.



In short the access road leading up to the proposed garden centre does not provide sufficient space for two vehicles to pass, therefore causing traffic congestion and a risk to many pedestrians, as the road is used by many dog walkers of all ages, including myself and my young family. This I feel is a huge concern and a health and safety hazard to the public.

With all this being said, I have two children who make great use of the facilities at Marl Pitts and fear for their safety amongst others, due to the heavy traffic flow which will occur through deliveries, wagons, heavy goods vehicles and customer cars.

An additional objection has been received from Mrs Sharon Watson, raising the following issues:

"I visit the Leisure Centre regularly with my grandchildren who live in Rawtenstall and the increase in traffic this business will create particularly in the early stages with large heavy wagons delivering materials to the site will pose a danger to members of the general public. This road is not really adapted for heavy goods vehicles and is also used on a daily basis by dog walkers.

I feel I must draw your attention to the fact that the access road is very narrow, and steep with NO passing places, particularly by the leisure centre, which makes it considerably hazardous, for families like mine who use these facilities. There are also numerous days in the calendar (Relay for Life, Raft Walking Football, etc.) when the Leisure Centre is busy with sports activities, which would cause congestion in and around the junction with Newchurch Road, making it hazardous to members of the public should this commercial development go ahead.

May I also point out that this road doesn't appear to have any street lights; therefore it is not ideal for a garden centre to be in this location as this poses a health and safety issue to members of the public particularly with the dark nights fast approaching."

Officer Response

Since receipt of objections raising the issue of potential conflict between vehicles and pedestrians using the access road, officers have highlighted the issues raised to the Local Highway Authority (Lancashire County Council). No further response or objection has been received from the Local Highway Authority in relation to the above.

Further Concerns

Further concerns have been received about the volume of car movements going to/from garden centre, and what size of wagons will be delivering the goods allowed for sale not produced on site.

Officer Response

The size of the development does not generate the need for a transport assessment in terms of vehicle movements. LCC Highways have raised no objection in respect of the additional traffic generated as part of the proposals.

Given that the size of the building is 48m² and the floorspace for products not produced on the site is restricted by condition to approximately 7.2m² it is not envisaged that deliveries will be via large vehicles. However to ensure that this is the case the following additional condition is suggested:

Once the development hereby permitted is operational no delivery vehicle over 3.5 tonnes, in gross vehicle weight, shall be used for deliveries to/from the site.

Reason: the access to the site is quite restricted and in the interests of highway safety it is considered appropriate to restrict the size of vehicles which deliver to the site.

Updates to Planning Conditions

Since publication of the Committee Report, the applicant has agreed to provide a roped-off walkway along a section of the access track, to provide some separation between vehicles and pedestrians using the track.

An additional plan has been received which indicates the position of the proposed roped walkway, and an amendment has been made to the proposed site plan to show an indicative portion of the proposed walkway. The additional plan and the relevant part of the amended site plan are included at the bottom of this update report.

As such, it is proposed to update condition 2 to reflect the amended plans. The condition would now read as follows:

"The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans and documents unless otherwise required by the conditions below:

- Application form date stamped 16th June 2017 by the Local Planning Authority.
- Site Location Plan date stamped 16th June 2017 by the Local Planning Authority.
- Proposed Site Plan, Section and Retaining Wall Elevation (Drawing Number RK-01-05-17-B) date stamped 12th July 2017 by the Local Planning Authority.
- Proposed Elevations and Site Plan (Drawing Number XXX) date stamped 16th June 2017 by the Local Planning Authority.
- Landscaping and Boundary Treatment Proposals document date stamped 16th June 2017 by the Local Planning Authority.
- Indicative Plan of Roped Pedestrian Walkway date stamped 10th July 2017 by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the development complies with the approved plans and submitted details."

Additional Conditions

Despite the submission of an indicative plan showing the proposed location of the roped pedestrian walkway, it is considered that full details of the precise location, layout, alignment and width of the pathway are required prior to any development taking place on site in order to ensure that the proposed development does not cause undue harm to the safety of pedestrians and other users of the access track.

The following additional condition is proposed:

“No development shall take place until full details of the proposed roped walkway (including a plan at a scale appropriate to demonstrate the precise location, layout, alignment and width of the proposed pathway and of the existing access track) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details and the roped walkway shall be retained and maintained in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of pedestrian safety.”

Further comments

Members of the Development Control Committee visited the site on Thursday 13th July with Planning Officers and it was noted that inclusion of the roped walkway along the existing access would reduce an already relatively restricted access and it is not clear from the plans submitted how the passing places will be dealt with. It was noted on site that there is already an informal route that has been created along the east side of the access road which appears sufficient to accommodate a pedestrian walkway without reducing the width of the access road. This land is outside the red edged application site but owned by Rossendale Borough Council. Property Services have confirmed that given that the current lease allows for access to the site relate to it operating as a golf driving range a completely new lease will be required and this can include a pedestrian walkway.

To secure this the following Grampian style condition is proposed:

“No development shall take place until a pedestrian roped walkway along the eastern side of the existing access road, from the five a side football pitches to the northern pitches adjacent to the application site, has been completed in accordance with a plan which has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall be provided at a scale appropriate to demonstrate:

- the precise location, layout, alignment and width of the proposed pathway and of the existing access track and passing places; and*
- Full details of the fence to delineate of the walkway.*

The roped walkway shall be retained and maintained in perpetuity thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that a safe pedestrian access route is provided for users of Marl Pits and the site and to avoid vehicles parking along the access road”

Condition 2 has been amended further to remove the indicative roped pedestrian walkway plan proposed on the access road:

“The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans and documents unless otherwise required by the conditions below:

- Application form date stamped 16th June 2017 by the Local Planning Authority.*
- Site Location Plan date stamped 16th June 2017 by the Local Planning Authority.*
- Proposed Site Plan, Section and Retaining Wall Elevation (Drawing Number RK-01-05-17-B) date stamped 12th July 2017 by the Local Planning Authority.*

- *Proposed Elevations and Site Plan (Drawing Number XXX) date stamped 16th June 2017 by the Local Planning Authority.*
- *Landscaping and Boundary Treatment Proposals document date stamped 16th June 2017 by the Local Planning Authority.*

Reason: To ensure the development complies with the approved plans and submitted details.”

It is also considered appropriate to include a condition requiring the submission and approval of a construction traffic management plan prior to any development taking place, to ensure that construction traffic is properly managed and again to ensure that the proposed development does not cause undue harm to the safety of pedestrians and other users of the access track.

The following additional condition is proposed:

“No development shall take place until a construction method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. It shall provide for:

- i) The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors*
- ii) The loading and unloading of plant and materials*
- iii) The storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development*
- iv) The erection and maintenance of security hoarding*
- v) Wheel washing facilities*
- vi) Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction*
- vii) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works*
- viii) Routing and timing of delivery and construction vehicles to and from site*

Reason: In the interests of pedestrian and highway safety”

Amended / New Plans

The relevant part of the amended site plan and the new indicative plan showing the location of the proposed roped walkway are included below.

rope suspended from 800mm high steel poles providing 800mm wide section of access track that is reserved for pedestrian use only



