

## **Planning Committee Update Sheet – 10<sup>th</sup> January 2018**

### **Item 7**

#### **07/2017/3144/FUL – 348 Station Road, Bamber Bridge PR5 6EL**

Two additional reports have been submitted by the applicant in support of the application.

The first report relates to Equipment Specification which has been shared with Environmental Health who have made the following comments in relation to its contents.

The documents suggest a background noise level between the hours of 09:00 to 23:00 of 47dB(A) but no further information was supplied. When and where was this figure measured and can we see the data. In addition it quotes the wrong standard (BS4142: 1997 which has been update in 2014).

The document then has some calculations of sound emissions from the extraction but in relation to a site at 294 Clarence Road, Sutton Coldfield, i.e. not this site. With distance correction based on 7m is this right. There is no tonal information although there appears to be one around the 250 Hz range.

In relation to the system itself do we do not have a plan showing the termination point of the extraction system. There is no information on any air handling/ conditioning units or whether walk in refrigeration unit is internal.

At the moment the information is very basic and not specific to the site, therefore in light of the lack of information the proposal cannot be supported based on the information supplied.

The second report is an Employment Land Availability study and a Sequential Test. The report states that this information was requested by the Council however, what was requested was details of how the site had been marketed as reference had been made to no one being interested in the site for light industrial purposes but no evidence had been supplied to demonstrate how the site had been marketed to support this statement. This information was requested in relation to satisfying the Controlling Re-Use of Employment Premises SPD.

Having looked through the report reference is made to Policy 9 of the Core Strategy which is for the provision of new employment/economic sites, and as such is not relevant to this scheme. The relevant policy is Policy 10 of the Core Strategy. The applicant, in his submission, has stated why, in his opinion, the property is suitable for the hot food takeaway use proposed, but he has not provided evidence to show how he has satisfied the criteria set out in Policy 10 for the loss of the property from an employment use.

Whilst it is accepted that the site is not within the “Best Urban” or “Good Urban” employment sites, it has still has a function in the employment offer in the Borough, and as such, from a policy point of view, there are still concerns about the potential loss of an employment unit without appropriate evidence being submitted.

The applicant provides a commentary in the statement, however, I would expect to see evidence to back up the statements he makes in order for the application to be acceptable in policy terms, however this is lacking in the submission.

An additional letter of objection has been received which raises the following concerns. This end of Station Road is predominantly residential with the existing commercial/ industrial business either starting work before 7am or working normal business hours. The resident's quality of life will be substantially downgraded if another business open to 11pm is to be allowed.

This appears to go against Central Lancashire Access to Healthy Living SPD 2012 which discourages planning consent for new take-aways. (This SPD is no longer actively in use)

The consultant report that states it meets criteria B 'need for proposed use' saying 'The development would meet a need for more retail shops and eating establishments, within the local community'. There is not a need for more take-aways demonstrated by the presence of plenty of existing premises. (It is not the purpose of the Planning System to regulate market forces) therefore this is not a material planning consideration.