

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT
TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

3rd April 2014

Agenda item 10

Application ref 14/00188/DEEM4

Former Sainsbury's Site, Ryecroft

Comments of the **Environmental Health Division** and the **Highway Authority** were have been received.

The **Environmental Health Division** (EHD) indicates that there is a significant potential for noise and vibration to cause disturbance to the surrounding area. They advise that these issues will be controlled through the tendering and contractual arrangements that will be in place as the contractor will be responsible for applying to the Council for prior consent under Section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974. Additionally the hours in which demolition work may take place will be restricted as the selected contractor will need to be registered to an appropriate site management/good neighbour scheme. The tendering and contractual arrangements also require the contractors to mechanically sweep the road from the site to address mud and dust on the highway. Due to the proposed hours of work, it is unlikely that any light nuisance would occur. They have no objections to the application.

The **Highway Authority** (HA) have no objections subject to a condition requiring the submission of a Traffic Management Plan detailing the management and routing of demolition traffic, delivery times, internal compound arrangements and wheel wash facilities.

The **Conservation Advisory Working Party** have no objections to the demolition but has concerns over the loss of car parking and does not want solid boarding

Your Officers' comments

The EHD highlight that whilst the proposed demolition has the potential to create noise/vibration, mud and dust and light nuisance these are suitably controlled through other legislation or are specified in the method of demolition and restoration included within the submission. As such the matters that are raised do not need to be addressed through conditions on any prior approval that is granted.

The HA recommend a condition that relates to highway safety, which is not a matter that can be addressed through this application process. The comments of the HA should be passed to the applicant for information, however.

Whilst CAWP is concerned about the loss of car parking, there is no loss relative to that currently provided (the upper floors of the multi-storey having been closed for sometime), and the loss of car parking is not considered to be a matter that can be addressed through this particular application process anyway. The submission indicates that the security boarding, to a height of 1.8m, may be erected if it is considered that the appearance of the site is not aesthetically suitable without it. To ensure that consideration is given to the final appearance of the boarding it is recommended that a condition is attached requiring details of any hoardings that may be erected to be approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Recommendation (a) remains as set out in the main agenda report, recommendation (b) is amended so to remain one of approval but to now include the condition referred to above, and an additional recommendation is made that the comments of the HA are passed to the applicant with any decision.

