

Application Number: 2014/0177

1 Nottingham Road, Ravenshead, Nottinghamshire, NG15

Location: 9HG



NOTE:

This map is provided only for purposes of site location and should not be read as an up to date representation of the area around the site. Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown Copyright No. LA 078026
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution of civil proceedings

Report to Planning Committee

Application Number:	2014/0177
Location:	1 Nottingham Road, Ravenshead, Nottinghamshire, NG15 9HG
Proposal:	Demolition of existing car showroom and erection of a convenience store (Use Class A1) with associated landscaping and car parking.
Applicant:	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd
Agent:	Turley Associates

Site Description

This application site is located at the junction of Nottingham Road and Main Road, Ravenshead and is currently occupied by a car sales business. The site slopes steeply down to the south and west and as a result the premises present a two-storey elevation to Nottingham Road and a three-storey elevation to Main Road, with garage/store facilities at basement level. A detached workshop building is situated to the rear, close to the boundary with the adjoining commercial properties. Historically the site was used as a petrol filling station and there are previously used storage tanks in situ.

Residential properties are located opposite the site on Nottingham Road. Larch Farm Public House is located opposite the site on Main Road. The site has existing vehicular access to both Nottingham Road and Main Road.

The site is located within the Ravenshead Village envelope and Ravenshead Special Character Area as indicated on the Proposals Map for the Gedling Borough Replacement Local Plan (Certain Policies Saved 2008).

Relevant Planning History

Planning application 89/1437 – Conditional Planning Permission was granted in October 1989 to 'Extend workshop, demolish front wall and form car parking area.'

Planning application 92/0392 – Planning Permission was refused in May 1992 for 'Proposed extension to existing car showroom building and erection of first floor office accommodation' given the office accommodation was located outside an area of allocation for office uses; there would be inadequate space for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles; and overintensification of development.

Planning permission 92/1391 – Conditional Planning Permission was granted in March 1993 for ‘Proposed extension to existing car showroom building and erection of first floor office accommodation’. This permission was never implemented.

Planning permission 2012/1449 – Conditional Planning Permission was granted in January 2013 for ‘Proposed conversion and change of use of existing garden centre building into a restaurant with single storey side extension, and front glazed extension’ at the adjoining site, No. 3 Nottingham Road.

In November 2013 Planning Permission (app. No. 2013/0563) was refused for Demolition of existing car showroom (Use Class Sui Generis) and erection of a convenience store (Use Class A1) with associated landscaping, car parking and servicing’ for the following reasons:

1. In the opinion of the County Council as Highway Authority and the Borough Council as Planning Authority the proposed development would lead to an increase in turning and manoeuvring at the existing vehicle accesses on a heavily congested junction during peak hours causing traffic dangers and difficulties on the adjoining highways for both drivers and pedestrians. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies ENV1 and T10 of the Gedling Borough Replacement Local Plan (Certain Policies Saved) 2008 and the NPPF which attaches great importance to good design and considers it as a key aspect of sustainable development.
2. In the opinion of the County Council as Highway Authority and the Borough Council as Planning Authority the proposed development would not provide adequate space within the site for manoeuvring of vehicles and for delivery vehicles, which would interfere with the safety and free flow of traffic on the adjoining highway. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies ENV1 and T10 of the Gedling Borough Replacement Local Plan (Certain Policies Saved) 2008 and the NPPF which attaches great importance to good design and considers it as a key aspect of sustainable development.
3. In the opinion of the County Council as Highway Authority and the Borough Council as Planning Authority the increase in the use of the right turn entrance into the site from Main Road, by virtue of its proximity to the junction and limited visibility over the brow of the hill, would interfere with the safety and free flow of traffic on the adjoining highway. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies ENV1 and T10 of the Gedling Borough Replacement Local Plan (Certain Policies Saved) 2008 and the NPPF which attaches great importance to good design and considers it as a key aspect of sustainable development.

An appeal against the decision has been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate and is under consideration at the present time.

Proposed Development

Full Planning Permission is sought for the demolition of existing car showroom (Use Class Sui Generis) and erection of a convenience store (Use Class A1) with

associated landscaping, car parking and servicing. The siting and design of the building remain as previously submitted, changes have been made to the scheme to address the previous reasons for refusal.

The proposed retail building would have maximum dimensions of 23.8 metres width x 13.6 metres depth and be located to the rear of the site. The building would consist of a two storey gable frontage with a single storey pitched roof extension to the south-west side. The maximum ridge height would be 8.3m above finished floor level. The shop front would be predominantly glazed at ground level to the north-west and south-west elevations. The building is shown to be rendered cream with an element of timber cladding.

Opening hours are specified as 7am – 11pm, 7 days a week.

20 full time employees are proposed.

New tree and hedge planting is shown adjacent to the north-west and north-east boundaries of the site.

Summary of proposed changes:

1. Reconfiguration of parking and servicing

Remove one car parking space, alter the location of another and reposition the servicing area.

15 spaces are shown on the submitted site plan (drawing no. 200 Rev B).

2. Alterations to access and egress

Retain and widen the positioning of access and egress points, whilst restricting right turn movements onto Nottingham Road.

Pedestrian island at the site access with Nottingham Road.

Dropped crossings and tactile paving at the site access.

Widening the existing pedestrian island at the junction of Main Road and Nottingham Road.

3. Safety enhancements to carriageway

Provide 'slow' markings and dragons teeth on the carriageway, speed limit signs on the approach to the junction and high friction surfacing, as well as widening of the existing pedestrian island.

Supporting documents include a Design and Access Statement, Transport Statement, Planning Statement, Plant Noise Assessment, Landscape Options, Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Desk Study (December 2012), Phase 2 Geo Environmental Assessment Report (February 2003) and a Protected Species Survey (Landscape Science Consultancy Report July 2013).

Consultations

Environment Agency – Planning permission could be granted to the proposed development as submitted if the following planning conditions are included as set out below. Without these conditions, the proposed development on this site poses an unacceptable risk to the environment and the Environment Agency would object to the application.

Condition

No development approved by this planning permission (or such other date as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall take place until a scheme that includes the following components to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall each be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority:

- 1) A Preliminary Risk Assessment which has identified: all previous uses potential contaminants associated with those uses a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.
- 2) A Site Investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.
- 3) The results of the Site Investigation and detailed risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
- 4) A Verification Plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

Any changes to these components require the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason

To safeguard the groundwater resource from potential contamination.

Condition

Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason

A piles foundation design has the potential to mobilise and provide preferential pathways for contaminant migration.

Nottinghamshire County Council (Highways) – Object, the Highway Authority, feel that this application does not address the previous highway reasons for refusal

adequately and therefore recommend that this current application also be refused.

The Planning Statement produced by Turley Associates as part of this current submission, states that this application will address the highway reasons for refusal, by including a number of on and off site highway improvements.

Nottinghamshire County Council's safety audit report listed a number of items of concern, which have not been fully addressed by the applicant, they are as follows:

Drivers travelling north on the A60 and attempting to turn right into the store may confuse a following driver who might be expecting them to be turning right at the main signalised junction. There is no indication of these different right turn movements within the road markings and the width of the existing right turn lane is below standard. This may lead to late braking and a shunt type accidents.

If the right turn lane on the northbound A60 is full with vehicles waiting to turn onto the B6020, a driver wishing to turn right into the store access might be tempted to pull across the southbound carriageway across the central hatching and face oncoming southbound vehicles merging at the access, especially as such drivers would have an awareness of how the signals operate at the junction ahead. This would cause obvious conflicts and could lead to accidents.

Southbound drivers will be concentrating on completing their merge downstream of the traffic signals and may not expect vehicles to be emerging from the store in front of them. A vehicle making a left turn out of the access onto the A60 will be travelling at relatively low speed and this could lead to shunt / late lane change type accidents. The proposed high friction surfacing will assist, but conflicts remain.

A vehicle slowing to turn left into the access from the A60 will be vulnerable to shunt type accidents from behind, since the proposed access is within the merging length from the nearby signals.

The access to the site on the B6020 is set close to the crest of a hill. A driver travelling east, making a right turn into the access will be braking beyond the brow of the hill and may have to wait in the carriageway to make the right turn. Following vehicles will not have an unobstructed view of the access due to the hill crest and will be unable to see the right indication light of the right turning vehicle, leading to shunt type accidents. The proposed "Keep Clear" markings will suffer from poor compliance and the proposed high friction surfacing will assist, but conflicts still remain.

A driver turning right out of the Main Road access has restricted visibility of eastbound vehicles due the hill brow. This will be exacerbated when vehicles travelling westbound form a queue for the signals, which will block the view from the access. A length of high friction surfacing has been proposed to provide better grip under emergency braking to mitigate against shunt type accidents, however it is shown as stopping short of the access and at the very

least should extend through the access.

When traffic is faced with delays at the signals westbound on the B6020, particularly at peak times, when a queue builds beyond the proposed keep clear, drivers may be tempted to use the store car park and the adjoining premises (as it is proposed to keep the right of way through these premises), as a cut through between the B6020 and the A60. There is also the possibility that drivers can mount the footway from the existing bus stop lay-by to circumvent the queue as there is nothing to prevent them doing so.

The village entry speed limit signs and associated dragons teeth markings are too distant from the signals to have an impact. They should be moved closer to the signals and the dragons teeth markings installed with high friction material.

There is no formal pedestrian provision for crossing the A60 from the westbound arm of the B6020 or the east arm of Main Road at present. The used car dealership would not generate pedestrian trips however a convenience store is specifically designed to generate this type of movement.

Clarification was also requested on the number of parking spaces within the site, the Planning Statement and Transport Statement conflicting with the plans submitted.

It is noted that it is also proposed that the right of way through the car park will be retained for access to the neighbouring properties located to the south of the site. This raises further highway safety concerns as this right of way gives access to a further two vehicular access points onto the A60, where both right and left turn manoeuvres can be carried out freely.

Nottinghamshire County Council (Petroleum Officer) – Officer states, inter-alia, according to the records that this Service hold on the subject site, there are two separate tank farms still in situ – the original tank farm, which consisted of 6 x 500 Gallon Underground Storage Tanks (UST's) and also a newer, separate tank farm, which was installed circa. 1970. The original 6 x 500 gallon UST's are slurry filled, but are probably still in situ. These UST's may be uncovered / disturbed by any works onsite regarding excavating / digging out for foundations / laying foundations or footings etc. I would strongly recommend that if these original UST's are found / discovered during any works on site, that they are excavated & removed completely from site. Please note though, these UST's can be considered to be safe from a fire / explosion / safety risk, as they are slurry filled, but it is still possible that voids may be present within the UST's, so it's possible petrol vapours could still be present, so caution must still be exercised whilst dealing with them.

Regarding the tank farm installed circa. 1970 and which is also still in situ, our records seemed to suggest that these UST's had been converted to store diesel after the site ceased to store and sell petrol. It is possible, due to their location, that these UST's won't be affected by any excavating / digging out for foundations / laying foundations or footings, but these UST's, as a minimum, must be made permanently safe, either by foam or slurry filling. Ideally, these UST's are again best

to be excavated & removed from site completely, as should any pipework and this would be this Services preferred option.

Nottinghamshire County Council (Forestry Manager) – No objections.

Planning Policy – No objections to the proposal subject to satisfactory comments on design, highways and residential amenity. The applicant has demonstrated that there is no sequentially better location within Ravenshead and the proposal is unlikely to cause a significant adverse impact on Ravenshead local centre. Masterplanning is underway to accommodate the growth identified in the Aligned Core Strategy and it is possible that this may recommend that an area of land is allocated for retail purposes. However, the final masterplans have not yet been issued and the recommendations have not yet been incorporated into the Local Plan. As such, it is not considered that any area recommended for allocation as retail by the masterplan is a sequentially better alternative at this stage.

Public Protection – No objections. The noise assessment suggests that the noise levels will be within recognised guidelines. If the equipment is installed and confirms to these guidelines then there are unlikely to be any environmental protection issues. However the timing cycles of similar appliances in similar situations have given rise to complaints. I would therefore suggest that the equipment should be operated so as not to give rise to complaints

Public Protection (Scientific Officer) –

1. Following the Phase II site investigations it would be appropriate for the subsequent report to contain a revised Conceptual Site Model (including a diagrammatical representation of the site) clarifying what has been discovered on site and also the remaining uncertainties.
2. Vapour monitoring has been carried out using a simple field headspace technique; backed up by a very small number of monitoring well visits. Due to the proposed land use it would seem that vapour intrusion is the dominant human health contaminant linkage (although this should be clarified in the revised CSM).

I would therefore recommend a more robust assessment of the risks associated the VOC intrusion; I would recommend the use of CIRIA 682 for the monitoring and assessment and CIRIA 716 for proposals for any remedial works and their verification.

3. The recommendations do not include any options for the removal /decommissioning of the insitu tanks. It is understood that the original set have been filled with concrete whilst the replacement tanks are currently water filled.

We would always recommend that the tanks be removed and the ground validated around, where possible, to remove any ongoing liability; this not being feasible we would recommend that the tanks are decommissioned in line with good practice and to the satisfaction of the County Council Petroleum Officer. (This point is particularly relevant to the water filled tanks).

Therefore, to ensure that the site is suitably assessed, remediated and verified I would

recommend the following conditions be applied:-

Unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority, development must not commence until the following has been complied with:

Site Characterisation

An assessment of the nature and extent of any potential contamination has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This assessment must be undertaken by a competent person, and shall assess any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. Moreover, it must include; a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination and; an assessment of the potential risks to: human health, property, adjoining land, controlled waters, ecological systems, archaeological sites and ancient monuments.

Submission of Remediation Scheme

Where required, a detailed remediation scheme (to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to critical receptors) should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s), and a timetable of works and site management procedures.

In the event that remediation is required to render the development suitable for use, the agreed remediation scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable of works. Prior to occupation of any building(s) a Verification Report (that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out) must be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority and once the Local Planning Authority has identified the part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination development must be halted on that part of the site.

An assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements above, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme, together with a timetable for its implementation and verification reporting, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Urban Design Officer – No objections. The store reflects a former building on this corner site and should improve the appearance at the junction.

Ravenshead Parish Council – Object on the following grounds:

The effect the convenience store will have on village life and the failure of the application to recognise 3 other shops that trade in the village that would also be affected.

The site if developed will be dangerous to pedestrians and road users.

The plans show a red line marked around the boundary of the site when in fact it is a right of way to the site situated behind. The deeds state that

access should be allowed through the site both ways and should not be blocked. The drawings show a hatched area where delivery vehicles will be parked for up to 45 minutes at a time blocking the right of way and any access or exit to the site.

The Parish Council are not of the belief that 20 operatives of the store can find suitable parking within the area.

The plan indicates maximum use of the store in the late afternoon – a massive blockage already occurs at peak time in this area without any further development.

Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust – No objections to bat survey (Landscape Consultancy 2013), but comment that should bats be found then work should stop immediately and the Bat Conservation Trust contacted. In order to avoid impact on nesting birds request that all work be undertaken outside the bird-breeding season, or a suitably qualified ecologist employed. Where new planting is proposed, recommend the use of native species.

Adjoining neighbours have been notified and 2 site notices posted – 7 representations have been received as a result, 5 objections and 2 in support. In summary:

Traffic impacts – potential increase in accidents at an already busy junction. Increased congestion, conflict and obstruction on the A60.

Insufficient parking provision on site.

Delivery vehicles will further exacerbate both traffic and nuisance to neighbours.

Impact on existing village shopping centre/ jobs will be lost.

No demand for development given the local facilities that exist in the village.

There are other stores in the local vicinity and no need for another.

The proposal will only benefit passing Nottingham and Mansfield trade.

Question evidence for promoting cycling and walking.

A large number of footpaths shown in the Design and Access Statement are private and should be disregarded.

The application will improve the amenity of the neighbourhood.

A 'keep clear' box on Main Road to support right turning traffic across would help.

In addition an objection letter and Transport Statement Appraisal has been submitted by Signet Planning on behalf of A F Blakemore and Son Ltd who operate the Spar on Milton Drive, Ravenshead who are of the opinion that the proposal represents inappropriate development of the site, in particular relating to pedestrian and highway safety.

Planning Considerations

The main planning considerations in the determination of this application are the appropriateness of the proposed use in this location, the design of the proposal and the impact on the appearance of the area bearing in mind its location within the Ravenshead Special Character Area, the impact on neighbouring residential amenity

and the access and parking layout within the site and any highway implications.

The main planning policy guidance at the national level is the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (March 2012). The following sections are particularly relevant in the consideration of this application:

1. Building a strong, competitive economy
2. Ensuring the vitality of town centres
4. Promoting sustainable transport
7. Requiring good design

At the local level the Gedling Borough Replacement Local Plan (Certain Policies Saved) 2008 includes the following policies relevant in considering this application:

Policy ENV1 – Development Criteria
Policy ENV3 – Development on Contaminated Land
Policy ENV17 – Ravenshead Special Character Area
Policy S13 – Local Day-to-Day Shopping Needs.
Policy T10 – Highway Design and Parking Guidelines

In addition Policy 10 (Design and enhancing local identity) and Policy 6 (Role of Town and Local Centres) of the Gedling Borough Aligned Core Strategy are material considerations.

Gedling Borough Council at its meeting on 13th February 2013 approved the Gedling Borough Aligned Core Strategy Submission Documents which it considers to be sound and ready for independent examination. Consequently, Gedling Borough in determining planning applications may attach greater weight to the policies contained in the Aligned Core Strategy Submission Documents than to previous stages, as it is at an advanced stage of preparation. The level of weight given to each policy will be dependent upon the extent to which there are unresolved objections (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater weight that may be given). Overall, while there are objections to the relevant ACS policies identified, these are not considered significant in terms of this application and significant weight can be given to the ACS policies identified above.

At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Section 1 of the NPPF states the planning system should do everything it can to support sustainable economic growth and that significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system.

Paragraph 19 of the National Planning Policy Framework states the Government is committed to ensuring that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth. Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth.

Proposed Use

Paragraph 24 of the National Planning Policy Framework states “local planning authorities should apply a sequential test to planning applications for main town

centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan. They should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres, then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale.”

In terms of the sequential assessment paragraph 6.10 of the Planning Statement submitted as part of the Application identifies that the focus has been on Ravenshead local centre. Given the size of the store this is appropriate although the store will attract a significant proportion of its customers from drivers on Mansfield Road. In accordance with paragraphs 214-215 of the NPPF limited weight should be given to part c of Saved Local Plan Policy 13 as ‘need’ is no longer part of the retail assessment required by the NPPF although it does form part of the sequential assessment.

There are no vacant units within Ravenshead local centre and no opportunities to develop a site within or on the edge of the centre. The applicant has given consideration to development of the safeguarded land to the south of Ravenshead. This site was discounted by the applicant as being Greenfield and too large. It is accepted that the site is not sequentially better than the application site. As such the applicant has demonstrated compliance with the sequential test.

In terms of impact, the site is well below the threshold for an impact assessment to be required. The proposed store is less than 500 sq metres and will involve the sale of convenience goods (food, drink and other items required on a day-to-day basis). The existing local centre has no vacancies and a good mix of retail units and other facilities and mainly serves a top-up or convenience function. The proposal will increase the range and choice for customers in the area. The proposed use will keep an existing commercial site in use thereby making an important contribution to the local economy in accordance with the aims of the NPPF. Overall it is considered that the proposal will not result in an adverse impact on Ravenshead local centre of a sufficient scale to justify refusal of the application. Should planning permission be granted I consider it appropriate to attach a condition restricting any comparison goods to be sold to no more than 15% of the net floor space, in order to limit the impact on Ravenshead local centre.

Design

The application proposes a gable fronted building with single-storey addition. I am satisfied that the proposals are of an acceptable size and design. I also consider the proposals would have an acceptable impact on the character of the area given the proposed materials and existing commercial buildings adjoining the site. I am mindful of the changes in levels across the site and would suggest that conditions relating to any changes in levels on the site, together with precise materials to be used, are attached to any permission in order to secure a satisfactory development.

Whilst the application site is situated within the Ravenshead Special Character Area, its design and layout being commercial in nature does not represent the typical

characteristics described within Policy ENV17. I note the proposals include planting of trees and hedges which I consider will improve the appearance of the site. I therefore consider the proposed change of use will have a relatively neutral impact on the Special Character Area and will not harm the historic setting of Newstead Abbey Park.

Highway Issues

I am mindful of the comments of the County Council as Highway Authority and the sites location adjacent to heavily trafficked roads on a busy junction. I consider that the proposed development would lead to an increase in turning and manoeuvring at the existing vehicle accesses on a heavily congested junction during peak hours causing traffic dangers and difficulties on the adjoining highways for both drivers and pedestrians. I have noted the proposed changes to the scheme to overcome the previous reasons for refusal. However, in my opinion, the proposals do not alleviate all of the potential highway hazards. In particular, I share the concerns of the Highway Authority that the right hand turn into the site from drivers travelling north on the A60 may confuse a following driver who might be expecting them to turn right at the signalized junction. Also, the increase in the use of the right turn entrance into the site from Main Road, by virtue of its proximity to the junction and limited visibility over the brow of the hill, would interfere with the safety and free flow of traffic on the adjoining highway.

I also share the County Council's concerns regarding manoeuvrability within the site, particularly service vehicles blocking the site and parking areas, which will impact on traffic flows on the adjoining highways to the detriment of highway safety.

I am therefore of the opinion that the proposed revised measures are not sufficient to overcome the significant highway safety concerns raised.

Other Issues

I note the comments of both the Environment Agency, the County Council Petroleum Officer and the Borough Council's Scientific Officer in respect of potential contamination and I am mindful of the past history of the site. I consider that the methods to deal with any contamination on the site can be dealt with by condition.

With regard to the impact on protected species, I note that Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust have advised that they have no objections to the proposal. I therefore consider there would be no undue impact on protected species, subject to the development being carried out in accordance with the Landscape Science Consultancy Report July 2013.

I note the comments received from local residents. Whilst residential properties sit in reasonably close proximity to the site, I consider existing commercial buildings which border the site provide a suitable buffer between the development and residential properties. However, if the development were considered acceptable it would be reasonable to attach conditions regarding opening hours and hours of delivery or waste collection in order to protect residential amenity. I also consider that details in respect of chiller units and ventilation / extraction systems can be conditioned as part

of any consent.

Conclusions

Whilst I have no concerns in relation to the proposed use, design, former use, impact on residential properties and local wildlife, I do have concerns in relation to highway safety. I am also mindful of the contribution that the proposal would make towards employment provision, however I do not consider that this contribution would outweigh the highway safety concerns. For the reasons set out in the 'Highway Issues' section above I would therefore recommend that the application is refused.

Recommendation:

To REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION for the following reasons:

1. In the opinion of the County Council as Highway Authority and the Borough Council as Planning Authority the proposed development would lead to an increase in turning and manoeuvring at the existing vehicle accesses on a heavily congested junction during peak hours causing traffic dangers and difficulties on the adjoining highways for both drivers and pedestrians. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies ENV1 and T10 of the Gedling Borough Replacement Local Plan (Certain Policies Saved) 2008 and the NPPF which attaches great importance to good design and considers it as a key aspect of sustainable development.
2. In the opinion of the County Council as Highway Authority and the Borough Council as Planning Authority the proposed development would not provide adequate space within the site for manoeuvring of vehicles and for delivery vehicles, which would interfere with the safety and free flow of traffic on the adjoining highway. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies ENV1 and T10 of the Gedling Borough Replacement Local Plan (Certain Policies Saved) 2008 and the NPPF which attaches great importance to good design and considers it as a key aspect of sustainable development.
3. In the opinion of the County Council as Highway Authority and the Borough Council as Planning Authority the increase in the use of the right turn entrance into the site from Main Road, by virtue of its proximity to the junction and limited visibility over the brow of the hill, would interfere with the safety and free flow of traffic on the adjoining highway. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies ENV1 and T10 of the Gedling Borough Replacement Local Plan (Certain Policies Saved) 2008 and the NPPF which attaches great importance to good design and considers it as a key aspect of sustainable development.