

**BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL**

**Development Control Committee**

**29<sup>th</sup> Jan 2014**

**OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED SINCE THE PREPARATION OF THE MAIN  
AGENDA**

**ITEM 10**

**ITEMS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION**

**Planning reference 13/02534/CA Demolition of bridges/underpass, former forge/wagon works, railway platforms and wall in connection with the development of the former Gwr railway land.**

**REPRESENTATIONS**

Ward Councillor Jackson has written in objection to the development commenting that since her objections written in 2008 changes have been made to the scheme but the original concerns raised relating to the premature road changes, archaeological, ecological, conservation area impact remain a concern.

**Third Party Representations**

Since the main agenda 4 further letters of objection have been received. Concerns raised covering impact of traffic, on ecology, air and noise pollution, loss of amenity, loss of rail heritage and contamination are addressed in the main report.

Radstock Action Group add additional objections to those previously made specifically relating to transport and the highway proposals.

**Officer Assessment**

The additional objections made are taken into account but do not raise new issues so as to affect the consideration of the application.

**Recommendation**

As per the main agenda report

**Planning reference 13/02436/EOUT Demolition and redevelopment of former railway lands to provide mixed use development including up to 210 residential units of varying sizes, up to 695 sq m of retail business floor space (use classes A1-A5 and B1); up to 325 sq m of use class B1 floor space or for community uses (use class D1), conversion of the Brunel rail shed for use class B1 or D1; car parking and new bus stops;**

**works to various existing roads within the town and establishment of new roads to service the development including new bridge structures; new public realm works, ground remediation, alterations to ground levels, works to trees and existing habitat areas; upgrading of below ground utilities; establishment of a new Sustrans route and diversion of existing public right of way**

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

Ward Councillor Jackson has written in objection to the development commenting that since her objections written in 2008 changes have been made to the scheme but the original concerns raised relating to the premature road changes, archaeological, ecological, conservation area impact remain a concern.

### **Consultee Comments**

Natural England additional comments made 21<sup>st</sup> January 2014 Agree with the considerations and conclusions of the Councils ecologist with regard to the effect of the development on bats. They advise that they are satisfied that the level of bat survey effort at the site was sufficient and confirm that we are confident that the mitigation measures can be adequately secured through planning conditions and Section 106 Agreement.

### **Third Party Representations**

Cam Valley Wildlife Group object to the ecological mapping and mitigation

There have been 6 further objections and 12 letters of support submitted since the agenda report but these raise no new issues.

Friends of Radstock Railway have written several additional representations which challenge the development ability to meet with National or Local polices for the site and add detail to their concerns about the development and add suggestions for alternatives. Their submissions include a transport study by a commissioned consultant.

The Royal Mail have written to object to the proposals. Their objections are on the basis that the development will impact on the ability of Royal Mail to meet their statutory duty of sorting and delivering mail due to the reversal of one way traffic on Fortescue Road and the introduction of weight limits which they say will cause Royal Mail's operational vehicles difficulty in regards to safe entry and exit from the site as there will be an insufficient turning area.

### **Additional Submissions by the applicant**

The applicant has responded to the objection made by Royal Mail. They consider that the scheme as presented does not adversely affect the PO

operation and that tracking has considered this and has come out as being satisfactory.

### **Additional Consultee comments**

The Highway officer has reviewed the objection from Royal Mail and advises that tracking drawings and scheme plans show that vehicles can enter and leave the site with the traffic flow reversed in Fortescue Rd. The Post Offices view that the internal depot layout restricts the room available to complete the loading/unloading manoeuvre is noted and it is also acknowledged that unloading and loading would be likely to take place in the lay by. These are not matters addressed within the submission specifically although it may be the case that a loading bay (as was shown in the previous scheme) should be reinstated.

### **Officer Assessment**

Of the issues and points raised these are covered within the main agenda report with the exception of the representation made by Royal Mail. The highway officer has confirmed that the development as proposed would allow appropriate access to the Royal Mail site from the public highway . There is insufficient detail of the operational requirements of Royal Mail to further consider the concerns raised relating to movements within their site however there are no in principle reasons why the highway changes in themselves would be sufficiently restrictive so as to impact upon the Royal Mail site taking account of the highway officers advice and the tracking information provided.

With regard to the Heads of Terms minor clarifications are to note.

1. The tenure split proposed is 90:10 not 70:30
2. Remaining financial sum for bridge to be spent on education specifically at St Nicholas C of E School which will be served by the footbridge

### **Recommendation**

As per the main agenda report with the above clarifications relating to tenure split and the surplus sum towards education.

### **Planning reference 13/03787/CA Demolition of existing structures**

### **REPRESENTATIONS**

#### **Third Party Representations**

Since the main agenda 4 further letters of objection have been received. Concerns raised covering impact of traffic, on ecology, air and noise pollution, loss of amenity, loss of rail heritage and contamination are addressed in the main report.

2 letters of support have also been received which also raise no issues but consider the regeneration benefits.

### **Officer Assessment**

The additional objections and supporting comments made are taken into account but do not raise new issues so as to affect the consideration of the application.

### **Recommendation**

As per the main agenda

**Planning reference 13/03786/EFUL Demolition of existing structures and redevelopment of former railway land to provide mixed use development including up to 70 residential units, up to 282 sqm of retail floor space (use classes A1-A5); up to 84 sqm of community uses (use class D1), public car park, associated highways works, ground remediation, alterations to ground levels, works to trees and existing habitat areas; upgrading of below ground utilities.**

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

### **Third Party Representations**

There have been 2 further objections and 2 further letters of support submitted since the agenda report but these raise no new issues.

The Royal Mail have written to object to the proposals. Their objections are on the basis that the development will impact on the ability of Royal Mail to meet their statutory duty of sorting and delivering mail due to the reversal of one way traffic on Fortescue Road and the introduction of weight limits which they say will cause Royal Mail's operational vehicles difficulty in regards to safe entry and exit from the site as there will be an insufficient turning area.

### **Additional Submissions by the applicant**

The applicant has responded to the objection made by Royal Mail. They consider that the scheme as presented does not adversely affect the PO operation and that tracking has considered this and has come out as being satisfactory.

The applicant has also responded to the ecology officers comments that "Solutions that would potentially be less ecologically damaging could be achieved, for example through a different layout to that on the indicative plans, and/or through a smaller footprint, and/or through different access arrangements." By commenting that the plans are not indicative for the full application and no other access is possible

### **Additional Consultee comments**

The Highway Officer has confirmed that revised layout drawings submitted address the previously identified issue of vehicles over running the pavement and the tracking into and through the development is acceptable.

The Highway officer has reviewed the objection from Royal Mail and advises that tracking drawings and scheme plans show that vehicles can enter and leave the site with the traffic flow reversed in Fortescue Rd. The Post Offices view that the internal depot layout restricts the room available to complete the loading/unloading manoeuvre is noted and it is also acknowledged that unloading and loading would be likely to take place in the lay by. These are not matters addressed within the submission specifically although it may be the case that a loading bay (as was shown in the previous scheme) should be reinstated.

### **Officer Assessment**

Of the issues and points raised these are covered within the main agenda report with the exception of the representation made by Royal Mail. The highway officer has confirmed that the development as proposed would allow appropriate access to the Royal Mail site from the public highway . There is insufficient detail of the operational requirements of Royal Mail to further consider the concerns raised relating to movements within their site however there are no in principle reasons why the highway changes in themselves would be sufficiently restrictive so as to impact upon the Royal Mail site taking account of the highway officers advice and the tracking information provided.

### **Recommendation**

As per the main agenda report.