

WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE**10TH MARCH 2015****ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS**

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
PART A		
14/0501/FULL	13	<p>Following the Planning Committee Site Visit on 5th March 2015, and by way of addressing matters raised and questions asked by Members at the Site Visit, the <u>Highway Authority</u> has provided the following additional comments:</p> <p>YELLOW BOX MARKINGS</p> <p>Guidance on the application of these road markings is provided in Chapter 5 of the Traffic Signs Manual, which is a national publication. This indicates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The junction should preferably, though not necessarily, be controlled by signals • Blocking back from a junction ahead should occur under existing conditions, even if only for short periods, • There should preferably be heavy traffic flows on both opposing arms of the junction. At unsignalled junctions with minor roads where blocking of the mouth of the minor road is infrequent, a KEEP CLEAR marking may be more appropriate, • Opposing roads at a junction should normally be in line with each other. The markings may, however, be used exceptionally at staggered junctions, particularly where the minor roads have a right hand stagger, provided the maximum box length is not exceeded, and irregular shapes can be avoided. Two half-boxes may be a practical substitute for a single large box in such circumstances, • The carriageway beyond the junction should be free from obstruction (this may necessitate the imposition of waiting or loading restrictions, or the adjustment of bus stops on the lengths concerned), • Where a succession of junctions gives rise to blocking back, the establishment of a series of boxes should be considered, provided at least 20m storage space can be maintained between successive boxes, and

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should preferably not be a high proportion of right-turning traffic, since experience has shown that the effectiveness of the marking is reduced under these conditions. <p>It goes on to say "Yellow box markings may be used outside police, fire, ambulance stations or hospitals only where there is an access road forming a junction with the main road. Where vehicles exit directly onto the carriageway, a KEEP CLEAR marking to diagram 1026 or a KEEP CLEAR marking to diagram 1027.1 (varied to omit the word "SCHOOL") should be used."</p> <p>Committee Members are advised that with reference to the above guidelines, this planning application utilises an existing dropped kerb access and not a road junction, additionally the application is for a local hub and not an Ambulance Station so the anticipated number of movements are significantly less. Notwithstanding this there may be an opportunity to install a "KEEP CLEAR" marking should it be needed.</p> <p>SPEED LIMIT ALTERATION It was suggested that the speed limit should be moved. This is not considered necessary as the suitability of the access would be considered against the prevailing traffic conditions and the location of the speed limit will have little impact as drivers will react to the surrounding environment. The access has a good level of visibility for existing vehicles and for passing traffic observing emerging vehicles, the relocation of the speed limit will not change this situation and there is no deficiency with the application which this would address so it therefore not considered necessary in planning terms to make the development acceptable.</p> <p>SIGNAGE Some signage could be considered to advise motorists of emerging vehicles either within the site on the highway, but the conspicuous nature of the vehicle and good visibility does mean that there is no express need to sign this facility.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>Notwithstanding the above comments it is expected that should planning permission be granted that the ambulance service will have future discussions with WCC to understand what their needs are and what level of warning may be necessary. For the purpose of the planning application no signs or road marking are considered necessary to make the application acceptable and should any features be deemed necessary in the future they can be applied without prejudicing the ability to use the site as it is currently anticipated.</p> <p><u>Neighbour</u> - 18 additional letters of objection have been received since the deferral from the February Committee. These take the form of identical letters, raising objections on the grounds of adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbours, and specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of emergency vehicle movements from the site; • The use of emergency lights at night; • The use of sirens, especially at night; • Pedestrian safety as emergency vehicles exit the site; • Highway safety and congestion on Birmingham Road, as emergency vehicles exit the site. <p><u>Public Speaker</u> - Officers are aware that all Members of the Planning Committee will have received an email from the public speaker in advance of the Committee Site Visit, which took place on 5th March 2015. The email listed what the author referred to as “the Top 10 safety and environmental issues relating to this application”. The email also raised matters relating to the extent of the neighbour notification undertaken in respect of the application.</p> <p><u>Officer Comment</u> - <i>On the matter of neighbour notification and publicity for the application, the Statutory requirements in relation to publicity of Planning Applications is set out within the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010 (as amended), and specifically under Paragraph 13(5) of that Order by giving requisite notice:</i></p> <p><i>(a) By site display in at least one place on or near the land to which the application relates for not less than 21 days; or (my emphasis)</i></p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><i>(b) By serving the notice on any adjoining owner or occupier.</i></p> <p><i>In this instance, both a site notice was posted and direct neighbour notification to properties on either side of the application site (not just those directly adjoining); properties to the rear; and, properties opposite. In total 16 neighbour notification letters were sent out. There is a certain inevitability that with any neighbour notification process one has to “draw the line” somewhere, and whilst one resident may receive a letter, their neighbour won’t. In terms of publicity for the application, the Council has acted appropriately and in accordance (actually beyond) the Statutory requirements, as well as actually exceeding the level of publicity set out within the Council’s own adopted Practice Note (No. 3) as it relates to Publicity for Planning Applications..</i></p> <p>To assist Members, the public speaker has provided a transcript of his 3 minute presentation to Planning Committee, which is attached (in full) to the rear of these papers.</p> <p><u>Additional Condition –</u> At no time shall sirens be used within the curtilage of the application site.</p>
15/0015/RESE	21	<p><u>Neighbour</u> : objection received - I think this is not the best place for the new leisure centre, as it is not central, and for most people will mean a car journey, or two busses. It should be in centre of town, either Stourport on Severn, say where Tesco's was, or in Worcester Street, Kidderminster on site of Woolworth or Littlewoods buildings, to rejuvenate the town centre, or on other abandoned land near town centre.</p> <p><u>Amended Comments from the Highway Authority -</u> Recommends that any permission which the District Planning Authority may wish to give include the following conditions:- The policy requirement for parking spaces for this site is 324 spaces plus accessible spaces, however this is a maximum provision. An exercise undertaken by the Highway Authority using a car parking accumulator based on TRIC's data confirms that notwithstanding the maximum policy provision that the proposed level of car parking is acceptable.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>However the number of disabled spaces, cycle spaces and motorcycle spaces falls short of a policy minimum provision, there is adequate spaces to address this within the application proposal and whilst some parking spaces may need to be removed to accommodate the disabled persons spaces there is sufficient flexibility within the proposal to accommodate this. I have therefore recommended conditions to address this shortfall.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="608 629 1426 920">i. Disabled Parking Need - Notwithstanding the details submitted 16 car parking spaces shall be provided on the site for the use by the disabled in a location to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such spaces shall be satisfactorily identified and reserved solely for that purpose and shall be made available prior to the developments first use. <li data-bbox="608 958 1426 1182">ii. Cycle Parking - Prior to the first use of the development hereby approved secure parking for 32 cycles to comply with the Council's standards shall be provided within the curtilage of the development and these facilities shall thereafter be retained for the parking of cycles only. <li data-bbox="608 1220 1426 1444">iii. Motorcycle Parking - Prior to the first use of the development hereby approved secure parking for 16 Motorcycle cycles to comply with the Council's standards shall be provided within the curtilage of the development and these facilities shall thereafter be retained for the parking of Motorcycles only. <p data-bbox="580 1473 1426 1659"><i><u>Officer Comment</u> – The figures above have been amended from the report as they have been based on the gross internal area of the leisure centre plus the floorspace of the two pools. Additional conditions to be added to the list within the report to cover points i, ii and iii above.</i></p> <p data-bbox="580 1697 1426 1841"><u>Countryside and Conservation Officer</u> - I have reviewed the revised plans and ecological report and find I am now happy that this application has met its biodiversity requirements.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Worcestershire Regulatory Services</u> - The consultant has undertaken their noise impact assessment using a set of baseline background noise level data which comprises of daytime measurements between 12pm to 5:30pm and a second evening background noise measurement between 9pm and 11:30pm.</p> <p>No levels are provided in the report relating to night time i.e. 11pm to 7am which are required to assess the noise impact during this sensitive period of the day (considering that the plant room will be operational 24/7). This is a significant shortcoming in the acoustics report for 3 reasons: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Night time background noise levels are known to be as low as 30dB(A) in this part of Kidderminster during considerable periods of the night time. 2. The rating of noise impact from the plant room/external equipment is incomplete/cannot be undertaken (due to point 1 above). 3. The location of static plant and equipment (internal/External) is not known to the author or absent in the report. For this reason there are no calculated noise propagation values evaluating exposure at the nearest residential receptors. <p>For these reasons above I cannot see how this report can be relied upon for the purposes of assessing noise impact from the external equipment and plant room. With this in mind and the impending deadline on the consultation period, I would advise that the Council should stipulate that the plant room and external static machine equipment should be inaudible at the nearest internal and external residential receptors/properties in order to protect the amenity of local residents from such noise.</p> <p>As you are aware matters pertaining to noise generated by patrons using the external facilities have already been discussed and addressed (<u>Officer Comment</u> - Please see paragraph 4.12 of the Committee report).</p> <p><u>Officer Comment</u> - In light of the comments made by Worcestershire Regulatory Services, it is proposed to amend Condition 10.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p><u>Officer Comment</u> - Since preparing the Committee report the applicants have submitted an ecological update and a revised landscaping plan which takes into account the Countryside and Conservation Officer's comments.</p> <p><u>Officer Comment</u> – Following the receipt of an amended landscaping plan, Change Recommendation to APPROVAL subject to the conditions listed in the report and the amended and additional conditions below.</p> <p><u>Amend Condition 10</u> - The building hereby approved shall not be brought into use until an additional noise assessment has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This additional noise assessment shall provide details of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing Background noise levels; • All proposed mechanical plant and machinery and an indication of its position within the site; • Predicted noise levels based on the proposed plant and machinery; • Suggested means of mitigation if deemed to be necessary. <p>The mechanical plant and machinery shall be installed in accordance with the agreed details and any means of mitigation implemented before the first use of the building.</p> <p><u>Add Additional Conditions</u> –</p> <p>11. Notwithstanding the above the area indicated on the Revised Landscaping Plan as 'Bank To Be Landscaped By Others' shall be planted in accordance with the details agreed under condition 24 of the outline planning consent 12/0146/EIA under condition discharge reference 13/2030/CR.</p> <p>12. The ecological protection shall be implemented in full in accordance with Table 1 – Proposed phased ecological protection within the Ecological Update dated 3rd March 2015 prior to the first use of the building hereby approved.</p> <p>13., 14., 15. Highway conditions (as listed i, ii, and iii above)</p> <p>To clarify condition 1 of the outline consent, the condition is to ensure that the proposal is utilised for the benefit of the Council as required by Regulation 9 of the Town and County Planning General Regulations.</p>

Greg Williams
Presentation to Planning Committee 10/3/2015

We all support our ambulance men and women, and the need for an effective Ambulance service. But this application isn't about that. They already easily exceed the national standard for the most critical 'Red 1' calls. And for the less critical 'Red 2' calls - the ones claimed to justify this application - performance against the national standard already exceeds 98%. No, it seems there may be other reasons behind this application, not least the opportunity to sell off Kidderminster's main ambulance station and replace it with a far cheaper option, regardless of any social impact.

Which brings us to 198 Birmingham Road. Many of you visited the site last Thursday, and saw just what an unacceptable proposal this is.

- You know there will be 14 emergency calls to this location every day, 28 when the station covers DY11 as the application permits.
- You know the application is for two emergency vehicles operating 24/7 - whilst just one rapid response car is currently anticipated, future changes will inevitably follow.
- You now know the number of objecting families is in fact 22, and that those who did not realise the severe impact of this application in time still want you to take their objections into account.
- And you know that the decision process cannot be more lenient just because this is the emergency services, rather than - say - a goods yard, or an entertainment venue.
- You saw, even as you were waiting so long to cross the road, just how much congestion there is around the Land Oak traffic lights - the busiest junction in Wyre Forest - and you can easily predict the severe dangers and traffic chaos which will arise.
- You saw just how dangerous this will be for pedestrians walking past on the pavement, some of whom will be schoolchildren going to and from the three schools on this route.
- You saw just how close the building is to surrounding residential properties, and will remember the Case Officer's findings that emergency light intrusion will be disruptive to residents' sleep.
- You heard the siren noise - around 75dB in the gardens behind and 90dB in the garden next door - and even from several yards away you experienced the disturbance this will cause up to 14 times a day, 100 times a week.
- You know that the siren and emergency lights will be in operation before the ambulance reaches the public highway - in fact, Highways demand this for safety reasons.
- You know that sirens will be used at times during night hours - indeed, this is a specific instruction to Ambulance drivers, as disclosed in a recent Freedom of Information response.
- And you could see, first hand, the immense impact this will have on Mr Rofik and the four generations of his family living immediately next door in 199 Birmingham Road. You know that his family home, walls and windows form one side of the narrow ambulance exit route. And you can easily predict the impact...
 - o On his children and grandchildren, who regularly play in the garden.
 - o On his elderly mother, who already requires medication to assist with sleeping.
 - o And on Mr Rofik himself, whose employment means he must sleep during the day despite the intolerable disturbance of the 120dB siren and flashing blue lights as the ambulance travels right alongside, and then across the front, of his family home up to 14 times every day.

Councillors, this is not about the efforts of West Midlands Ambulance Service to find their ambulances new homes, it is about the fact that they should do so where there are not so many homes already. It is of course important that everyone in our community appreciates and supports their difficult work, but it is also clear that 198 Birmingham Road is simply not fit for this purpose.