

<b>Agenda Item</b> A5	<b>Committee Date</b> 16 October 2017	<b>Application Number</b> 17/00345/FUL
<b>Application Site</b>  Royal Lancaster Infirmary Ashton Road Lancaster Lancashire	<b>Proposal</b>  Erection of 6 storey staff car park on the site of the existing staff car park (west of main hospital complex) and the regrading, resurfacing and new layout of entrance/exit routes to the existing visitors car park (east of main hospital complex) and erection of a single storey day nursery (D1 use class)	
<b>Name of Applicant</b>  Mr Tristram Reynolds NHS Morecambe Bay Trust	<b>Name of Agent</b>  Mr Andrew Goodwin	
<b>Decision Target Date</b>  3 July 2017	<b>Reason For Delay</b>  Negotiation and assessment of traffic impacts and highway designs.	
<b>Case Officer</b>	Mrs Jennifer Rehman	
<b>Departure</b>	N/A	
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Approval	

## **1.0 The Site and its Surroundings**

- 1.1 The application site relates to the Royal Lancaster Infirmary (RLI) located and accessed off Ashton Road A588 via the Pointer Roundabout, south of Lancaster's city centre. The RLI site occupies a large triangular parcel of land effectively between Lancaster Canal to the northwest, Ashton Road (unclassified cul-de-sac) to the east and Ripley School/Sixth Form to the southwest with the West Coast Mainline beyond. There are some NHS buildings and uses located to the east side of Ashton Road including the existing visitor car park. The land is heavily built-up and comprises a mix of historic buildings, utilitarian building blocks and modular temporary buildings typical to most health institutions across the country. Between the buildings land is taken up by surface level parking, a helipad, internal service roads and pockets of landscaping.
- 1.2 The applicant's proposals cover two separate parcels of land within the wider RLI site. The staff car park proposals relate to land to the rear (west) of the hospital where the existing surface level staff car park is located. This car park lies adjacent to Aldcliffe Road Conservation Area (to the north), with Medical Unit 2 and the Mortuary to the east, a day nursery (within the RLI complex) and the recreational playing fields associated with Ripley High School to the south and southwest. To the north of the staff car park a narrow band of predominately tall deciduous Ash trees (not protected) line the stone wall boundary between the existing staff car park and Aldcliffe Road Conservation Area, specifically Aldcliffe Yard, which has recently been re-developed and comprises a combination of residential conversions and newly built dwellinghouses. This adjacent development is predominately two-storey in scale and occupies a group of grade II listed buildings fronting the canal. A further linear group of trees separate the site from the recreational fields (PPG 17 land) to the south west. None of these trees are protected. The surrounding hospital buildings (to the east of the staff car park) range in height from single storey to four-storeys high. The existing nursery is a single storey modular building set within an enclosed curtilage situated in the furthestmost southern part of the site (to the rear of Medical Unit 2).

- 1.3 The second parcel of land relates to the existing visitor car park. This is located to the eastern side of the main hospital complex. This car park is a surface-level car park accessed off the unclassified section of Ashton Road (hereafter referred to as Ashton Road) with its main entrance located to the south side of Ashton Court and its exit close to the emergency drop off at the Centenary Building. This car park includes the last remaining remnants of the former railway goods platform. This is now incorporated into a raised landscaped area comprising a group of mature trees (not protected) along the visitor car parks' western boundary with Ashton Road. The south eastern boundary of the car park predominately consists of native hedgerow with some trees. As the car park tapers towards the southern end of the site where a small triangular parcel of green space provides some landscaping. This area forms part of the highway and is outside the application site. The eastern boundary comprises of a mix of hedgerow/tree specimens to the south west of Railway Street and Boundary Road and a high stone wall to the rear of properties on South Road. There are some off-site trees in this location, in particular a group of trees located behind 2-16 South Road which are protected by Tree Preservation Order Number (TPO) 347(2003).
- 1.4 The eastern visitor car park is bound by residential dwellings to the east, including Railway Street, Boundary Road and South Road. These consist of traditional stone terraces. Railway Street and Boundary Road properties are two-storey and orientated northwest-southeast either flanking or backing the proposed site. The properties on South Road are taller, more prominent stone terraces with larger gardens backing the application site in this location. A number of these properties have been sub-divided into flats. There is an existing pedestrian link through the existing visitor car park to Railway Street.
- 1.5 The site levels across the entire RLI site fall approximately 10m between Ashton Road (main entrance to the hospital) towards the rear of the site adjacent to Aldcliffe Yard (staff car park). This is most noticeable to the rear of the Centenary Building along the internal service road. The scale of existing hospital buildings and site levels are noticeable from Lancaster Canal forming a background view from the canal particularly further eastwards from Aldcliffe Yard.
- 1.6 In terms of other constraints/designations of interest, Lancaster Canal Biological Heritage Site lies within 35m of the boundary of the site (at the western staff car park). Land to the west of the staff car park and beyond the railway line up to the boundary with Haverbreaks, is land designated as Key Urban Landscape and Urban Greenspace, with Morecambe Bay's SPA and Ramsar site and the Lune Estuary SSSI located circa 2km to the west of the application site. The site is located close to Lancaster's Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and lies within its consultation zone.
- 1.7 The RLI site is only 300m south of the city centre with easy access to bus services with bus stops directly outside the hospital and nearby on the A6 or Ashton Road. Both Lancaster's main bus station and railway station are within 1km of the site. Cycle Route 6 runs along the canal from Aldcliffe and towards the city centre where there are various links to the wider cycle network including direct cycle routes from the south and east of the city towards the RLI. There is a direct cycle route from Aldcliffe Road over Basin Bridge extending up through the hospital site. This route runs along the northern boundary of the staff car park.

## **2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 The proposal has three main components, all of which are intended to facilitate improvements to the level of available on-site parking for staff and visitors associated with the RLI. They are:
1. Alterations to the existing visitor car park comprising re-grading; reconfiguration to the access and egress points, re-design to provide additional parking spaces; improvements to pedestrian facilities (pathways/crossings) and provision of cycle/motorcycle parking;
  2. Erection of a new multi-storey staff car park (MSCP) over 6 decks including cycle parking and electric vehicle charging spaces; and,
  3. Relocation and erection of new nursery building and external play area with drop-off facilities and parking provision.
- 2.2 Alterations to the existing visitor car park  
This involves the removal of the earth embankment (former railway platform) and mature trees along its western side to enable regrading and the re-design of the car park layout to provide a total of 242 spaces, of which 24 spaces shall be designated as accessible bays. The car park access located to

the north will move slightly closer to Ashton Court – the proposed access still serves the Trust buildings to the north in this location. The car park exit will be relocated approximately 45m south and will provide a two-lane exit from the proposed car park. The car park shall include pedestrian routes through the car park with separate pedestrian access points onto Ashton Road where two zebra crossings are proposed towards the main RLI complex. The pedestrian access to Railway Street shall be formalised as part of this proposal. In addition a new footway shall be provided to the east side of Ashton Road along the frontage of the visitor car park. Cycle parking for 24 cycles (or motorcycles) are catered for within the visitor car park.

### 2.3 Staff MSCP

The second element of the proposal involves the erection of a 6-deck MSCP for staff building in the location of the existing surface level staff car park. This car park will be accessed via the internal service road as existing via the hospital's second access point off Ashton Road (classified) serving Medical Unit 2, the Mortuary, other NHS buildings and the hospital's day-care nursery. The internal road layout in this location does not substantially change. The MSCP provides a total of 788 parking bays including 11 designated bays – an increase in 524 staff car parking spaces overall in this location. The proposal includes 12 additional cycle parking bays next to the proposed MSCP and proposals to improve the lighting along the existing cycle path which runs to the north of the existing staff car park area. In addition, four electric charging points are proposed adjacent to the MSCP to serve the wider RLI site.

2.4 The proposed building is positioned to the rear of Medical Unit 2. It measures approximately 98m by 52m with its longest axis orientated north-south. The east elevation of the MSCP extends to 98m reducing to approximately 65m (including the splayed section of the building) on the west elevation to account for the zig-zagged footprint along the southwestern boundary. The building at its highest point measures approximately 18.5m (the two circulation towers), gradually dropping to approximately 13.8m, 8.25m and 4m as the MSCP steps down towards the canal (north). Naturally as the building steps down the floor areas of the decks reduce also.

2.5 The proposed building will be a cast-concrete structure. The concept for the façade treatment is a combination of concrete 'ribbons' forming the upstands (walls) to each deck and timber-effect vertical and horizontal cladding panels in a range of brown hues. Behind the cladding protective mesh would be applied as a matter of health and safety. The two tall circulation towers shall be finished in natural concrete featuring a central glazing wall.

### 2.6 Nursery building

The proposed development involves the relocation of the existing nursery. A new modular building measuring approximately 23m by 16.5m with a height of approximately 3m is proposed to the north west of the proposed MSCP. This includes an enclosed external play space between the car park and the nursery building which also wraps around the southwestern elevation of the building. An acoustic fence is proposed around the building and external space. Drop-off facilities and staff parking is proposed to the front of the nursery at the same level that currently exists. The building shall be finished in a timber-effect vertical cladding system with dark grey aluminium window frames/doors with a dark grey flat roof system with deep fascia's and large overhangs to the entrance and to create a covered external play space.

## 3.0 Site History

3.1 The hospital site has an extensive planning history. Only the applications that are specifically relevant to the proposed development are listed in the table below, this includes the relevant parent planning consent associated with the residential development to the former British Waterways site. The applicant submitted an application for a multi-storey staff car park and alterations to the visitor car park in April 2015. This application was withdrawn following officer advice that the proposal was not capable of being supported due to highway/traffic, heritage, air quality and arboricultural concerns and due to inconsistencies and inadequacies in the submission. The applicant has since undertaken formal pre-application discussions with the Council.

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
17/00407/EIR	Screening request for erection of 6 storey staff car park on the site of the existing staff car park (west of main hospital complex) and the regrading, resurfacing and new layout of	Not Environmental Impact

	entrance/exit routes to the existing visitors car park (east of main hospital complex) and erection of a crèche	Assessment (EIA) development
<b>15/00493/FUL</b>	Erection of 5 storey staff car park on the site of the existing staff car park (west of main hospital complex) and the regrading, resurfacing and new layout of entrance/exit routes to the existing visitors car park (east of main hospital complex)	Withdrawn
<b>15/00508/EIR</b>	Screening request for a 4 Storey staff car park on the site of the existing staff car park, new layout for the ambulance/visitor drop off zone & the resurfacing and new layout and entrance/exit routes of the existing visitors car park.	Not EIA development
<b>09/00123/FUL</b> <i>(and associated listed building consents and subsequent variation of condition applications)</i>	Residential development comprising the conversion of Listed Buildings to provide six dwellings and the erection of 8 new dwellings	Permitted
<b>09/00251/DPA</b>	Construction of a cycle route between Aldcliffe Road and Ashton Road, through Lancaster Infirmary	Permitted

#### **4.0 Consultation Responses**

4.1 The following responses have been received from statutory and non-statutory consultees:

<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>County Highways</b>	<p><b>No objections</b> subject to the delivery of highway mitigation (Pointer Roundabout lane alterations); highway works to the junction of Ashton Road A588 and Ashton Road (unclassified); pedestrian improvements works to Ashton Road (unclassified); and the delivery of all proposed sustainable measures, including cycle, electric charging facilities, implementation of the Travel Plan and the following obligations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Funding for 1 bus to increase Park and Ride services to 15 minute frequencies during daytime hours 6 days a week for 4 years (3 years post MSCP opening;</li> <li>2) £10,000 for bus stop and safety improvements within the MSCP;</li> <li>3) £10,000 for a review and implementation of residential parking areas around the RLI site;</li> <li>4) £75,000 towards improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the Pointer Roundabout; and,</li> <li>5) £6,000 for Travel Plan support.</li> </ol> <p>A number of conditions are also recommended to secure off-site highway works, details of the access arrangements, car parking management, traffic and construction management and submission and implementation of a Travel Plan.</p>
<b>Conservation Officer</b>	<p><b>No objections</b> - The proposal will have some harm/impact to the setting/views from the Conservation Area but the impact is judged less than substantial and should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposals in accordance with paragraph 134 of the NPPF. Taking account of the amendments made, the proposals are considered acceptable subject to conditions relating to materials and finishes.</p>
<b>Environmental Health Service</b>	<p><b>No objection. Noise</b> – considering the proposals in terms of layout and design, entrance and exit areas in relation to existing dwellings, shift patterns and times of peak usage, the existing use of the land and the noisescape at this location, it is judged unlikely that the proposed development will cause unreasonable ‘observed effect levels’ in respect of noise. <b>Contaminated Land</b> – no comments received. <b>Air Quality</b> – objection on the grounds that the proposed mitigation is not sufficient to address the impacts of the development.</p>
<b>Lancashire Archaeology Advisory Service</b>	<p><b>No objections</b> subject to archaeological recording condition.</p>
<b>Lead Flood Authority (LLFA)</b>	<p><b>No objection</b> subject to sustainable drainage conditions.</p>

<b>United Utilities</b>	<b>No objection</b> subject to development according with the Flood Risk Assessment.
<b>Natural England</b>	<b>No comments.</b>
<b>Canal and Rivers Trust</b>	<b>No objection</b> subject to appropriate bat lighting strategy and retention of trees to the northern and western boundaries. They are disappointed about the loss of the green walling as previously proposed.
<b>Lancaster Canal Trust</b>	<b>No objections</b> subject to a suitable bat lighting strategy to safeguard the BHS of the canal.
<b>Tree Protection Officer</b>	<b>Objects</b> due to excessive tree loss to facilitate changes to the visitor car par and lack of suitable replacement planting to mitigation for such loss. The proposal is considered contrary to DM Policy 29.
<b>Lancaster Civic Society</b>	<b>No objections</b> – following amendments they indicate that their earlier objections (to the withdrawn scheme) have been addressed. The re-positioning of the crèche is an added improvement. With regards to the visitor car park, they comment the loss of the former platform remnants is regrettable but accept that the needs of the additional parking would outweigh the loss of the masonry associated with the former platform. They would like to see the masonry re-used elsewhere and suggest appropriate recording of the removal of the platform remnants. The Civic Society add that the Trust should be supporting the Park and Ride service to relieve traffic beyond the construction period.
<b>Lancashire Constabulary</b>	<b>No objections</b> subject to the inclusion of a number of security recommendations including designing the development to meet Safer Parking Scheme standards and Secure by Design New Schools 2014 and/or Commercial 2015 criteria. Other measures include provision of appropriate lighting, CCTV, landscaping, anti-climb barriers and control barriers to the car parks.

## **5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 At the time of compiling this report, 15 letters of objection have been received. The main reasons for opposition are as follows:

- Increased congestion, noise and air pollution;
- The NHS should be doing more to support people's health and the environment;
- A significant increase in on-site parking will not support sustainable travel;
- If the Park and Ride is suitable for construction why not on a long term basis;
- Travel Plan is inadequate;
- Concerns over improvements to the cycle link via Basin Bridge in case this means the link being opened 24 hours;
- Increase risk of crime to neighbouring properties;
- Detrimental impact on neighbouring residential amenity due to its overbearingness in close proximity to smaller properties, subsequent loss of light and increased noise/light pollution;
- Lack of need for the staff parking proposed – outside Monday-Friday 9-5 the car park is virtually empty;
- MSCP building is excessive in scale, out of proportion (described as monstrous) and will have detrimental impact on the skyline, the conservation area and its setting and the enjoyment of Lancaster canal;
- MSCP has increased in height from earlier proposals;
- MSCP will result in a loss of views over the canal;
- MSCP will not resolve the Trust's concerns as it only caters for 50% of the existing demand and the Trust have failed to evidence improvements and modal shifts to sustainable travel (evident by the 33% increase in car users between 2009 and 2015);
- MSCP has increased from 733 to 788 spaces;
- Concerns over consultation.

Some local residents have indicated they support the modifications to set the building back from Aldcliffe Yard but are concerned by the increased scale at the southern end.

An objection from the Ward Councillor for Scotforth West (Councillor Abi Mills) has been received commenting that despite being fully aware of the need to address parking issues in neighbouring areas of Greaves, caused mostly by staff from the RLI, the Travel Plan submitted is inadequate and fails to demonstrate the Trust is committed to modal shift from car use to sustainable transport.

A letter of support has been received from County Councillor for Lancaster East (Lizzi Collinge). The reasons for support include alleviation of the impact of hospital staff parking in other areas of the city, particularly in the residential areas of Moorlands and Primrose; improvements for visitors and patients including increased provision for disabled motorists; proposal should assist with staff recruitment; proposal still leads to an increase in sustainable transport measures; there should be enforcement of parking regulations and parking pass costs should relate to salary levels.

## **6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies**

### **6.1 National Planning Policy Framework:**

Paragraphs 7, 12 and 14 – Achieving Sustainable Development

Paragraph 17 – Core Principles

Paragraphs 32, 34, 35, 36, 39 and 41) – Promoting Sustainable Transport

Paragraphs 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66) – Requiring Good Design

Paragraph 111 – Planning should encourage the effective use of land

Paragraph 118 – Biodiversity

Paragraph 120 - 125 – Land contamination, noise and light pollution and air quality considerations

Paragraphs 128 – 141 – Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

Paragraphs 187 – Decision Taking

Paragraphs 188 – 190 – Pre-application Engagement

Paragraphs 196 -197 – Determining Applications

Paragraphs 203 - 206 – Planning Conditions and obligations

### **6.2 Local Planning Policy Overview**

At the 14 December 2016 meeting of its Full Council, the local authority resolved to undertake public consultation on:

- (i) The Strategic Policies and Land Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD); and,
- (ii) A Review of the Development Management DPD.

This enabled progress to be made on the preparation of a Local Plan for the Lancaster District. Public consultation took place from 27 January 2017 to 24 March 2017. Whilst the consultation responses are currently being fully considered, the local authority remains in a position to make swift progress in moving towards the latter stages of: reviewing the draft documents to take account of consultation outcomes, formal publication and submission to Government, and, then independent Examination of the Local Plan. If an Inspector finds that the submitted DPDs have been soundly prepared they may be adopted by the Council, potentially in 2018.

The **Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD** will replace the remaining policies of the Lancaster District Core Strategy (2008) and the residual 'saved' land allocation policies from the 2004 District Local Plan. Following the Council resolution in December 2016, it is considered that the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD is a material consideration in decision-making, although with limited weight. The weight attributed to this DPD will increase as the plan's preparation progresses through the stages described above.

The **Review of the Development Management DPD** updates the policies that are contained within the current document, which was adopted in December 2014. As it is part of the development plan the current document is already material in terms of decision-making. Where any policies in the draft 'Review' document are different from those adopted in 2014, and those policies materially affect the consideration of the planning application, then these will be taken into account during decision-making, although again with limited weight. The weight attributed to the revised policies in the 'Review' will increase as the plan's preparation progresses through the stages described above.

### **6.3 Lancaster District Core Strategy (2008)**

SC1 Sustainable Development

SC5 Achieving Quality in Design

SC6 Crime and Community Safety

E1 Environmental Capital

E2 Transportation Measures

- 6.4 Development Management Plan DPD (2014)  
 DM20 Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages  
 DM21 Walking & Cycling  
 DM22 Vehicle Parking Provision  
 DM23 Transport Efficiency and Travel Plans  
 DM29 Protection of Tress, Hedgerows and Woodland  
 DM30 Development affecting Listed Buildings  
 DM31 Development affecting Conservation Areas  
 DM32 The setting of Designated Heritage assets  
 DM34 Archaeology  
 DM35 Key Design Principles  
 DM37 Air Quality Management and Pollution  
 DM38 Flood Risk  
 DM39 Surface Water & Sustainable Drainage  
 DM48 Community Infrastructure  
 DM49 Local Services  
 Appendix C (Car Parking Standards)
- 6.5 Other Material Considerations  
 District of Lancaster Highways and Transport Masterplan Consultation Draft (March 2015)  
 National Planning Policy Guidance  
 Provision of Electric Vehicle Charging Points New development Planning Advice Note (PAN) (September 2017)  
 Low Emissions and Air Quality Guidance for Development PAN (September 2017)  
 The Setting of Heritage Assets 'Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: Note 3 (March 2015)

## **7.0 Comment and Analysis**

- 7.1 The principal planning considerations in the determination of this application are as follows:
- Highway matters including parking requirements, traffic impacts and sustainable transport measures;
  - Design;
  - Cultural heritage;
  - Residential amenity;
  - Landscaping and ecology.
- 7.2 Highway Matters – Parking Requirements  
 The applicant (hereafter referred to as the Trust) are seeking to improve on-site parking facilities for both staff and visitors. Most significantly, the increase in parking provision proposed by this application relates to staff parking. The Trust currently employs 2,700 staff of which approximately 2,000 are present on site on a typical weekday. The Trust has undertaken staff travel surveys which indicates that approximately 76% of staff currently drive to work. This results in a potential demand for over 1,500 staff parking spaces. When considering other areas for staff parking within the RLI complex, the total number of staff car parking spaces will be 991 spaces, which is equivalent to 66% of the total demand (509 spaces short to meet the demand). The remaining staff travel demands (by car) are catered for as part of the Trusts' Travel Plan proposals (covered later in the report).
- 7.3 The Trust has made a case that the apparent lack of staff car parking facilities on site causes a number of issues, such as; the ability for the Trust to recruit staff, particularly senior staff/consultants; on-road parking around the hospital complex causing obstructions affecting the operation of the hospital; on-street parking in surrounding residential streets; parking difficulties causing staff and visitors to be late for duties and appointments missed/delayed.
- 7.4 The level of proposed parking has been scrutinised at length, not least because of the concerns that a proposal for car parking does not appear to represent a sustainable form of development, particularly having regard to the RLI's highly sustainable location. However, currently the site provides only 488 staff car parking spaces on site (32% of the demand) and the knock-on effect of this causes serious problems for the Trust (and the surrounding area). The proposal increases the available staff park spaces to approximately 66% of the demand. There are no objections in principle

to the Trust increasing their parking provision to better meet their existing demands. The fundamental issue is how the remaining demand is catered for via the Travel Plan and how the Trust commits to a modal shift to more sustainable transport modes (discussed later in the report) to support their proposal and limit the impacts.

- 7.5 Having regard to the staff surveys, car park management, the existing daily usage profile (factored to represent a typical day), the car park accumulation modelling in the Transport Assessment (TA) (and subsequent technical notes), the assessment highlights that the MSCP would typically be operating at 92% of its total capacity (726 spaces). This means a theoretical over-provision of spaces of 62 spaces. The local highway authority has confirmed that it is important that there is a level of spare capacity provided at peak times and that car parks typically operate efficiently at 85%-90% capacity. This is to avoid unnecessary vehicle circulation while users search for spaces. In this case, a further argument is put forward in respect of staff work patterns and the need for the spare capacity (increased parking demand) to cater for shift patterns and change-overs. This point has been accepted. Even if the targets in the Travel Plan are achieved and the percentage of car users reduces from 76% to 70%, the car park would still be operating at 85% capacity which is within the typical efficiency boundaries (85-90%). On this basis, the size (number of spaces) proposed in the MSCP is accepted.
- 7.6 With regards to the existing visitor parking provision, the Trust argue that the existing parking layout at peak times does not provide sufficient capacity and has an inefficient layout. The proposed changes to the visitor car park provide an increase in 30 spaces, of which 24 spaces will be accessible spaces. However, the proposal does result in the loss of some on-street parking for visitors, to accommodate a new footway along Ashton Road, resulting in a total increase of only 16 spaces. Despite this relatively modest increase, the proposals provide a significant increase in the number of accessible spaces for visitors and patients in this location and vastly improve the efficiency and pedestrian safety in, out and through the car park. The local highway authority is satisfied with the level of accessible spaces and raise no objections to this element of the proposal.
- 7.7 Traffic Impacts  
The relocation of the nursery and the modest increase to the size of the visitor car park are not considered to have a material impact on the local highway network. Whilst the submitted TA covers all elements of the proposal, the main concern relates to the impact of the proposed MSCP. The TA (and subsequent technical notes and re-modelling) includes a reasonable, realistic assessment of traffic generation and trip distribution taking account of existing on-site car parking demand; those users who park on-street around the site; and future growth. The methodology and scope of the assessment has all been agreed in consultation with the highway authority and has been thoroughly tested. This has been the main reason for the delays in the determination of the application. The conclusion is that the proposal will not result in any new additional traffic generation associated with the hospital. The proposals simply change the routes traffic take around the city. The fundamental issue therefore relates to how the traffic is re-distributed around the local highway network due to proposed development. Inevitably the proposal results in a localised increase close to the RLI, particularly on the A6 Greaves Road arm of the Pointer Roundabout.
- 7.8 The modelling concludes that both access junctions from Ashton Road onto the Ashton Road A588 and from the private roads onto the Ashton Road A588 with the development (and including committed development) will operate within their practical capacity in the future years.
- 7.9 The Pointer Roundabout on the other hand is already operating close to its practical capacity with the A6 corridor known to experience significant traffic congestion at peak times. The modelling undertaken indicates that that in the future year (growth factor to 2022) including committed development with the development, the junction would be operating over-capacity in the future year during the AM peak on the A6 Greaves Road and Bowerham Road arm of the junction, leading to a level of congestion which would have a significant impact.
- 7.10 The applicant recognises this and has proposed modest changes to the A6 Greaves Road arm of the junction to account for existing lane under-utilisation. The existing arrangement is for all A6 ahead and left turning traffic to utilise the nearside lane with the right-hand lane for Bowerham traffic only. In the future year with the development in place there will be more traffic turning left onto Ashton Road than turning right onto Bowerham Road in the AM peak hour. The applicant therefore proposes to alter the road markings at this arm of the junction to allow the nearside lane to be left turn only and the off-side lane marked as ahead and right turn traffic flows. This relatively minor

adjustment when re-modelled allows the junction to operate within its theoretical capacity. It should be noted that the assessment has not taken account of the Heysham to M6 link and the changes in traffic flows through the A6 corridor and Pointer Roundabout as a consequence. Whilst there will be an increase in traffic flows through the junction which will lead to some congestion, the impacts are not considered severe in the context of paragraph 32 of the NPPF. The test of 'severe' is a matter of professional judgement and in this case, the Highway Authority has indicated to Officers that a 'severe' impact would be if an arm or multiple arms of the junction operate close to or beyond its theoretical capacity for the whole hour. In this case it is only operating close to theoretical capacity for 15 minutes and for a further 15 minutes above practical capacity, with the remaining 30 minutes operating well within capacity. Furthermore modelling junction safety in both the existing and future situation are considered. Again the Highway Authority does not consider the impacts/influence of the development would result in severe conditions. The Highway Authority is satisfied with the modelling and mitigation and raises no objections in relation to traffic impacts, provided the mitigation measures for the junction are secured by planning condition. Subsequently, the proposal is considered compliant with policy DM20 of the DM DPD and paragraph 32 of the NPPF.

#### 7.11 Access Arrangements

The proposed access arrangements to both the MSCP, the crèche and the visitor car park have been considered as part of the applicant's proposals and their supporting Transport Assessment and supplementary highway technical notes. Access to the MSCP and crèche maintains the use of the existing access off the A588 Ashton Road onto the internal hospital road network which wraps around the main RLI complex down towards Medical Unit 2. There are no proposed changes to this junction. The access and egress points to the MSCP are on its eastern boundary between the proposed building and Medical Unit 2. The route to the crèche follows the same route to the MSCP but extends along the northern boundary of the MSCP to its own dropping off, parking and turning space. The visitor car park is also accessed off the A588 Ashton Road onto the unclassified section of Ashton Road. The proposals here do include some alterations to this junction as well as alterations to the locations of the car park access and exit points on Ashton Road itself. The proposed access strategies for both the MSCP, visitor car park and crèche are acceptable and supported by the local highway authority.

7.12 For all three elements of the scheme the proposal includes improvements to the pedestrian environment, particularly to the visitor car park where there is now a new footway along the eastern side of Ashton Road, two zebra crossings together with improvements to kerbs and tactile paving at crossing points to the west side of the road too. A pedestrian access point will also be provided between the visitor car park and Railway Street. Cycle and pedestrian connectivity is maintained between the RLI site and Aldcliffe Road with surfacing and lighting improvements proposed within the application site alongside the new internal road around the MSCP and crèche. Speed tables and crossing facilities are also provided to provide a safe environment. It is contended that the access arrangements proposed for each element of the scheme and connectivity improvements to the pedestrian environment are deemed safe and suitable and therefore compliant with paragraph 32 of the NPPF and policies DM20 and DM21 of the DM DPD. The local highway authority has supported the applicant's access strategy and pedestrian facilities proposed.

#### 7.13 Sustainable Travel Mitigation

A proposal for a large car park does not, in isolation, represent sustainable development. Whilst the development is seeking to meet the existing parking demands of staff that travel by car, Officers in consultation with the highway authority, have expressed concerns that unless a robust Travel Plan (complete with sustainable transport measures) supports this car park proposal, that the development would simply encourage and overly-promote the use of the private car. This in turn would increase traffic and pollution, leading to wider social and environmental impacts and would conflict with national and local planning policy. There have been lengthy negotiations on this point. The application does now provides a number of sustainable measures/initiatives and supports public transport to limit the car park impacts. These are set out below and overleaf.

#### 7.14 Cycle Provision

The proposal includes 12 additional cycle spaces adjacent to the MSCP and a further 24 cycle spaces within the visitor car park. There are 82 spaces already on site, the proposed represents an increase of approximately 43%. However, the overall provision within the RLI complex is considered below standard. As matters stand based on current cycle demands the proposed level of additional cycle provision is satisfactory, though the amount of cycle parking is likely to need to increase in future years. The commitments in the submitted summary Travel Plan will provide the mechanisms

to review cycle demands and parking provision in future years (through monitoring and reporting) as well as actively encouraging cycle use through a range of other initiatives.

7.15 *Electric charging facilities*

The proposal provides for 4 electric charging spaces, though no details are provided as to the type of charging points to be installed. Given the emerging shift in the motoring industry to promote electric vehicles, this is considered to be a low provision and does not accord with the expectations set out in the Council's planning advisory guidance note. Officers are in negotiations on this matter but are satisfied an appropriate level of provision can be secured by condition and that future needs can be accommodated through the Trust's Travel Plan.

7.16 *Public Transport*

Given that a significant proportion of the staff travelling to the hospital travel from the north, the application now includes a commitment to fund the Park and Ride bus services to provide a 15 minute service throughout the day, 6 days per week (as opposed to the current half-hourly service). The funding will be secured during the construction of the development and three years post opening of the MSCP. The Trust have also committed to a small contribution to improve safety and the bus stops within the Park and Ride site.

7.17 *Travel Plan*

The applicant has submitted a revised Travel Plan to bring together a range of measures and actions to encourage sustainable travel patterns at the hospital. It predominately focuses on staff but caters for patients and visitors too. The fundamental aim is to provide opportunities and encourage alternative sustainable travel options to reduce car use. The RLI recognises that despite their proposal for a large car park, a successful Travel Plan has environmental and health benefits which sits firmly alongside the Trust's wider role as a healthcare provider.

7.18 Aside from the measures already noted in this report, the Travel Plan commits the Trust to a number of initiatives such as setting up a Bicycle User Group, subsidising the cost of the Park and Ride bus services; liaising with bus operators for season tickets; promotion of car sharing initiatives; travel information, and appropriate charging regimes for car parking permitting.

7.19 The Travel Plan has set targets to reduce car trips from 76% (2015) to 70% by 2020 and 66% by 2025. Actions have been set out in the Travel Plan to help achieve these (and other) targets which includes monitoring and review. Overall, the revised Travel Plan is considered acceptable and meets the Highway Authority's submission criteria for a full Travel Plan. The Trust has also agreed to a contribution of £6,000 to secure professional support from the local highway authority to oversee and monitor the Travel Plan. The submitted Travel Plan must be an integral component of this car park to ensure the development does not over-promote the use of private car. The mitigation and initiatives set out therein would comply with the requirements of policy DM23 of the DM DPD.

7.20 *Residential Parking*

The Trust has also agreed to provide a contribution of £10,000 to the County Council to review and implement (if necessary) residential parking areas on surrounding streets close to the RLI site. Again, this is a matter of ensuring the proposal does not lead to traffic impacts. Those staff that currently park off-site should be encouraged to apply for parking permits in the new MSCP and not continue parking off-site. If residential parking areas are established this discourages the risk of this occurring.

7.21 Overall, it is accepted that the traffic impacts associated with the MSCP are a result of the re-distribution of traffic already on the network; that there are no capacity issues associated with the junctions off Ashton Road A588 with the private road to the MSCP or Ashton Road (unclassified); with mitigation the Pointer roundabout will operate within its theoretical capacity at the future year (and taking account of committee development); the access arrangements for all elements of the scheme are acceptable; the application includes a range of sustainable travel measures including cycle parking and electric charging points, physical improvements to provide new footways and pedestrian crossings and supports improvements to the park and ride service; and a contribution towards pedestrian and cycling improvements at the Pointer Roundabout. These measures collectively mitigate and limit the impacts of the car park proposal and are considered compliant with national and local highway related policy. The local highway authority do not object.

7.22 Design of the buildings

The design of the MSCP has been greatly influenced by its proximity to the adjacent Aldcliffe Yard development. This has led to the repositioning of the building on the site and the relocation of the nursery building, the stepped approach to the car park decks and the use and application of materials. The appearance of the building has improved from earlier iterations, with the massing broken up and articulated by the proposed facade treatment, which is a combination of timber-effect cladding panels laid in sections either vertically or horizontally broken up on some elevations with strong horizontal concrete ribbons and the two taller circulation towers. Overall the approach adopted is considered suitable and represents good design.

- 7.23 The nursery building is a modular building which is clearly suitable for its intended purpose. The external appearance takes reference from the Aldcliffe Yard development together with the proposed MSCP. The use of dark timber cladding, dark grey windows and doors, deep fascias and large overhangs represents in a more contemporary, high quality design and finish. This element of the scheme is also acceptable.
- 7.24 Cultural heritage  
The NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Similarly, the local planning authority in exercising its planning function should have regard to s66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which states "*In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses*". Similarly, section 72 requires that in the exercise of planning duties special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving and enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.
- 7.25 Paragraph 132 of the NPPF seeks to express the statutory presumption set out in s66(1) and s72 of the 1990 Act. How the presumption is applied is covered in the following paragraphs of the NPPF, though it is clear that the statutory presumption is to avoid harm. The exercise is still one of planning judgment but it must be informed by the need to give significant weight to the desirability to preserve the heritage asset. The key considerations in this case relate to the impact of the setting of Aldcliffe Conservation Area and the setting of listed buildings located at Aldcliffe Yard and the setting of Ripley St Thomas School. There is also potential for known archaeological interests associated with the formal railway platform.
- 7.26 The applicant has submitted a heritage assessment which despite some deficiencies is adequate to enable proper consideration of the impacts on adjacent designated heritage assets, to avoid conflict with paragraph 128 of the NPPF. DM DPD Policies DM30-32 are relevant here, namely development affecting listed buildings, conservation areas and the setting of designated heritage assets. The thrust of policy is to ensure that the development would not lead to significant harm. The proposed alterations to the visitor car park are judged not to impact on the setting of any designated heritage assets. The proposed nursery building, by virtue of its siting, design and scale, is also judged not to impact the setting of any designated heritage assets. The principal consideration relates to the impact of the MSCP on the historic environment.
- 7.27 In the case of Aldcliffe Yard (former waterworks site), it contains a group of Grade II listed structures including the Packet Boat House (c.1830), Basin Bridge (c.1797) and the Old Blacksmiths Shop and House (c.1800), whose boundary walls form the northwest boundary to the western part of the development are also considered curtilage listed. This complex was recently redeveloped for housing involving some new build properties and the conversion of the listed structures. The development has been successful in contributing positively to the Conservation Area as well as returning the listed buildings back into active use. The significance of the setting of the group of listed buildings is strongly linked and defined to the canal. The same applies to the Conservation Area – its setting is very much confined to the canal and the canalside buildings (both immediately on the canal and those facing the canal on Aldcliffe Road). The hospital site does not form a significant part of the setting of the Conservation Area or the listed waterworks site, though the backdrop of trees help frame the listed complex in views from the canal towpath and Basin Bridge. The MSCP has been altered considerably from the earlier proposals, with the building pushed as far back into the RLI site and the building stepped at its northern end to reduce the massing towards the Conservation Area and listed complex. The feature cladding is designed to reflect the materials, colour and verticality of the surrounding buildings and landscaped canal corridor.

- 7.28 This repositioning of the building and the gradual increase in height away from the conservation area means the building will now be seen in the context of the existing RLI built environment, sitting much closer to Medical Unit 2, which is a similarly large building (but not as tall as the MSCP). This does not mean it will not be seen – rather that it will not result in an unacceptable overbearing presence from the canal corridor. The trees along the north-western boundary between the site and Aldcliffe Yard are tall Ash trees which provide some screening and greening to the backdrop of the listed complex and the Conservation Area but they do not provide a dense tree belt buffer to prevent views of the development. It will be possible to capture views of the MSCP through the trees and over their canopies in certain locations and more so in winter months. This has been carefully considered resulting in the cladding purposefully not extending to the northern elevation. Adding the cladding to this elevation would only make the building more conspicuous.
- 7.29 Overall, whilst the MSCP will be visible from the canal and canalside buildings it is contended that the proposal would not lead to substantial harm to the significance of the setting of these designated heritage assets. But recognising the sheer scale of the building and its proximity to the listed complex, it is difficult to argue there is no impact at all, especially in relation to the views across the Conservation Area towards the listed buildings on Aldcliffe Yard. The existing backdrop to the listed buildings on Aldcliffe Yard when viewed from the east along the canal or on Aldcliffe Road is framed by the existing trees, but beyond it is relatively open (due to the surface level car park) with the large hospital buildings in the distance. The proposal retains the trees but results in the RLI complex extending closer to the boundary of the listed complex with a significantly large building that, by virtue of its purpose, does not reflect the contrasting small-scale intricate buildings along the canal. Views of the listed complex from the west side of the canal are already viewed with the backdrop of the main hospital complex. This is consequence of the change in levels between the western side of the complex to the far eastern side alongside Ashton Road. The MSCP will not be visible above existing utilitarian Trust buildings from Ashton Road. Subsequently, the level of impact is judged to be less than substantial. In accordance with policy DM32 of the DM DPD and paragraph 134 of the NPPF, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
- 7.30 The setting of Ripley St Thomas school building (grade II) and chapel (grade II\*) is very much confined to the school grounds. The proposed MSCP is positioned approximately 180m away from the listed school building and chapel and will be seen in context with the RLI site. The development will not impact the significance of the setting of this listed building, though some distant views of the chapel spire from the listed Basin Bridge and the canal will be obscured by the development. This would not lead to significant harm to the designated assets and has been improved and mitigated by the re-design of the MSCP.
- 7.31 In terms of archaeological interest, LAAS have considered the proposals in detail and have confirmed that the archaeological interests associated with the railway siding would not warrant preservation in situ at the expense of the development, nor would they recommend that the structure is dismantled and rebuilt elsewhere. An archaeological recording condition is recommended. The Civic Society have raised no objections on heritage grounds and support the preservation and re-use of the former platform masonry elsewhere in the district (as proposed). Whilst it is commendable of the applicant to try and preserve the stone and potentially re-use it elsewhere (not on the RLI site), this would not be a necessary planning requirement. The proposal is considered compliance with DM policy DM34 and paragraph 141 of the NPPF.
- 7.32 Residential Amenity  
For clarity, residential amenity has been considered separately for each element of the proposal:  
**Visitor car park** – the proposal does not result in any above ground development alongside neighbouring properties. The works comprise re-grading and re-surfacing of the car park to provide a more efficient layout and to create the additional spaces. The most affected properties are the end terraces to Railway Street (backing the site) and Boundary Road (flanking the site albeit separated by the road with some views to the front in the direction of the car park). The outlook from the rear of properties on Railway Street will not alter - the car park remains as existing immediately abutting the boundary wall. Immediately parallel to the side elevation of 2 Boundary Road the proposed alterations will provide an improvement with additional landscaping in this location and again their view over the site will very much remain a car park. In both cases, views from these properties will be altered by the loss of trees from this part of the site, which will have previously provided some greening to soften the expanse of car parking in this location. Whilst this has wider visual amenity impacts, it is not such that would significantly harm residential amenity.

The changes to the layout and the increase in parking spaces in this location would not lead to a material impacts in respect of noise and disturbance to these neighbours. External lighting proposals to the car park shall be conditioned to enable the positioning of lighting and the type of lighting would not lead to significant adverse impacts (above what currently exists as the car park is already illuminated). The link through to Railway Street already exists with the proposal simply improving this facility. This would not create additional impacts.

- 7.33 **MSCP** – the impact of the proposal on the neighbouring residential properties on Aldcliffe Yard has been the subject to much negotiation (pre-planning) in order to address previous concerns and to improve the relationship of the development to neighbouring property. The original scheme provided a similar number of parking spaces (733) over 5 floors. This was because it occupied a larger footprint and each deck had of the same floor area. The scheme now extends over 6 decks because of the staggered decks (i.e. floor areas of each deck reducing as the building gets taller) and the zig-zagged footprint. The MSCP has also be pushed back form earlier proposals resulting in the need to relocate the crèche. The revised layout, footprint and staggered design has enabled the interface distances between the development and neighbouring dwellings to be increased to an acceptable level. Below are the estimated interface distances at respective heights of the MSCP. Whilst the building is large, with these interface distances together with the retention of existing planting it is contended that the development would not lead to significant harmful impacts on the living conditions of these neighbouring residents and would not therefore conflict with paragraph 17 of the NPPF and policy DM 35 of the DM DPD.
- 7.34 The closest distance between the MSCP and the first few new build terraces (2-6 Aldcliffe Yard), which are parallel to the MSCP, measures approximately 32m. At this closest point the building is only 4.25m high. The highest part of the MSCP is approximately 55m away from these neighbours. The closest and lowest part of the MSCP is approximately 36m from 1 and 2 Aldcliffe Yard and around 50m from 5 and 7 Aldcliffe Yard and significantly further away from the highest part of the building; 8 and 10 Aldcliffe Yard are around 36m from the MSCP though the height is approximately 10m at their closest point; approximately 40m from 12 and 14 Aldcliffe Yard and approximately 50m from 16 and 18 Aldcliffe Yard (note – the MSCP is approximately 15m high at this point). The closest property to the MSCP is 9 Aldcliffe Yard which flanks the site. This property is orientated east- west so does not have its principal windows facing the development. This dwelling is approximately 22m from the lowest part of the development (4.5m). At approximately 26m separation the MSCP is 8m high and at approximately 45m separation the building reaches full height.
- 7.35 The MSCP does allow for a significant increase in the number of vehicle movements in this location which has resulted in neighbour concerns over increased noise, pollution and disturbance. Currently, there is an existing external staff car park that can operate 24 hours with little mitigation against associated car noise (engines running, doors banging, etc). Given the layout and design of the MSCP, the entrance and exit areas in relation to existing dwellings, shift patterns and times of peak usage, the existing use of the land, Environmental Health have judged it unlikely that the proposed development would cause unreasonable 'observed effect levels' in respect of noise. On this basis, the proposal is not contrary to policy DM35 of the DM DPD and paragraph 123 of the NPPF.
- 7.36 **Nursery** - whilst the development will be visible above the listed stone wall, it is not of significant scale to cause adverse visual impacts or adversely affect neighbouring outlook. The visual impacts are further mitigated by the retention and bolstering of landscaping along this boundary. The building fenestration is relatively inactive along the boundary with Aldcliffe Yard and the external spaces enclosed by acoustic fencing. The detailing of the acoustic fencing will need to be secured by condition. The nursery currently operates between the hours of 0730 and 1800. It is considered reasonable and necessary to ensure the use of this building is limited to a children's day nursery (as opposed to other D1 uses) and that the hours of use are limited to 0700–1900.
- 7.37 Landscaping and Ecology  
There are many significant mature and early-mature individual trees and groups of trees within this site that make an important and measurable contribution to public amenity. The majority of trees are clearly visible from a range of public locations, contributing to the character and appearance of the site and that of the wider locality. Trees within the eastern car park provide greening and partial screening, helping to soften what would otherwise be a visually harsh and heavily-urbanised locality. The existing trees currently form an important buffer between the activities associated with the hospital site and wider public domain, principally the movement of vehicles and people. The proposal does result in the loss of all significant trees from the eastern car park. Some landscaping is

proposed as part of the alterations to the eastern car park but will not mitigate the extent of the losses proposed. This will have a negative impact on the visual amenity of the locality and is found contrary to policy DM29 of the DM DPD. This is a negative of the proposal and will need to be weighed against the scheme's benefits.

- 7.38 Trees along the north and western boundaries of the staff car park are proposed for retention with the boundaries of the site marked for additional landscaping. Whilst the trees are generally, in good overall condition, their long term sustainability is limited by the constraints presented by their restricted growing environment. Additional bolstering of planting is considered necessary in these locations, albeit carefully selected species and planting locations to minimise impacts to neighbours. The Canal and Rivers Trust have also emphasised the need for the boundary trees in these locations to be retained with additional landscaping, in order to secure the visual amenity and recreational qualities of the canal corridor. To secure these trees in the long term and any future landscaping in this location (because of their importance to screen the development and secure the setting of the canal), a new Tree Preservation Order is considered appropriate. In addition, if the proposal is supported, it will be necessary to secure details of tree protection, methods for working close to retained trees and appropriate landscaping details.
- 7.39 With regards to ecology, the principal issues relate to the impact on protected bat species and the loss of habitat (tree loss). The submitted assessments and survey efforts conclude the proposed eastern car park site (despite the loss of trees) is of negligible value for bats, likely due to the well-lit nature of the site. The western car park site is of more value given its proximity to the canal and the historical buildings on Aldcliffe Yard and they provide opportunity for enhancement. Overall there was minimal bat activity recorded on site, the most notable outside the site along the boundary with Aldcliffe Yard. Subsequently, there development is considered not to have any adverse impact upon the favourable conservation status of bats on site. Appropriate mitigation and enhancement can be provided including sensitive external lighting (to the western car park), the retention of trees along the northern and western boundaries of the MSCP, additional planting and the installation of bat boxes on retained trees. This can be controlled by condition.
- 7.40 Other Matters  
An air quality assessment has been undertaken which concludes that the development will result in a daily increase of 111 trips through the AQMA. This is considered a modest increase and would have some impacts. Impacts should be avoided so mitigation will be necessary. As matters stand, the Travel Plan is not robust enough in relation to the commitment to actively encourage and manage staff/visitors to shift to electric vehicles. The provision of just 4 electric charging points is considered to be a token effort. The application also lacks specific details over the Electric Charging points and therefore requires further details to be provided, which should also include details of how future proofing the proposed car parks to deliver more EV points as the demand increases, which is inevitable in future years. For these reasons, Environmental Health has raised an objection. The impacts are not likely to lead to significant adverse impacts to warrant a refusal on air quality grounds but the level of mitigation not particularly compelling. If Members are minded to seek better EV charging provision on the site of both the staff and visitor carparks, this could be controlled by condition.
- 7.41 Construction during development has the potential to cause disruption to the local highway network and disturbance to residents. In most cases this impacts during construction are not material to the planning decision, and can be controlled by non-planning legislation (highway and environmental legislation). However, in this case there are potential implications as a consequence of the construction period as staff, visitors and patients will need to find alternative parking around the site. The applicant proposes to fund the Park and Ride in advance of construction and to encourage staff to use this facility, which greatly assists. Nevertheless, it is felt in this case that a construction and traffic management plan will be helpful in order to enable the local planning authority, in consultation with the highway authority, to assess the Trust's proposed management of parking and construction traffic/routing during construction works. The construction and traffic management plan can also ensure construction vehicles/routing avoid the listed Basin Bridge (a point raised by LAAS).
- 7.42 The site is in flood zone 1 in a heavily built-up part of the city. Given the scale of the development the application has been accompanied with a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) which concludes that an appropriate drainage scheme should be designed in consultation with the Lead Flood Authority (LLFA). The LLFA do not object subject to the imposition of appropriate drainage conditions.

- 7.43 In relation to contamination, with the exception of the nursery, the proposed use of the land for a car park is not particularly sensitive and so an unforeseen contaminated land condition may have sufficed. However due to the sensitive end users of the nursery a suitable site investigation will need to be carried out to ensure the risks of contamination are addressed and if necessary remediated. This can be secured by condition and is deemed compliant with paragraph 120 of the NPPF.

## **8.0 Planning Obligations**

- 8.1 To ensure the proposal does not over-promote the use of private car, which would be contrary to national and local transport/sustainability policy, the following measures have been agreed with the Trust and need to be secured via Section 106 legal agreement:
- Funding of 1 bus for the Park and Ride to support the needs of hospital users (staff and visitors) for the full construction period, followed by an additional three years post opening of the MSCP;
  - Pedestrian/cycle improvements to the Pointer Roundabout to the sum of £75,000;
  - Travel Plan support from LCC to the sum of £6,000;
  - £10,000 contribution for bus stop and safety improvements at the Park and Ride site; and,
  - £10,000 contribution for the review and the implementation of residential parking schemes (if necessary from the review) close to the hospital site.

## **9.0 Planning Balance and Conclusions**

- 9.1 At the heart of the NPPF is the presumption in favour of sustainable development and in assessing proposals, decision-takers must be satisfied that the proposal represents a sustainable form of development acknowledging that there are three dimensions to sustainable development; economic, social and environmental.
- 9.2 The benefits of the proposal are clear – the development will enable the RLI to operate and manage more efficiently by providing a greater level of on-site staff parking to meet a greater proportion of the existing demand. Despite the MSCP being substantial in size/capacity it does not meet the current demand. To support the proposal and ensure the remaining parking demand is catered for sustainably (and does not lead to impacts) the Trust have committed to a Travel Plan including a number of sustainable transport initiatives and physical works. The improvements to the visitor car park will further support the Trust's aims to improve the visitor/patient experience, improve capacity at peak times, provide additional spaces for disabled motorists, better cater for cyclists and improve pedestrian safety between the car park and the main hospital complex. The RLI has a critical role in the community not only as an essential public healthcare provider for the region, but also as a major employer.
- 9.3 Turning to the impacts: the increase in traffic through the Pointer roundabout will have an effect on the efficiency of the junction, but with the appropriate mitigation set out in the submission, this traffic is not judged to have a severe impact. The design and layout of the MSCP has improved substantially since the original submission with the impacts on the designated heritage assets significant improved, though still having some limited adverse impacts. The MSCP is of considerable scale in contrast to the neighbouring dwellings and will have a sense of overbearingness, but not such that is judged to result in adverse residential amenity impacts. Finally, the loss of mature trees from the eastern car park is judged to adversely affect the visual amenities of the locality and despite some proposed landscaping this would not provide sufficient mitigation.
- 9.4 It is for the decision taker to consider the above material considerations and weigh the benefits against the impacts in the overall planning balance. In this case, it is considered that the proposal represents necessary parking infrastructure that is supported by essential sustainable transport improvements too. This should provide opportunities for the RLI to operate more efficiently to support existing and future healthcare needs for the district. This public benefit carries significant weight and in your officers opinions' outweighs the localised impacts to the visual amenity around Ashton Road through the loss of trees and the limited impact to the backdrop and views over the conservation area towards the listed buildings on Aldcliffe Yard. Members are recommended that permission can be granted.

## **Recommendation**

That Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** subject to a legal agreement to secure those items listed in section 8 of the report and the following conditions:

1. Time limit
2. Approved plans

### **Pre-commencement**

3. Construction and traffic management plan
4. Tree Protection Plan and AMS
5. Surface water drainage condition
6. Archaeological recording condition
7. Scheme for all off-site highway works covering the required mitigation to the Pointer roundabout and all other works specified in the submitted, including phasing plan
8. Phasing plan to be provided
9. Site Investigation
10. Details of electric vehicle charging points (number, type and location) and provision for additional cabling for future EV points to be agreed.

### **Before above ground works**

11. External lighting details to be agreed
12. Details of boundary treatments/enclosures
13. Landscaping to be agreed based on landscape strategy plans and ecology recommendations
14. MSCP details – cladding system (including mesh); window details, lighting; concrete finish
15. Nursery details – roofing details (materials, fascias and rainwater goods); cladding details (timber effect cladding and feature panel to main entrance); acoustic fencing.
16. Cycle parking shall be covered and secure – details to be agreed – then provided and retained
17. Scheme for security and crime prevention measures to be agreed and implemented.

### **Pre-use/occupation of development**

18. Full Travel Plan to be provided before first use
19. Surface water drainage management and maintenance condition
20. Car Park management plan
21. Ecology Mitigation – bat lighting strategy/bat boxes to retained retains

### **Control**

22. All access/egress points indicated on the approved plans to be provided in full before first use
23. Oil Interceptors
24. Occupation and use of the crèche limited to D1 nursery use only
25. Parking and drop off to be provided for the D1 use and retained at all times
26. Hours of use D1 nursery

## **Article 35, Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015**

In accordance with the above legislation, the City Council can confirm that they have made this recommendation in a positive and proactive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development, working proactively with the applicant to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. The recommendation has been taken having had regard to the impact of development, and in particular to the relevant policies contained in the Development Plan, as presented in full in the officer report, and to all relevant material planning considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, National Planning Practice Guidance and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents/ Guidance.

## **Background Papers**

None.