

Late Representations

Planning Committee 15 November 2018

Item No. 7	<p>Application No. - FUL/2018/2655</p> <p>Description of Development - Redevelopment of Trinity Square comprising of the removal and re-location of the Coventry Cross, the redesign of the public space area and reconfiguration of the existing rear terrace to facilitate a larger seating area in connection with the existing restaurant</p> <p>Site Address - Cathedral Lanes Broadgate</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>The neighbour notification period expires on 15th November 2018. To cover this notification period the recommendation has been updated to read:</p> <p>Planning committee are recommended to delegate the granting of planning permission, (subject to the conditions listed in the report) to the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services upon the expiry on the consultation period and subject to no new significant material matters being raised that have not already been considered.</p> <p>Additional representations</p> <p>Councillor Roger Bailey has objected to the proposed removal of the Coventry Cross, to another location. Councillor Bailey notes that the removal of the Coventry Cross will leave a gap that acts as a link to important heritage assets. The Cross also acts as a welcome to many visitors to the city from the university, by car or coach. The Cross was taken away from its original location as a replica cross and since 1976, is the latest cross of Coventry. It is also a heritage asset in its own right, be that of more recent times and enhances the local environment in its current location, for which it was built for.</p> <p>The Coventry Society and five further representations have been received objecting to the scheme on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Misleading description, scheme does not include any proposals for relocation of the cross. b) Loss of public space with private dining area. c) The Heritage Statement is flawed/poor quality. d) The proposed development is not of sufficient quality for an important part of the city. The rear of Cathedral Lanes has not weathered well and would benefit from refurbishment, but not at the cost of demolishing a historic structure and losing public space. e) Removal of the Cross is contrary to the provisions of the Hill Top Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, the Local Plan 2016, City Centre Area Action Plan policies and the NPPF. f) The loss of the wheelchair ramp, and its replacement with an outdoor electrical lift will reduce the accessibility of the site for disabled people. Outdoor electric lifts are unsightly and unsuited to a historic conservation area. g) No objection to reposition the cross in a suitable place providing all the funds are in place with a timetable to complete the work, and the net cost to public funds is zero. h) Ironmonger Square is not a suitable place. It is not focal, it is not the site of the original cross and it's surrounded by modern buildings of mediocre quality.
---------------	--

	<p>Members are advised that an 830 signature on-line petition was submitted through the petition page on the Council's website against the previous application FUL/2018/0340, which was for the removal of the Cross sculpture only and included no plans for relocation. This petition objected to the demolition of the structure with no firm plan to rebuild it in a suitable place and with no explanation why public funds should be used to facilitate commercial development. Members are advised that as FUL/2018/0340 was withdrawn on 24/10/18 it is considered to be inappropriate to transfer the petition to the current application, which is materially different in that it deals with the redevelopment of the rear of Cathedral Lanes and the removal and replacement of the Cross. The petition organiser is unhappy with this approach and has expressed concern that the voices of local residents are not being considered fully. Whilst officers are sympathetic to this concern as the petition specifically states 'objection to the removal with no firm plans to replace' it would be inappropriate to assume that all signatories to the petition object to the second application bearing in mind the relocation of the Cross is included in the proposal.</p> <p>Additional consultee responses</p> <p><u>Historic England</u></p> <p>Advice has been received from Historic England who have commented that the loss of the Cross will inevitably have a detrimental impact on the adjoining listed buildings (through changes to their setting) and to the character of the Conservation Area. Historic England state that it is for the local planning authority to judge the overall public benefits of the scheme and whether or not they outweigh the heritage harm. If minded to grant consent Historic England suggest that it would be appropriate to impose appropriate conditions to ensure the careful dismantling and re-erection of the cross on a meaningful time scale, which might help to reduce the level of heritage harm caused.</p> <p>Officers note that the scheme has been carefully assessed against national and local planning policies and in terms of the character of the conservation area and surrounding heritage impacts. The Conservation Officer and Urban Design Officer consider that the general works to the terrace area outside Cathedral Lanes will have a clear and beneficial impact on the conservation area, as detailed within the officer report, which will outweigh any harm caused by the loss of the Cross at this location.</p> <p>The scheme has the added benefit of relocating the Cross to Ironmonger Square to act as a positive focal point / landmark and take on a new degree of prominence that it doesn't necessarily have at its current location. Conditions are included for a phasing programme of works and method statements to deal with how the Cross will be dismantled and also relocated to its new position.</p>
Item No. 8	<p>Application No. - FUL/2018/2876</p> <p>Description of Development - Stopping up and change of use of highway land to domestic garden in association with No.10 Lichen Green and the erection of a 1.8m brick pier and timber panel wall</p> <p>Site Address - Land adj to Bransford Avenue and 10 Lichen Green</p> <p>Points of clarification/ corrections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The decision date in the planning history table for application FUL/2010/1404 should read, granted 08/12/2010, not granted 08/12/2018 • The officer's report references the land within the application site was sold to the applicant by The Council. This is incorrect. The land was sold to the applicant and transferred into his ownership on 23/07/2017 by the original builder Beazer

Homes Bedford Limited. Whilst not within the ownership of The City Council, the land was adopted highway and the City Council stopped up the highway status of the land and disposed of its interests on the land. This was agreed at cabinet on Monday 12th December 2016.

Public consultation responses

Since the publication of the committee report 13 letters of objection have been received from nine individual residential addresses, including one objection received from the Cannon Park Community Association. The following material planning issues were raised;

Objections regarding the impact on the character of the area

- a) Loss of green space – the original plan for the area was to create small pockets of green space to create an attractive environment for all residents. The Radburn development of the area intended for no boundaries – this application is at odds with this aim and would remove this open character of the area.
- b) The application would set a precedent for other pockets of land within the estate to be enclosed, thus eroding the character of the area.
- c) The application is similar to the previous application which was refused on the grounds of loss of open space. This should also be refused on the grounds of loss of open space.
- d) The hedge will reduce openness and should be restricted to 0.5 metres in height.
- e) The tree is protected and will be lost as a result of the wall being constructed.

Objections on design grounds

- f) The building line for No. 11 (south of the site) is 5.5m from the back of pavement. Owing to the bend in the road, this building line should be continued and the new boundary should also be located 5.5 metres from the back of the road.

Objections regarding the impact on Highway safety

- g) Highway safety issue; To enclose the corner would reduce visibility to traffic travelling around the bend and pedestrians crossing the road

The following non-material planning issues were raised;

- h) Money making exercise by the applicant;
- i) The applicant will build an extension and create a HIMO (House in Multiple Occupation);
- j) The tree will be removed
- k) Applicant does not look after his property – left in a poor state of repair

Appraisal

Objections regarding the impact on the character of the area

Objections have been raised regarding the loss of openness as a result of the new boundary wall and hedge. The officer report does acknowledge there will be some loss of openness, however the introduction of an attractive boundary 2 metres from the back of the footpath with landscaped grass verge and low level hedging is considered to maintain the visual amenity and some level of openness the site provides. It is therefore considered that whilst there will be some loss of openness, the

amenity value of the site will be maintained and the proposal is thus in accordance with Policy GE2 of the Coventry Local Plan, 2016.

The application proposal has been significantly amended since the refused scheme, which sought to construct a 1.8 metre close boarded fence 0.7 metres from the back of the footpath to Bransford Avenue. The extent of the fencing followed the footpath to the south of the site. The current scheme has sought to address officer's concerns regarding the impact on openness and the incongruous nature of the boundary treatment. The current proposal shows a 2 metre gap from the back of the footpath to the new boundary wall. This is considered to give the characteristic spacing between footpaths and built form which is prevalent in the area. Furthermore the boundary wall will be constructed of brick piers interspersed with close boarded fencing, which it is considered represents a high quality boundary, and is in accordance with the New Residential Guidance SPG.

Concern has been raised regarding this proposal setting a precedent for future losses of open space within the estate. It is considered that this proposal will not result in the complete loss of open space, therefore will not set a precedent for the complete erosion of open spaces across the estate. It is acknowledged there will be some reduction, however officers consider the openness of this corner will not be eroded to a demonstrable level which would warrant refusal of this application. The proposal complies with the Local Plan Policies and has secured a degree of openness which reflects the character of the area. In terms of future applications on open space, these will be assessed individually against local plan policy and on their own merits. It is not considered this proposal will set a precedent in the area, owing to their being not a complete loss of green space in this instance.

Regarding the height of the hedge. The height will be restricted to 1 metre in height, which is lower than the existing hedge at No.11. This is considered a reasonable height to maintain visibility across footpaths and maintain openness. Highways officers have raised no objections with regards to reduction in visibility as a result of this hedge.

There have been several objections regarding the loss of the tree which will lead to a loss of amenity value, with some residents raising concern the tree is protected. To clarify; the tree is not protected under a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). The Tree officer does not consider it worthy of a Tree Preservation Order as is outlined in the officer report.

The tree is not indicated to be removed as part of this proposal therefore no replacement planting can be requested. Furthermore, the tree can be removed at any time and this removal is outside of the scope of this planning application.

Objections on design grounds

An objection has been received on the basis on the proposal infringing the building line to No.11. It is considered that given there is a curve in the road, there is no set building line in this instance to assess the proposal against.

Objections regarding the impact on Highway safety

Concern has been raised regarding the location of the new boundary and the potential for it to reduce visibility to drivers and pedestrians in the vicinity. Highways Officers have been consulted and do not consider the boundary will cause an obstruction to drivers or pedestrians owing to the wide sweeping path of Bransford Avenue. It is therefore considered the proposal is acceptable from a Highway safety aspect.

	<p>Response to non-material planning objections</p> <p>References to the future use of No.10 Lichen green have been made. Several local residents are concerned that this property will utilise this additional land and form a new extension to create a larger house in multiple occupation, and this is a 'money making exercise by the applicant'. This is outside of the scope of this planning application and cannot be considered a material planning consideration in this instance. It should be noted that any future extensions to the property are likely to be subject to planning permission and will be assessed on their own merit against local plan policies.</p> <p>Concern has also been raised regarding the current state of the property (No. 10 Lichen Green). This is outside the scope of this planning assessment.</p>
Item No. 9	<p>Application No. - LB/2018/2494</p> <p>Description of Development - Listed Building Consent for the demolition of upper level pedestrian footbridges, ramps, walkways, canopies and covered escalator serving the West Orchards Shopping Centre. Extension and alteration of existing retail units incorporating the insertion of new shopfronts.</p> <p>Site Address - Upper Precinct Smithford Way</p> <p>Planning history</p> <p>There is a typo within the Planning History section of the report on page 45. The decision date for LB/2017/2781 should read 18th December 2017, and not 2018.</p> <p>Additional consultee responses</p> <p>Historic England have provided additional comments that state that they have read the committee report and are pleased to see condition No.5 has been recommended; but that they are concerned that one of their suggested conditions has not been applied requiring respective tenants to have signed leases and confirmed in writing that they will not take on units unless the removal of the canopies and the enclosure of the colonnades take place. Historic England considers that their suggested condition is not ultra vires. This matter has been dealt with on page 54 of the officer report. The NPPF requires conditions to meet the six tests in that they are: necessary; relevant to planning and; to the development to be permitted; enforceable; precise and; reasonable in all other respects. It is clear that it is for the Local Planning Authority to assess if conditions meet the six tests, and it remains the view of Officers that whether applied as a condition or legal agreement Historic England's suggestion does not meet the six tests and the imposition of such a requirement upon the applicant is unreasonable, imprecise and unenforceable. Further concerns are raised to such a piecemeal approach to the removal of canopies and installation of shop fronts to only those units that have obtained the tenancy agreements suggested by Historic England. Given the existing vacancies within the precinct such a condition would make it difficult to deal with the redevelopment holistically.</p>
Item No. 10	<p>Application No. - S73M/2018/2495</p> <p>Description of Development - Variation of condition 2 (plan numbers) and removal of conditions No. 2, 7, 10, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 21 and 22 imposed upon original Application: FUL/2017/2767 for the demolition of upper level pedestrian footbridges, ramps, walkways, canopies and covered escalator serving the West Orchards Shopping Centre. Extension and alteration of existing retail units incorporating the insertion of new shopfronts and associated stopping up of highway. Change of use, and extension at rear and roof level, of existing retail unit (A1 use) and upper level ancillary storage areas</p>

	<p>in northern link building to student accommodation (sui generis use) providing 75 student rooms within six cluster flats and communal facilities granted on 15/12/17.</p> <p>Site Address - Upper Precinct</p> <p>Planning history</p> <p>There is a typo within the Planning History section of the report on page 77. The decision date for LB/2017/2781 should read 18th December 2017, and not 2018.</p>
Item No. 11	<p>Application No. - OUT/2018/2115</p> <p>Description of Development - Hybrid planning application comprising:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Outline planning for demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide up to 1,000 student bed spaces and up to 2,500 Sqm (GEA) floor space for academic purposes with associated access works, plant, parking, landscaping and ancillary works. All matters reserved. 2) Outline planning for the creation of new pedestrian/cycle route including demolition of two existing dwellings and associated drainage, landscaping and ancillary works. All matters reserved. 3) Outline planning for erection of a new academic building comprising up to 5,000 sq.m (GEA) floor space for academic purposes with associated access works, plant, parking, landscaping and ancillary works. All matters reserved. 4) Outline planning for the erection of new academic building comprising up to 10,555 sq.m (GEA) floor space with associated access works, plant, parking, landscaping and ancillary works. All matters reserved. 5) Outline planning for demolition of existing buildings and erection of new academic buildings comprising up to 18,330 sq.m (GEA) floor space with associated access works, plant, parking, landscaping and ancillary works. All matters reserved. 6) Full planning for the demolition of Car Park 7 and redevelopment for a new Faculty of Arts Building with associated access works, plant, parking, landscaping and ancillary works. 7) Full planning for the development of new Interdisciplinary Biomedical Research Building with associated access works, plant, parking, landscaping and other ancillary works. 8) Outline planning to create new public realm with associated drainage, landscaping and ancillary works, including removal of existing car park. All matters reserved. 9) Outline planning for demolition of existing decked car park and redevelopment of a 650 space multi-storey car park with associated access works, plant, parking, landscaping and ancillary works. All matters reserved <p>Site Address - The University of Warwick Gibbet Hill Road</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Planning Committee are recommended to delegate the granting of planning permission to the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement relating to highway implications and NHS contribution and subject to conditions.</p> <p>Consultation</p> <p>Highways England comments that they have been liaising directly with the applicant and transport consultants. They have agreed trip generation and distribution matters and reviewed the TA. They have been concerned regards potential impact of traffic generated by the development and requested a sensitivity test be undertaken to determine the impact at the Stoneleigh junction should the proposed WCC improvement</p>

scheme not go ahead within the anticipated timescales. They conclude that as there is no indication that the applicant would seek to deliver a scheme of mitigation at the junction conditions would be required to ensure highway works are delivered to reduce the traffic impacts to an acceptable level. They comment that discussions regarding S106 are ongoing and they would like to continue to be involved to ensure a robust agreement is in place upon the granting of planning permission.

Warwickshire County Council have lifted their holding objection and requested contributions towards the A46 link road – phase 2. As such the total contributions towards Highway improvements are as follows:

Element	£
Cycle facility along Lynchgate Road	100,000
Pedestrian/ Cycle route through the University from Westwood Way to Kirby Corner Road	50,000
Support traffic management measures on Cannon Hill Road	100,000
Support the Highway Authority's to address car parking issues	50,000
Bond for measures to help mitigate against detrimental impacts as a result of the 16% increase of traffic flow threshold being exceeded.	300,000
WCC contribution towards A46 link Road – Phase 2.	£650,000
Total Contribution	£1,250,000

Counter Terrorism Unit - Raise no objections on the receipt of additional information.

Urban Design Officer has made comments on the updated Design and Access Statement and amended parameter plan for Project 9.

"The proposed façade treatments 1 and 3 seem to show promise. The organic wave form of façade proposal 1 combined with the more natural organic materials on page 69 would help create a building that blends more into the tree canopy and the skyline. This could also be combined with elements of indicative façade design 3. Further work will need to be undertaken at the detailed design stage to ensure that the 'horizontal' of the roof line is broken up – the top needs to dissolve more into the sky, this could be done through varying the height of the cladding to the top of the building and 'thinning' the material toward the top.

We will need to ensure that all railings and crash barriers to the upper floor are hidden behind the cladding and consideration will need to be given to minimising the impact of any lighting columns and stair/lift cores. Low height lighting solutions should be used if at all possible and any columns/light units should be hidden by the cladding. The lift/stair cores should be as low as possible with lift overruns etc. kept to a minimum. Any fall-arrest systems to the top of the cores should be low level and not visible."

A further 7 objection letters have been received raising the following:

- a. Objection to any uplift in car parking spaces at the University.

- b. The TA states that the building of the NAIC and the Sports hub has required additional car parking spaces, however, why were they not taken into account when the NAIC was granted.
- c. Locating Multi Storey Car Parks (MSCP) on the periphery of the University Campus only then locates them on the fringes with residential development and impacts on the visual amenity of the area.
- d. The MSCP at Lynchgate is an eyesore and therefore they object to the MSCP proposed for project 9
- e. Concerns of congestion around the university and Cannon Hill / Cannon Park.
- f. The objectors wish to see the proposed packages of measures to include the A46 works and the works to the A46 are in place before any of the development is occupied.
- g. Existing bus stopping on Gibbet Hill causes congestion as cars cannot pass. The number of bus services along Gibbet Hill Road will increase due to the development and make congestion worse.
- h. Discrepancies against the Transport Assessment (TA) between the application for the proposed 425 dwellings off Westwood Heath Road and TA submitted with this application.
- i. The application should not be granted consent unless mitigation measures are proposed that reduce delays on the Westwood Heath Road approach to the Gibbet Hill Road roundabout to the levels without the proposed development.

Appraisal

Highways

The conditions suggested by Highways England relate to construction traffic impact and a satisfactory scheme of works at the A46 Stoneleigh junction. Discussions with Highways England are ongoing to establish the correct wording of such conditions as it is imperative that the conditions meet the tests and relate to mitigating the impact and its source. For example: projects 2 and 8 have no highway impact and shouldn't be subject to such conditions.

The additional objections are noted, however, they have not raised any new issues with regards to the assessment of this application. The highway implications have been robustly assessed by Coventry City Council Highways Authority, Warwick County Council Highway Authority in conjunction with Highways England. All consultees have raised no objections subject to suitable mitigation measures being implemented, as above.

The objection to Project 9, the Multi Storey Car Park (MSCP) is noted. A revised Design and Access Statement has been submitted which depicts a design brief for the MSCP, the Urban Design Officer is satisfied that a MSCP can be accommodated successfully in this location and as indicated on the parameters plan for project 9.

The detailed design will be subject to Reserved Matters application.

Additional/Amended Conditions

Project 1

Condition No.2: Amended to include the red line site plan drawing number.

Condition No.3: Approval for Reserved Matters has been increased from 3 to 5 years.

Condition No.4: time limit for commencing development increased from 5 to 7 years.

Condition No.19: includes LAQM.TG(16) instead of LAQM.TG(09).

Condition No.26: Project 1 add for clarification.

Project 2

Condition No.28: The parameters plan drawing no. 0208-01-152 Rev B has been added together with the wording of condition no.27.

Condition No.29: Approval for Reserved Matters has been increased from 3 to 5 years.

Condition No.30: time limit for commencing development increased from 5 to 7 years.

Condition No.31: reworded

Condition No.45: deleted as public realm and the air quality implications will be taken into account during the other surrounding projects.

Condition No.49: deleted as repeated reason from condition above.

Condition No.50: 'Project 2' added for clarification.

Project 3

Condition No.52: Condition No.51 was added to the wording together with the drawing no. 0208-A-01-154 Rev D.

Condition No.53: Approval for Reserved Matters has been increased from 3 to 5 years.

Condition No.54: time limit for commencing development increased from 5 to 7

Condition No.69: includes LAQM.TG(16) instead of LAQM.TG(09).

Condition No.75 'project 3' added to the wording.

Project 4

Condition No.77: drawing no. 0208-A-01-154 Rev D was added to the wording.

Condition No.78: Approval for Reserved Matters has been increased from 3 to 5 years.

Condition No.79: time limit for commencing development increased from 5 to 7

Condition No.94: includes LAQM.TG(16) instead of LAQM.TG(09).

Condition No.100 'project 4' added to the wording.

Project 5

Condition No.102: drawing no. 0208-A-01-158 Rev D was added to the wording.

Condition No.103: Approval for Reserved Matters has been increased from 3 to 5 years.

Condition No.104: time limit for commencing development increased from 5 to 7

Condition No.119: includes LAQM.TG(16) instead of LAQM.TG(09).

Condition No.125 'project 5' added to the wording.

Project 6

Condition No.134 reworded

Condition No.137 reworded

Condition No.144 has been reworded and LAQM.TG(09) changed to LAQM.TG(16).

Condition No.148 deleted as not required.

Condition No.149 'project 6' added.

Project 7

Condition No.154 has been reworded to include reference to submitted documentation.

Condition No.157 re worded

Condition No.158 re worded

Condition No.160 deleted repetition.

Condition No.162: re worded

Condition No.163: approved documentation has been added to the wording of the condition.

Condition No.164 deleted repetition.

Condition No. 169 has been reworded and LAQM.TG(09) changed to LAQM.TG(16).

Condition No.174 'project 7' has been added to the wording.

Project 8

Condition No.176: The parameters plan drawing no. 0208-A-01-160 Rev C has been added.

Condition No.177: Approval for Reserved Matters has been increased from 3 to 5 years.

Condition No.178: time limit for commencing development increased from 5 to 7 years.

Condition No.179: re worded

Condition No.194: deleted as public realm and the air quality implications will be taken into account during the other surrounding projects.

Condition No.199: 'Project 8' added for clarification.

Project 9

Condition No.201: drawing no. 0208-A-01-158 Rev A and the Design and Access Statement Rev A was added to the wording.

Condition No.202: Condition No.201 wording added and Approval for Reserved Matters has been increased from 3 to 5 years.

Condition No.203: time limit for commencing development increased from 5 to 7

Condition No.216: includes LAQM.TG(16) instead of LAQM.TG(09).

Condition No.221 'project 9' added to the wording.

Item No. 12	<p>Application No. - FUL/2018/1732</p> <p>Description of Development - Construction of a new station building, providing a second entrance at the western end of the station, including passenger facilities (including waiting area and seating, retail/ cafe kiosk concessions, WCs, baby changing facilities), pedestrian lift access between concourse levels, staff welfare facilities, with associated lighting, soft and hard landscaping, services and boundary treatment. Construction of; new and temporary roads; and a new 634-space multi-storey car park.</p> <p>Site Address - Coventry Railway Station Station Square</p> <p>Consultation</p> <p>An additional objection has been received following the receipt of the Transport Addendum and the publication of the committee report. The objections are summarised below:</p> <p><u>a) Traffic Impact</u></p> <p>The TA predicts a total delay of 26-27% compared to a scenario without the development. This is not a small impact upon the overall network performance. Furthermore, the committee report gives the impression that the proposal would not affect delay in the PM peak, as it only refers to delay in relation to the AM peak. The TA actually shows a delay of 15% in the AM peak and 27% for the PM peak. Furthermore, assessments within the TA compare the impact of the development to those of the Friargate development (as set out at table 12 of the TA). The predicted increase in delay is a simple comparison of the impacts of the Coventry Station Masterplan to those of the Friargate scheme.</p> <p><u>b) Warwick Road/Central Six Roundabout</u></p> <p>The predicted impact upon the Warwick Road/Central Six roundabout would be significant. Table 16 of the TA predicts queues of 91m on the Central Six access road and 212m on the multi storey car park exit. In addition there would be queues of 236-247m for southbound traffic at the King Henry VIII school crossing. As the roundabout is approximately 150m to the south of the crossing, queueing traffic could extend through the roundabout. This is a significant impact which should be mitigated in accordance with paragraph 108 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.15 of the Addendum demonstrates that provision of a flare and pedestrian refuge would reduce queueing on the Central Six arm of the junction. However, amended drawings have not been submitted and commitment to a flare has not been given.</p> <p>Given the modifications to the roundabout are only required at this time to enable the bus interchange and the egress from the multi-storey car park, it is proper that these impacts be considered as part of the planning application. The suggested highway works (flare and pedestrian refuge) are required to mitigate the unacceptable impacts of the development and implementation of them should be conditioned to ensure they occur prior to bringing the development into use.</p> <p><u>c) Central Six access</u></p> <p>The Addendum predicts an increase in queue length on the Central Six arm of the roundabout from 24m to 91m and the journey time to travel 100m along this road to the junction would increase from 12 seconds to 26 seconds. An increase in the delay will</p>
----------------	--

adversely affect the viability of the retail park by deterring customers from visiting. Improving the flare to the Central Six access would mitigate this adverse impact.

d) Pedestrian safety

The removal of the existing pedestrian refuge on the Central Six arm of the roundabout and replacement with a zebra crossing would be detrimental to pedestrian safety as many would not be prepared to undertake the required detour and would attempt to cross close to the roundabout without a refuge. A phase 1 road safety audit would normally be undertaken prior to determination of a planning application.

e) Bus interchange layout

Concerns regarding the access to bus layover spaces within the new bus station and potential need to reverse towards Central Six access.

f) Construction impacts

There would be adverse impact upon the retail park arising from highway works and construction of the bus interchange

g) Sustainable travel

No travel plan has been submitted, contrary to national guidance

h) Potential link road through retail park

The Addendum should have included a replacement figure 26, which shows a link road through the retail park. Any other text referring to the potential link road should be removed.

i) Initial Highway consultation response

The Highway Authority response does not include an assessment of the merits of the proposed development or commentary on why the significant congestion predicted in the TA is considered to be acceptable. The use of the term severe in the response appears to be a reference to the 2012 NPPF, whereas the 2018 NPPF is more specific in consideration of transport impacts and includes reference to mitigation of significant congestion and highway safety issues.

One further objection has been received, which is summarised below:

j) The TA only considers up to 2021, as opposed to 2031 when the train station usage is proposed to increase by 75%.

k) There is no provision for rapid transit.

l) The Station Square pedestrian route to the new building crosses the proposed vehicular drop off lane twice. This is not safe.

m) No improvement are proposed to existing cycle routes / linkages such as the inadequate Spencer Park / City Centre link

n) The proposal would direct cyclists onto a dual carriageway roundabout.

o) More W.C.'s should be provided in the station.

p) An air quality assessment should be provided prior to determination of the application

q) Free parking for short periods of time should be included in the car park to aid pick up / drop off

Appraisal

In response to the additional objections received:-

a) Traffic Impact

It is acknowledged that the predicted increase in total delay on Warwick Road is 15% in the AM peak and 27% in the PM peak. However, it is considered that this increase is not significant and that mitigation is not required in order to make the application acceptable in Highway terms.

b) Warwick Road/Central Six Roundabout

It is acknowledged that there would be queues on the Central Six arm of the roundabout, however, this does not fall on adopted highway and as such this is not a material consideration for the Highway Authority. With regard to the queuing on the arm of the roundabout for the multi storey car park; the queueing would primarily fall within the car park and is only partially on adopted highway on this basis the impact does not result in significant harm to the highway network.

On the basis of the above the addition of a flare/pedestrian refuge is not considered to be necessary to make the development acceptable.

The queue southbound from the King Henry school crossing is currently 209m, which takes it past the existing Warwick Road / Central Six roundabout. This is predicted to increase to 247m, which is an increase of 18%. This is not considered to be a significant impact on this existing congested urban network.

c) Central Six access

As above, it is acknowledged that there would be queues on the Central Six arm of the roundabout. However, this would not fall on adopted highway and as such is not a material consideration for the Highway Authority. Therefore the addition of a flare/pedestrian refuge is not considered to be necessary to make the development acceptable.

As stated in the report, whilst any adverse economic impact upon the viability of Central Six retail park would be regrettable, the vast majority of the retail park lies outside of the defined City Centre and any impact would not outweigh the benefits associated with the development of the station building.

d) Pedestrian safety

It is considered that the provision of a controlled pedestrian crossing (such as a zebra) is inherently safer than an uncontrolled pedestrian refuge. The technical approvals of the highway scheme for remodelling of the junction shall include road safety audits in accordance with DMRB (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges). Phase 1 road safety audits are not normally required to be undertaken prior to determination of planning applications within Coventry.

e) Bus interchange layout

This relates to the previously approved bus interchange application (FUL/2018/1733) and as such is not a material planning consideration for this application.

f) Construction impacts

As stated in the committee report, impacts during construction are, by their nature, both inevitable and time limited and do not outweigh the benefits of the proposal.

g) Sustainable impacts

	<p>As stated in the committee report, this was not considered necessary by the Highway Authority as the proposal will improve the sustainable transport offer to users of the station by the inclusion of electric vehicle charging parking bays and would also be linked to the approved new bus interchange via a pedestrian access under Warwick Road. A cycle hub has also recently opened at the station and current franchise operator encourages sustainable access to the station via their website.</p> <p>h) Potential link road through retail park</p> <p>As per the committee report, the potential link road is not part of the application and the Transport Assessment does not take this link road into account. The Addendum confirms that the figure in question has not been included in the transport modelling in the Transport Assessment. It is not necessary to remove the figure or amend the text as reference to it results in no harm.</p> <p>i) Initial Highway consultation response</p> <p>The application has been reviewed with reference to 2018 NPPF whereby the term severe is still used at paragraph 109, where it states that “development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe”. For the avoidance of doubt, it is the Highway Authority’s position that there would not be an unacceptable impact upon highway safety, nor would the residual cumulative impacts upon the road network be severe.</p> <p>In response to j) above The TA considers a future scenario of 2021 on the basis that this is the anticipated completion date for the development. This is a standard approach in the compilation of Transport Assessment</p> <p>In response to k) above There is no provision for Rapid Transit as the application itself is for improvement to an existing passenger transport hub.</p> <p>In response to m) – n) above It is not considered that there would be any pedestrian or cycle safety problems but pedestrian and cycle safety routes within the immediate vicinity of the proposed development will be analysed further as part of the road safety audit process of the Highway Technical Approval. Furthermore, it is not considered that any improvements to existing pedestrian / cycle routes within the wider area are required to make the development acceptable.</p> <p>In response to o) above; the amount of W.C. provision is not a material planning consideration</p> <p>In response to p) above; Environmental Protection have recommended an Air Quality Assessment as a condition on any approval, as oppose to requiring one prior to determination.</p> <p>In response to q) above; it is understood that there will be free parking for a short period in at least part of the car park to facilitate pick up of passengers</p> <p>In conclusion, the highway impacts of the development have been thoroughly assessed and the impacts would not be significant, subject to the imposition of conditions listed in the report.</p>
Item No. 14	<p>Application No. - S73/2018/1873</p> <p>Description of Development - Variation of condition 5 and 6 - (to allow repairs and valeting of vehicles 24 hours per day 7 days per week and deliveries to site between</p>

0700-2300 hours everyday) - imposed upon permisison OUT/2013/0041 for mixed use redevelopment of site

Site Address - Evans Halshaw Car Store 800 Old Church Road

Appraisal

An additional condition is proposed, as recommended by Environmental Protection, as it was inadvertently missed off the list published with the Committee report.

Additional Condition

No repair work shall be undertaken in external areas between the hours of 2100-0900.

Reason: *To safeguard the amenities of nearby residential occupiers in accordance with guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.*