

From: Nolan, Chris
Sent: 11 July 2017 11:35
To: Alan Rogan
Subject: D12.2017.0231 - 1 THE PADDOCK HIGHFIELD AVENUE BURNLEY

Hi Alan

With regard to the letter from Mr Matthew Waytt of JWPC Chartered Town Planners in respect of my comments regarding planning application D13.2017.0231 to change a care home to a hostel for hospital key workers.

I have looked carefully at the points the Mr Waytt has raised and would like to address them as follows:

1. Sustainable Location and the shuttle bus

Whereas I agree that the bus will serve to allow a number of staff to access the Royal Blackburn Hospital whilst residing at 1 The Paddock at best this will only aid some staff and at worst this will result in staff cars being parked on Highfield Avenue all day whilst employees are working in Blackburn. The bus service will not support staff who are on call or shift workers starting before 7:00am or finishing after 10:00pm. The bus service will not be any use for staff who may want to have a social life outside work. The property is some distance from the town centre and as such I believe residents will need private transport whilst having this address as their base.

2. Capacity of Highfield Avenue

This is an area where I cannot agree with Mr Waytt. I have inspected Highfield Avenue on a number of occasions in respect of this application and for other residents who have applied for extensions to their properties.

My inspections have noted that the section of Highfield Avenue running from south to north between nos. 15-31(east side) and Nos 22- 38(west side) had a large number of parked cars. When the locations of the vehicle crossings to private drives was also looked at it had to be noted that on Friday 7th July 2017 at 7:30am only one parking space was available on this section. All the vehicles that were parked had done so by parking on the footway to a point that the area would not be available to be used by a pedestrian pushing a pram or a disabled person using a wheel chair. Because of this situation when residents have applied for extensions I have requested that such changes included sufficient parking for the size of the dwelling.

Looking at the section of Highfield Avenue running west to east between Properties Nos. 52-82 (north side) and Nos. 33-53 (south side), the dwellings on this section are of a vastly different design with limited boundary fences (allowing better visibility). It was noted that there was less on street parking in this area. What parking had been under taken was at the west end closer to 1 The Paddock and also required vehicles to park partially on the footway. The distribution of the private vehicle crossing and the width of the carriageway dictates that there are very few points at which a safe parking space could be found that would not cause difficulties for present residents.

Mr Waytt claims that many of the residents are likely to be from overseas and trainee staff who are unlikely to own a car. This point was not missed when I was assessing the off street parking for the proposal and that is why I was not asking for a full 21 parking bays, one per bed room. I am requesting that a the development has a parking space for only 75% of the proposed capacity of the building.

I do feel that Highfield Avenue has very restricted additional capacity for on street parking. Any such additional load would also lead to partial footway parking. Whereas I am aware that this is custom and practice in many areas I am unable to support any development that would prove that such measures are necessary. Please see Pictures taken as part of my investigation and plan indicating the position and length of vehicle access points on Highfield Avenue.

3. Travel Plan and cycle parking.

Whereas a travel plan will indicate the possibilities for day to day travel the plan will not necessarily alter the number of cars parked at the address overnight but is more likely to mean that cars are left there through the day whilst residents are using public transport for their commute to and from work. This could actually make an unacceptable situation even worse. I am still of the mind that professional people will bring their own vehicles to their temporary residence and it is this situation that will cause the need for on street parking.

As for cycle provision, depending on the length of stay at the property cycles may be used by residents but by the fact that they are to be housed at this facility then they will need to transport their cycle to the site as well as any of their belongings that they would need. In addition to the above points the provision of a cycle rack would not be seen as cycle provision. I would be looking for a safe secure and dry place to store cycles usually I would ask for an enclosed lockable cycle shed.

4. Fall-Back Position

I fully appreciate that 1 the Paddock has still got a land usage of C2 set as a residential care home. Whereas different individual care facilities may deal with patients/residents with differing needs the and that this could alter the number of staff required at any given time. The present standard of 1 parking bay per 5 beds has been seen as on average the correct level. Previously the property had 17 residential rooms. Five parking bays would indicate a sufficient standard for its use under those circumstances.

The present application came through as sui generis application and as such there is no set standard. This means that we would assess the usage from the information provided and then make a decision as to the parking need. I have to admit that it is not unreasonable to say that the planned usage is much closer to that as a halls of residence. This is also a C2 land usage but in this case the parking requirements would be set at one parking space per bedroom. Changing the application to suite this use would increase the need

to provide 21 parking bays. It is due respect to the planning statement that the number requested was dropped to only 15 taking into account that some of the residents may not own cars. This is a generous measure as the use of the building could change from week to week and whereas on some occasions very few of the occupants could have cars at other times all 21 may bring their vehicles. In such a situation there would be problems with where to park the significant overspill.

5. Relevant Appeal Decisions

Mr Waytt has presented a successful planning appeal (PINS ref: APP/R2330/a/14/2225810) siting sufficient similarities to this case. It is my considered opinion that the similarities are too few to make a comparison. The impact of a possible six more cars in an area where on street parking is the normal situation is very small compared to the possible increase of 16 vehicles in an area where on street parking is a fall back situation and the overspill is likely to cause difficulties on a bend in the road.

I see that the differences between the two cases are as follows.

Property	1 The Paddock Burnley	130 Manor Street Accrington
Sustainability – Distance from Town Centre	2800m to Burnley Town Centre	800m to Accrington
Town Centre travel	Bus Journey	Walking distance
Residence	Staff moving to area for short periods to fulfil short needs temporary residency	Rental Affordable homes with occupants making a long term commitment to site
Area	An area where on street parking is overspill and limited by planning	An area built for low car ownership where there is no off street parking for any of the residents.
Parking Requirements	The level of parking for the site could change from week to week in the worst case look to a requirement for 16 on street parking spaces	The building would house a maximum of 6 bedrooms requiring an increase of on street parking from an expected 3 to 6. Only if all residents had cars
On Street Parking	With a high level of off street parking the number of private drives limit the kerb length available for parking	Very limited off street parking in the area leave full lengths of street available on first come first served basis with the exception of traffic regulation orders.
Other uses	Planning application have been received within the previous 12 months	No other application for the same site

6. Conclusion

The level of impact of the development cannot be fully assessed as this will change dependant on the mix of occupants at any time. To provide only five parking bays when up to 21 spaces may be necessary is a severe highway impact. This would be completed in an area were the collected evidence shows that the only available space will cause difficulties due to footway parking, over spill parking is likely to be on a bend in the road and footway parking is likely to obstruct private drives.

It is appreciated that a development of this type will bring benefits to both Burnley General Hospital and Royal Blackburn Hospital but unfortunately I feel that this site is not suitable because of the intensification of the on street parking would not be sustainable on grounds of road safety.

Regards

Chris.

Chris Nolan

Development Support

Community Services

Lancashire County Council