

From: planning
Subject: FW: 170811 SB-RM Re Application 3 2017 0610

From: Steve Burke
Sent: 11 August 2017 15:10
To: planning

Subject: 170811 SB-RM Re Application 3 2017 0610

FAO Robert Major

Dear Robert

Re Proposed Extension of existing Lidl food store and provision of nine staff car parking spaces, with accompanying landscaping. Application Ref 3/2017/0610

Having considered the details of this proposed application Clitheroe Civic Society object to the application, in its present form, for the following reasons stated below. Italicised text relates to either RVBC's Core Strategy Policy or extracts from the application supporting documents.

Core Strategy Policy and Local Representation:

Core Strategy Policy DMG1 requires that: Developments must also consider the potential traffic and car parking implications and ensure safe access. Development must also not adversely affect consider the potential traffic and car parking implications and ensure safe access.

The changes to the car park to reduce the number of spaces (from 14 pay and display spaces with two disabled bays) to a nine-space private car park for staff will not have an adverse impact on the adjoining properties. In fact, the change in the nature of the car parking area and the reduction in the number of spaces will result in an improvement through a reduction in the number of traffic movements, and a reduction in noise and disturbance for local residents.

The local residents of Peel Street seem to disagree with the London Consultants about this. It will be encouraging to see that their opinion counts for something as this application is considered. Peel street is already overparked for most of the weekdays. Double parking makes transit hazardous at peak times and in particular at the Shawbridge Road junction, which is positively dangerous, where vehicles park across pavement corners and frequently on them.

Parking :

In our opinion, the reduction of off street parking, which is the actual and irrefutable consequence of this application if approved, can only be to detriment of the safety and amenity of local residents as well as pedestrians and drivers in transit around the area. As such this is contra to Core Strategy Policy DMG1 referred to above.

Notwithstanding arguments to the contrary, by the applicants and their agents, the loss of the existing 15 (or 16, the number is ambiguous in the information presented) public car parking spaces at Peel Street does not adequately consider the potential traffic and car parking implications and ensure safe access. It cannot but adversely affect safe access in the vicinity of the site. This is particularly so with the exponential growth of residential development in the Borough since the approval of the Core Strategy and its Housing Policy. In turn, this has increased the unaddressed pressures on existing on and off street parking. To remove parking provision will not and cannot in any objective assessment of the facts 'result in an improvement' as the applicants agents claim.

'Less is more' might well be an accepted design concept. As a means of assessing quantitative provision, of parking spaces in this case, less is less!

To remove the 15 spaces on Peel Street will increase this current pressure. Even if one accepts that the Public Car park on Peel Street, as claimed, is 'underutilised', that the demand for Town Centre Parking will increase as more of the residential developments are commenced and completed is inevitable. To permit the removal of an existing facility which has, apparently, additional capacity, can only be regarded as short sighted - at best.

Pre Planning Negotiations:

The Council, the current owners of the car park, have confirmed during the negotiations for the sale of the site to the applicants *that the loss of this small car park, which is underutilised, as demonstrated above, will not have a significant impact in the amount of parking provision within and around the town centre.*

If this statement is correct, it seems to have a rather premature statement to have been made prior to the determination of a Planning Application. This has the potential for seeming to prejudice an objective determination of this application by the authority who is also the Vendor. Is there not a conflict of interest here requiring independent determination or scrutiny?

Design Principles:

The proposal, to modify what is a standard unit plan for one of Lidl's small stores, could probably accommodate most if not all and even more of the required additional all the additional storage and retail space within the existing site footprint. This could be achieved if the applicants and their 'Architectural Services Consultants' were able - and allowed - to literally think outside the box that they have been presented with. That this is not the commonly accepted practice for this 'Deep Discount' retailer should not be a reason for them to be required to avoid conducting a more comprehensive and imaginative approach to what can be achieved within the existing site boundary, and on one or more levels. If the current team of advisors cannot produce these skills then others could and should be engaged to resolve the issue to everyone's benefit.

Your Sincerely

Steve Burke
Acting Chairman
Clitheroe Civic Society



Virus-free. www.avast.com