

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: 4 th February 2020		
<p>NOTE: This schedule reports only additional letters received before 5pm on the day before committee.</p> <p>Any items received on the day of Committee will be reported verbally to the meeting</p>		
Item No.	Application No	Originator
7	19/04987/ADV Battlefield Services	SC Highways
<p>Having looked at the application details and the advice provided by WSP, I am content that the specific requirements of WSP can be dealt with by way of a negatively worded condition. In this regard I would suggest the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior to the commencement of the development full structural engineering details and supporting calculations of the sign foundation and sign fixing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; the sign pole, its fixing and supporting foundation shall be constructed fully in accordance with the approved details. Reason: To ensure the structural integrity of the sign in the interests of highway and pedestrian safety. <p>Clearly the above will require a DIS application to be submitted and it is a matter therefore if the applicant wishes to submit the details requested by WSP in order to avoid a DIS application.</p> <p><u>Case Officer comments:</u> Proposed condition 7 in the Committee Report seeks similar details to the above, however it is recommended that condition 7 is re-worded in line with the above.</p>		
Item No.	Application No	Originator
7	19/04987/ADV Battlefield Services	Public comment
<p>Objection received on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - existing sign is large enough for the size of road; the building itself is also visible from the road and does a lot of the advertising for itself - the application says that it is not already in place, and n/a when talking about replacing existing signage. While this may be a mistake it does not show clear intent to replace the existing one and may be an application to place a new one in addition to the old one (despite the wording in the title) - also says that it projects over a footpath/highway (assuming the footpath?). Once again, if something goes wrong let it only fall 6m to the ground rather than 9m if cars or pedestrians are underneath it - sign is currently in keeping with the height of the signs around it. The all work together as a block. No need for one to dramatically tower over the others <p><u>Applicant's response:</u></p>		

In response to the above the applicant has confirmed that the existing totem sign is already in place, and the proposed sign is a replacement to this. In addition the applicant has confirmed that there is no overhang onto any footpath/highway.

Case officer comments:

The application, as set out in the description of the development on the application form, is for a replacement sign at the same position as the existing one. The 8 metres high sign would be positioned approximately 10 metres from the public highway. The Committee report recommends that structural details of the sign are submitted for approval, and it is considered that this would provide satisfactory reassurance over safety implications.