

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Planning Committee

26 November 2015

Agenda Item Number	Page	Title
21.	(Pages 1 - 17)	Written Update

If you need any further information about the meeting please contact Aaron Hetherington, Democratic and Elections aaron.hetherington@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk, 01295 227956

CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

26 NOVEMBER 2015

WRITTEN UPDATES

Agenda Item 9 15/00760/F Bicester Eco Town Exemplar site

- In relation to the amended plans, **Bicester Town Council** has no objections to this amendment.
- Comments from the Council's **Community Development Team** have confirmed that the concerns relating to the location of the office, the use of a pitched roof and the indication of the demountable partition wall between the main room and the smaller room are now acceptable. They have raised a query in relation to the position of the cleaning cupboard as it had been requested that this be adjacent to the toilets. Having reviewed this again, it has been agreed that the internal layout is acceptable as proposed as by moving the cupboard, this would have a negative effect on the window that serves the adjacent meeting room.

There has also been concern raised in relation to the location of the waste bins for the community hall. It is considered that the currently proposed position is too far for community volunteers to carry refuse that will have already been brought downstairs and through the bike storage shed. It is considered that the community hall waste storage should be at the rear door of the entry stairwell, which would mean the cycle storage would need to be re-located. The applicants have indicated that it would be possible to review the position of the waste storage but that this would require a reconsideration of the car parking spaces and cycle storage. Officers have looked at this and based on the current arrangement, it may mean the loss of one parking space to accommodate the waste storage and cycle parking close to the rear of the entrance to the community centre.

It is therefore recommended that Members delegate to the Development Services Manager authority to resolve this issue to his satisfaction, including the need to potentially look at whether a parking space would need to be lost and to establish whether this is to the satisfaction of the Oxfordshire County Council Highway Authority. Planning Condition 2 may need to be amended to suit any amended plan that addresses this point.

- The **Highway Authority** has considered the amendments and has advised that the latest amendments reflect their previous comments and concerns in respect of the geometric layout. It is recommended that a condition be imposed that agrees the final surface treatment of the proposed highway

that can be adopted by the County Council, particularly as a section 38 agreement already exists – amendments to the agreement will be necessary. They advise that the submitted drawings appear to indicate a colonnade on both sides – areas underneath this will not be considered for adoption. To conclude, the County Council considers the overall layout of the scheme to be acceptable, however, proposed materials are another issue affecting adoptability of the proposed development. In light of this element of the design, the Landscape Masterplan needs consideration and amending in order for the layout to be designed to an adoptable standard, although we understand a condition agreeing the final surface treatment can overcome this.

- The recommendation includes a proposed condition to require final agreement of the proposed spine road including the final surfacing (condition 8) and so this matter can be later agreed. The Landscape Masterplan referred to is not proposed to be an approved plan. All other conditions recommended by the Highway Authority are included within the recommendation.
- The following amendments are recommended in relation to the identified conditions. These amendments respond to comments received from the Applicant in relation to the conditions within the recommendation and following further Officer consideration. Notwithstanding these proposed changes, the recommendation remains as per the report (page 102-103) including to delegate authority to the Development Services Manager to make any necessary amendments to finalise the conditions.

In respect to **condition 6**, it has been requested that the condition be prior to the construction of the foundations of the development rather than pre-commencement. This aligns with the condition trigger for materials suggested by conditions 3, 4 and 5 and is a reasonable alteration in the view of Officers. Condition 6 is recommended to be re-worded to:

6. Prior to the construction of the foundations of the development hereby approved, full details of the doors and windows hereby approved, at a scale of 1:20 including a cross section, cill, lintel and recess detail and colour/finish, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the doors and windows shall be installed within the building in accordance with the approved details.

Reason - To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the completed development and to comply with Policy C28 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

In respect to **condition 11**, the applicant has requested that this be changed to refer to a site wide travel plan only, which they would be responsible for. The applicant would not be able to prepare Travel Plans for each unit and future occupiers would need to prepare their own travel plans for their particular unit. Officers therefore consider it to be acceptable

to change condition 11 to:

11. Prior to the first occupation of any unit hereby approved, a Travel Plan prepared in accordance with the Department of Transport's Best Practice Guidance Note "Using the Planning Process to Secure Travel Plans" and its subsequent amendments, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for the local centre as a whole. Thereafter, the approved Travel Plan shall be implemented and operated in accordance with the approved details.

Reason - In the interests of sustainability, to ensure a satisfactory form of development and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

In respect of the requirements upon future tenants of the units, it is suggested that an **additional condition** be imposed stating:

Prior to the first occupation of a unit, the occupier where required by the OCC guidance and the Framework Travel Plan, will prepare a Travel Plan for that unit, prepared in accordance with the Department of Transport's Best Practice Guidance Note 'Using the Planning Process to Secure Travel Plans' and its subsequent amendments, which shall be submitted to and approved in writing. Thereafter, the approved Travel Plan shall be implemented and operated in accordance with the approved details.

Reason - In the interests of sustainability, to ensure a satisfactory form of development and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

In respect of **condition 28** relating to delivery hours, the applicant considers the condition to be unreasonable in respect to deliveries on Sundays and Bank Holidays and that this restriction could cause future operators severe problems. It is therefore requested that delivery hours for Sundays and Bank Holidays be restricted to 09:00 – 17:00 hours. In the view of Officers this is reasonable given the hours are reduced and occur during the day. Condition 28 is recommended to be changed to:

28. There shall be no deliveries to any of the units within the local centre outside of the following times:

Monday-Saturday – [7.00am to 8.00pm]
Sunday and Public Holidays – [9.00am to 5.00pm]

Reason - In order to safeguard the amenities of the area and to comply with Policies C31 and ENV1 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

In respect of **condition 30**, it is considered that this condition is unnecessary as this information is controlled by condition 10 in relation to

cycle parking and condition 17 in relation to the benches. It is agreed that this condition is repetitive but condition 17 requires amendment to ensure these details are picked up. It is therefore recommended that condition 30 be **deleted** and that **condition 17** be amended to:

17. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a landscaping scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme for landscaping the site shall include:-

(a) details of the proposed tree and shrub planting including their species, number, sizes and positions, together with grass seeded/turfed areas,

(b) details of the existing trees and hedgerows to be retained as well as those to be felled, including existing and proposed soil levels at the base of each tree/hedgerow and the minimum distance between the base of the tree and the nearest edge of any excavation,

(c) details of the hard surface areas, including pavements, pedestrian areas, reduced-dig areas, crossing points, steps and street furniture including benches.

Reason - In the interests of the visual amenities of the area, to ensure the creation of a pleasant environment for the development and to comply with Policy C28 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

In respect of **condition 34**, the applicant considers that this condition should not be applied to something which is aspirational and requests that this condition be deleted. Whilst it is accepted that the wording as currently drafted is not reasonable, it is considered that such a condition is necessary to ensure that there is a reduction in water use and contribute towards the applicant's aspiration towards water neutrality which aligns with the PPS requirement. It has not been possible to draft a suitably worded alternative condition at this point; however it is considered that this will be possible and Officers will work to ensure a suitable condition is imposed in place of that currently drafted.

In respect to **condition 35**, the applicant's view is that this condition is not a policy requirement and should be deleted. This condition is repeated from the Exemplar permission 10/01780/HYBRID and is considered necessary by Officers as well as being a requirement of Policy Bicester 1 of the Adopted Cherwell Local Plan. It is recommended that this be retained as drafted to ensure that embodied carbon is reduced and to contribute to meeting the zero carbon requirements across the Exemplar site.

In respect to **condition 38**, the applicant advises that they will be responsible for building out to shell and core only and will not therefore be

providing Real Time Information Systems for Occupiers. It is therefore requested that this condition be reviewed. Officers note the concern and suggest that condition 38 be amended as follows to ensure that RTI systems are installed but without necessarily needing to agree the details of them:

38. Prior to the occupation of each non-residential unit or commercial building, the building shall be provided with a 'real time information' system.

Reason – To facilitate information delivery and travel information in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 1: Eco Towns.

Based on these amendments, the **numbering of the conditions** will require revision to ensure it is consecutive in relation to the finalised list.

Agenda Item 11 15/01090/F Land at Cumberford Hill, Bloxham

- All Members of the Planning Committee appear to have received an email from the applicant's agent in support of the application and endorsing officers' recommendation. Whilst Members may have familiarised themselves with the contents of the email, for completeness officers' summarise below the points that it raises:
 - Officers' are thanked for the proactive approach taken on this application and the support provided to the applicant;
 - A recent appeal decision that dismissed a scheme for residential development on the site is a material planning consideration which, despite the decision, confirmed that the loss of the employment site was not harmful, that the use of brick and stone building materials was acceptable and that only very limited weight can be afforded to the emerging Bloxham Neighbourhood Plan;
 - In the dismissed appeal scheme the vehicular access and driveway were in the same position as that now proposed and the Inspector did not find this element of the appeal proposals unacceptable despite serving five dwellings rather than the four now proposed;
 - Residential development on this site would be more neighbourly than the potential re-use of the car repair workshop building;
 - There have been no objections from statutory consultations on highway, flood risk or contamination grounds which are all issues that can be satisfactorily addressed by conditions. The Environment Agency has confirmed that the proposals would reduce flood risk in the surrounding area which is a clear benefit of the proposals;
 - The scheme provides the opportunity to remediate a site suffering from historic contamination that would otherwise remain contaminated presenting risks to public health and the environment;
 - There were very few objections to the amended proposals now before Members;
 - This scheme presents the ideal opportunity to make use of redundant previously developed land which is clearly preferable to the

endless uptake of greenfield land around the fringes of Bloxham.

The matters raised in the email present no new issues for officers' to address at Planning Committee.

- **Bloxham Parish Council** hope that members would visit the site before making any decision but in the event that they do wish to re-iterate the following comments

1. We believe that four properties on this site is an overdevelopment of the site. The natural constraints of the site mean that a significant area cannot be used for building.

2 .We believe that the scale and massing of the proposed dwellings would adversely impact views into and out of the conservation area. The Inspector in deciding the Appeal and refusing planning permission for the previous application for this site(14/02147/F) said : 'Cumberford Hill acts as a key gateway into the historic and intimate core of the village, which is predominantly two storey and modest in scale. These features contribute positively to the character and appearance of the conservation area as a whole and its significance as a designated heritage asset.'

It is the view of the Parish Council that this comment could be applied equally to this new proposal.

Agenda Item 12 15/01165/F Vespesian Way,Chesterton

- **Additional condition**

The proposed buffer planting within the curtilages of Plots 1,5 and 6 shall be fenced from the remainder of the garden areas by post and rail fencing , and such fencing shall be retained thereafter

Agenda Item 14 - Land South Of Little Shotover and East of Cherry Cottage, Horn Lane Road, Adderbury

- Since the report was drafted further information has been received from the applicant which now includes the width of the proposed access road within the application site. This complies with OCC requirements and OCC Highways have confirmed that have no objection to the use of the access and consider it to be suitable to accommodate the level of development proposed. The applicant has served the relevant ownership certificates on the other parties with an interest in the land. It is therefore considered that if the development were acceptable in all other regards, the provision of a suitable access could be controlled through a Grampian condition to ensure the access was provided prior to the commencement of development. The highway aspects of the development are therefore considered to be acceptable in light of relevant planning policies and technical advice from OCC.

However the resolution of the highways issue does not overcome the other planning issues relating to the development as outlined in the committee report.

- Furthermore it has been noted that the second reason for refusal should also make reference to the harm caused to the setting of the nearby listed buildings as outlined in the report.

The recommendation therefore remains to refuse the application for the reasons outlined in the report with the second reason for refusal amended to read:

2. The proposed development by virtue of its intrusion into the open countryside, loss of open land, backland position, and proposed layout and access would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the setting of the village and nearby listed buildings and the enjoyment of the nearby rights of way. There are no public benefits which would outweigh this harm. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policy ESD13 and ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1, Saved Policy C28, C30 and C33 of the Cherwell Local Plan (1996) and advice in the NPPF in particularly particular paragraphs 7, 17, 75, chapter 7 and chapter 12.

Agenda Item 15 15/01565/F 13 Hampden Close, Bicester, OX26 4UG

- **Consultation Responses**

4 further letters have been received since the writing of the original report, objecting to the application. The following new issues were raised: Noise levels and environmental issues.

A total of 16 responses have been received to date all objecting to the application.

- **Bicester Town Council:**

Objection to this application as an overdevelopment of the site

- **Representation received from the applicant Mr Bedwell on 22.11.2015**

Asks for additional information to be taken into account when the Council makes its decision:

Parking – policy

The first consult received from OCC Highways recommended approval of this scheme, subject to parking provision of a bike shed. We provide this as standard in all of our current properties and will also do so here.

The updated consult on 16th November confirmed that the four bays provided were sufficient but then imposed an additional requirement of 1.2m width. This new criteria is not covered by any policy we have seen and has not been mentioned in any of our previous applications below.

Approved comparable applications in Bicester and Banbury with similar or less parking arrangements

- Application 13/00306/F in Bicester, no objection was raised from OCC Highways and was approved with a 9.8m width drive.
- Applications 14/00802/F and 13/00708/F in Banbury for 6 to 9 Bedrooms were approved with zero parking provision.

The change in criteria was the sole reason for the change of recommendation from both the Highways and the Planning Officers, and to date despite requesting it from the Officer we have not received or seen any policy guidelines or new information that relates to the updated advice given by OCC Highways.

Parking – practicality

We do understand the issue is of most concern to the neighbours and our experience of running properties in Bicester since 2012 indicates lower levels of car ownership than the planning benchmarks.

Two comparable properties at Churchill Road and Linden Road have a total of 5 cars between 18 tenants – an ownership level of 28%.

At this precise moment 56% of our 49 rooms in Bicester are occupied by tenants who drive which would be equivalent to the number of off street parking provision provided for the proposed development.

The DCLG report entitled ‘Residential Car Parking Research’ states that ‘households occupying rental accommodation can have up to 50% fewer cars than owner occupied households’.

Purpose of application / change of use

No planning consent is required for an HMO of up to 6 bedrooms, this application relates only to the structural change and our ability to use the 7th bedroom proposed.

The structural aspect of this application has not been contentious with either neighbours or the Planning Officer.

The proposed layout of the development exceeds the Cherwell District Council space standards for size of bedrooms and communal living space.

Only one bedroom is suitable for double occupancy therefore the maximum number of tenants who could live in the property is 8.

Previous appeals across England have determined that HMO of 6 up to 8 people is not deemed to materially change the land use in terms of noise levels, environmental issues such as bin storage and car use.

Housing need

The Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014 indicates a high demand for housing in Bicester for younger households who are unable to afford their own properties and are forced in to the private rented sector. This HMO can help to address this demand.

This development provides high quality, affordable accommodation which contributes to a mixed community of different household types –consistent with National Planning Policy Framework.

Management

Our houses are tenanted by working professionals not students or DSS
25% at Bicester Village
33% are office based management /marketing /IT/HR
13% are in public service

We are fully accredited NLA Landlords and all tenants will be fully referenced and would be working professionals

We have clauses in our Assured Tenancy Agreements which restrict noise outside of bedrooms before 8am and after 11pm, prohibit the use of drugs and restrict the extent to how often friends /partners can stay over at the property

Cherwell District Council's Housing Officer Giles Mason has been consulted as part of this application and has reported no previous issues with regard to our management of other properties.

- **Officer comment:** The Highway Authority was asked to comment on the additional information from Mr Bedwell and the response was as follows:
- **Statement received from the Highway Authority on 23.11.2015 :**

Confirms receipt of correspondence from the applicant seeking further information as to the reasons for the change in the Highway Authority's recommendation, and replies as follows:

"A) I was contacted twice on 3rd November 2015 by the case officer to look at this application which indicated a need for urgency. Amidst the work load at the time, I made an effort to deal with this application outside of work and my first interrogation of the documents showed the application to be okay subject to imposing cycle storage on site condition as shown by my initial consultation response.

"A few days later, I was forced to revisit this application with regard to access following a comment raised by a member of the public which when I read into the Approved Document M, which is a governments guidance for accesses into buildings confirmed the need for me to reverse the

decision of my initial response.

“Also consultation I made with Oxfordshire County Council fire department confirmed the requirement of a wide enough approach to the front of the property.

“The official guidance to part M, is Approved Document M1 http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/uploads/br/BR_PDF_ADM_2004.pdf

“The guidance in connection to access to the main entrance of the building is contained within 6.10 of the document with states;

“6.10

The width of the approach, excluding space for a parked vehicle, should take account of the needs of a wheelchair user, or a stick or crutch user (see paragraph 6.13)

“Note

Account will also need to be taken of planning requirements, such as for new buildings within conservation areas.

Location and arrangements of dwellings on the site is a matter for planning, whereas the internal layout and construction of the dwellings is a matter for building control.

“It appears from the drawings submitted along with this application, that no such assess is intended to be provided with a parking provision of 4 spaces.

“B) A further look at the parking provision on this site also shows that dimensions for parking bays are well below the minimum standard. The Oxfordshire County Council’s Residential Road Design Guide states a minimum of 4.8m by 2.4m which is not the case in the proposals of this application.

“On this basis, I was bound to carry out my responsibilities and taking regard to current parking stress at Hampden Close and the levels of on-street parking demand in the vicinity of the development I retracted my initial response.

“I hope this shows the applicant my justification for reversing my decision.”

- **Officer comment:** It is considered that the additional information that Mr Bedwell has provided does not overcome the recommended reason for refusal, which remains unchanged.

Agenda Item 16 15/01599/F Land rear of 52-58 Bucknell Road , Bicester

- **Highway Liaison Officer** – amended plans - No Objection. Based on the improved proposals, Oxfordshire County Council as Local Highway Authority hereby notifies the District Authority that they do not propose to

object to the grant of planning permission.

- As a result of the amended plans the conditions need revising:

Condition 11 – omit

Condition 13 – The cycle parking facilities shown on plan No. 1416/2C and Economy Two Tier Rack Assembly 1/7 received on 21/10/15 shall be provided prior to the first occupation of the development and be permanently retained and maintained for the parking of cycles in connection with the development.

Reason – To ensure sufficient amount of well-designed cycle parking is available at all times to serve the development and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Bicester Town Council – amended plans – Bicester Town Council still objects to this application for the same reasons. The amendments do not alleviate any of the matters previously raised.

- **Additional condition** - to restrict any potential overlooking between habitable room windows in the existing maisonettes and the new flats

Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, the first floor Kitchen window serving unit 4 in the west elevation of the shall be fixed shut, other than any top hung opening element, and shall be fully glazed with obscured glass that complies with the current British Standard, and retained as such thereafter.

Reason - To safeguard the privacy and amenities of the occupants of the adjoining premises and to comply with Policy C30 of the Cherwell Local Plan and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Agenda Item 17 15/01615/F Sports pavilion, Whitelands Way, Bicester

- Bicester Town Council fully support and welcome this application
- Chesterton Parish Council raise no objections
- One additional letter has been received from a resident of Whitelands Way expressing concern about the vehicular entrance from Whitelands Way.. They suggest an alternative access be taken from Verney Drive

Agenda Item 18 15/01725/F 24 Church St. Bicester

- A technical note on Trip generation has been submitted by the applicants' agents and is attached as an appendix to this update
- A response to this document has been sought from OCC and will be reported verbally if received
- Letter received signed by 17 residents of Bicester

We object in the strongest terms to the change of use for this property in the Conservation Area of Bicester and to the accompanying plans to convert it to a hot food takeaway. 23 letters of objection were sent in to CDC Planning and are summarized in the Planning Officer's report.

We would like to clarify that we welcome new businesses opening up in the town and understand the need for the local economy to flourish. However, we oppose the opening of a hot food takeaway in this residential and Conservation Area because we consider it to be totally inappropriate when there are more suitable candidate businesses in the Class A1 category.

When Bicester is set to expand rapidly over the next decade, it is important that the areas which give the town its character should be conserved. Church Street with its views of the Grade I listed church is one of the most picturesque parts of the Conservation Area. It is therefore alarming to see that Cherwell's Conservation Officer has not responded to the application (at time of writing) when Church Street is of such historical importance in the town. We would appreciate being given a reason for this.

The Planning Officer's report, Point 7.6 "Principle of Development" states, "Development should have particular regard to enhancing the character of the Conservation Area". It is difficult to see how a change to a hot food takeaway is consistent with this requirement.

Referring to Point 7.8 of the Principle of Development, "The existing night time economy within the town centre is also likely to support the use of the unit as an A5 hot food takeaway and the change of use is likely to enhance the vitality of the town centre during the evening". There are three takeaways in the Market Square and one in the Causeway, besides seven restaurants in the Market Square many of which also serve takeaway meals, all within about 200 metres of 24 Church Street. In Church Street itself there are two restaurants. We fail to see how a takeaway so close to these numerous other outlets would contribute to the town's vitality. Opening this new venture would be at the expense of the peacefulness of residents in this part of town who would be subject to noise from scooters and delivery vehicles until at least midnight (possibly 1.00am) on Fridays and Saturdays and 11.00pm on all other nights.

Within the outline for Accessibility, Highway Safety and Parking (7.16-7.17), no consideration has been taken into account of the impact on residents of the increased demand for parking (a point made several times

*in the objections from local residents). Parking is only mentioned in regard to the safety of customers who may park their cars and cross the road to the takeaway premises. Church Street already has to accommodate cars for people attending two churches and two busy restaurants without car parks, in addition to vehicles of residents without garages. **It has been completely overlooked that parking is already an issue for residents and this extra demand will only exacerbate an already difficult situation.***

The recommendation for refusal on the grounds that the highway would be unsafe is completely true and extremely important, but please also take into consideration the strong and valuable objections outlined by residents.

Papa John's (GB) Ltd Proposed Change of Use, Church Road, Bicester



Job Number: 1511-33

Technical Note No.1 - Trip Generation Summary

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This Technical Note (TN) has been prepared by Transport Planning Associates (TPA) on behalf of Papa John's (GB) Ltd in order to address comments received from the highway authority, Oxfordshire County Council (OCC), in relation to planning application 15/01724/F.
- 1.2. The application is for the change of use from a shop (use class A1) to a hot food takeaway (use class A5) with a Gross Floor Area (GFA) of 86 square metres. The site last operated as a furniture store. The proposed end user of the takeaway store is Papa John's.
- 1.3. This TN considers the likely vehicle trips that could be associated with the extant and proposed uses at the site.

2. Previous Trip Numbers

- 2.1 The number of trip movements that could be associated with the previous furniture store has been forecast through an interrogation of the TRICS database, version 7.2.3.
- 2.2 The TRICS database provides trip rate information based on existing trips observed from surveys at similar sites throughout England and Wales. Trip rates within the '*Other Individual Non-Food Superstore*' category have been extracted, with similar characteristics to the extant furniture store, as this is considered to provide the most comparable assessment.
- 2.3 Three sites have been identified within TRICS as being the most comparable to the previous use. A copy of the TRICS output report is included at **Appendix A**.
- 2.4 Based on the nature of the site, it is considered reasonable to assume that the majority of trips associated with the furniture store would be car bound.

3. Forecast Trip Numbers

- 3.1 The number of trip movements that could be associated with the proposed Papa John's has been obtained from bespoke operator data provided by the applicant. The relevant extracts are included at **Appendix B**.
- 3.2 **Table 3.1** sets out the total number of orders received by a typical Papa John's store outside of London. This demonstrates that the store is likely to be busiest at the weekends (Friday to Sunday) with limited orders during the weekday periods.

Table 3.1 – Total Weekly Orders (Papa John's Outside Of London)

Day	Total Orders	Delivery Orders	Total Walk In Tickets	Collection Tickets
Monday	22	15	3	4
Tuesday	22	13	6	3
Wednesday	28	16	8	4
Thursday	20	13	1	6
Friday	95	55	21	19
Saturday	84	58	18	8
Sunday	53	36	12	5

3.3 **Table 3.1** demonstrates that on the busiest day of operation (Friday), the majority of orders are deliveries (57.9%); with a further 22.1% of orders being 'walk-ins' and 20% being collections. As a robust case, assuming that all collections and 'walk-ins' are done by car, this could equate to only 40 vehicle trips to the site on the busiest day.

3.4 In addition to the data set out in **Table 3.1**, the applicant has provided a breakdown of the forecast peak times of delivery orders for the site. This is set out in **Table 3.2**.

Table 3.2 – Delivery Dispatch Times

	11am – 12	12 – 1pm	1pm – 6pm	6pm – 9pm	After 9pm
Day of week/Time of Day	Morning Orders	Midday Orders	Afternoon Orders	Peak Orders	Post 9PM Orders
Monday	0	0	5	10	0
Tuesday	0	0	7	10	1
Wednesday	0	0	4	14	5
Thursday	0	0	5	4	3
Friday	0	0	12	52	6
Saturday	0	1	14	32	4
Sunday	0	1	14	13	5

3.5 **Table 3.2** demonstrates that the greatest number of deliveries is forecast to occur at the weekends after 6pm.

3.6 Deliveries will be carried out using the company's vehicles. It is important to note that the total number of delivery orders set out in **Table 3.2** above is likely to result in fewer vehicle movements in reality due to the possibility of consolidating delivery runs to include more than one order at a time. As such, the assessment is considered to be robust.

3.7 The store will not be open in the AM peak hour on the highway network (i.e. 0800-0900) and will not open until around midday. As such, there will be minimal vehicle trips associated with the change of use before noon.

- 3.8 It is envisaged that deliveries of food stuffs to the store will take place up to three times a week only, taking approximately 20 minutes each visit. This is not considered to be material in real terms.

4. Trip Comparison

- 4.1 In order to provide a comparable assessment between the existing and proposed land uses at the site, the typical periods of peak operation at the site have been used. These periods are for midday, afternoon and early evening and evening orders.
- 4.2 **Table 4.1** provides a comparison of the trips which could be associated with the existing and proposed land uses on the site.

Table 4.1 – Comparison of Furniture Store and Takeaway Vehicle Trips (Deliveries only)

	11am-12pm	12pm-1pm	1pm-6pm	6pm-9pm	After 9pm
Furniture Store	8	4	11	1	0
Papa Johns	0	0	7	18	3
Comparison	-8	-4	-4	+17	+3

- 4.3 **Table 4.1** demonstrates that the proposed change of use could be associated with a similar number of vehicle trips on the highway network throughout a typical day when compared to the previous use at the site.
- 4.4 As the Papa John's will not be open until the lunchtime period, this will result in a reduction in trips associated with the change of use during this time. It is also considered reasonable that the takeaway store could be associated with a number of linked and pass-by trips, attracting trips that are already on the network. However, for the purposes of this assessment, there has been no reduction in the number of trips in order to provide a robust assessment.
- 4.5 The data demonstrates that the peak hours of operation for the Papa John's will be outside of the typical peak hours on the highway network (i.e. 0800-0900 and 1700-1800). Whilst there is forecast to be an increase in the numbers of trips after 6pm when compared to the extant use, which is considered typical based on the proposed takeaway use, this is considered to be immaterial with up to 20 additional vehicle trips between the hours of 6pm and 11pm (noting the site is proposed to be open until 11pm Sunday to Thursday and 1am on Fridays and Saturdays). This equates to an average of four additional vehicles per hour. This is not considered to be material or severe in the context of Paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

5. Summary and Conclusions

- 5.1 This Technical Note (TN) has been prepared by Transport Planning Associates (TPA) on behalf of Papa John's (GB) Ltd. It addresses the highway authority's concern in relation to planning application 15/01724/F.
- 5.2 The application is for the change of use from a shop (use class A1) to a hot food takeaway (use class A5) with a Gross Floor Area (GFA) of 86 square metres.
- 5.3 This report demonstrates that the change of use proposal will not have a material impact on the operation and safety of the local highway network, and the residual impacts of the development cannot be considered severe in the context of NPPF.
- 5.4 It is therefore concluded that movements generated as a result of the proposal will not represent a highway safety hazard in the vicinity of the site.
- 5.5 It is finally concluded that there are no valid highway or transportation reasons, which should prevent the proposed change of use at this site.