

Peasholme Relocation - Comparative Analysis Of The Shortlisted Sites

Monk Bar Garage

COMPARATIVE CRITERIA	COMMENT
OPERATIONAL	
1. Built form capable of operating to management guidelines (this will include shape, number of floors, response to brief etc.)	The outline scheme would meet the requirements of the brief, be limited to two floors and respond to management criteria for the service. Proximity to Bar Walls may have design implications and privacy issues for residents.
2. Location and Accessibility (This is about the immediate environment – lit routes, security for guests and neighbours)	This location meets the criteria for access to the city centre and supporting services. Access to the building would be controlled from the front of the premises. Design would ensure security of residents and neighbours. Located on main road but with a number of smaller side streets which may increase the perceived fear of crime for local residents. Close to preferred site for relocation of Arc Light which, although not insurmountable, may cause some operational difficulties.
TECHNICAL	
1. Planning (This includes constraints upon the scale and mass of the building in a particular location; constraints or restrictions upon any development imposed by adjacent development or regeneration plans for the city; the proximity of historic and listed buildings or structures and any conflict between the proposed development, the LDF and current use status)	<p>Planning:</p> <p>Currently used as a garage for the repair and service of motor vehicles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Development Control Local Plan <p style="margin-left: 40px;">The site has been identified for housing in the Development Control Local Plan (H1.38). As an allocated housing site, the provision of a hostel would be an appropriate use and there would therefore be no need to satisfy Development Control Local Plan Policy E3b, despite the site currently being in employment use.</p> ▪ Conservation Designations

Peasholme Relocation - Comparative Analysis Of The Shortlisted Sites

	<p>Site backs on to City Walls which are a Scheduled Ancient Monument and Grade I Listed – any proposals must be in accordance with PPG15: Planning and the Historic Environment and Local Plan Policies HE4 and HE9. Development proposals which would affect the setting of the Walls will require Scheduled Ancient Monument Consent and Listed Buildings consent separate to any planning permission</p> <p>Within City Centre Area of Archaeological Importance – any development proposals must be in accordance with PPG16: Archaeology and Planning and Local Plan Policy HE10</p> <p>Within Central Historic Core Conservation Area – any development proposals must be in accordance with PPG15: Planning and the Historic Environment and Local Plan Policies HE2 and HE3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Archaeology:<p>This site lies immediately adjacent to the rampart and City Wall. The scheduled area extends to the boundary wall at the rear of Monk Bar garage. The site will include deposits underneath the garage which were formerly sealed by and protected by the rampart. Other parts of the site lie on top of the now backfilled defensive ditch. There has been limited archaeological work in this area, and no archaeological evaluations on this site. Any development proposal for this site would therefore require an archaeological evaluation. The information from the evaluation would be used to design a structure which would meet the preservation requirements set out in HE10. This work would have to be done prior to any consent being granted for development. The issue of the effect a building on this site would have on the scheduled ancient monument is more difficult to resolve. Clearly, a new structure would have a significant effect on the setting of the City Walls. It would potentially block views of the Walls from Lord Mayors Walk and views from the Walls to the north-east. The massing of a building could compete with the Walls and detract</p>
--	--

Peasholme Relocation - Comparative Analysis Of The Shortlisted Sites

	<p>from their visual and physical dominance of this area. It may be possible to resolve these issues through a carefully considered design process. In addition, English Heritage would have to be consulted and their views given due weight. As the boundary wall at the rear of this site is also the retaining wall to the rampart, it is my view that scheduled monument consent (SMC) will be required for works which affect the wall. SMC is granted or refused by the Secretary of State for Culture Media and Sport who will receive advice from English Heritage. This site presents the more difficult archaeological and conservation issues which would need to be resolved for the site to be redeveloped.</p>
<p>2. Highways and Access (This includes accessibility for clients, staff, deliveries and parking; conflict with existing highway arrangements, rights of way etc; any highway improvement needs including lighting and drainage and any constraints on the development; This also considers the impact upon car parking provision in the respective areas.)</p>	<p>Much of the development depends on the extinguishment of adopted public highway in the rear lane off Monkgate. An Order needs to be made at Magistrates Court to allow development to proceed. The yard area also currently provides parking bays for the Lord Mayors Walk respark zone, which will need amendment by Members following consultation with local residents.</p> <p>The proposals are generally acceptable from a highway point of view - parking for staff members being provided in the yard area and visitor parking can be accommodated in the nearby St. John's car park.</p> <p>In the interests of security of the site, I would recommend that there be no pedestrian access to the Centre via Monkgate, and that gates be erected at the entrance to the yard.</p> <p>The cycle storage area should be fully enclosed and details will be required at some point.</p>
<p>3. Property (This includes any legal or property constraints upon development; clarifies ownership and boundary issues)</p>	<p>The site is in council ownership and currently occupied by a small garage complex. The existing user had occupied the premises and carried out his business under a tenancy agreement. That agreement has now ended. Future development will be dependant upon relocating some residents parking and extinguishing the public highway on the</p>

Peasholme Relocation - Comparative Analysis Of The Shortlisted Sites

	land adjacent to the garage. Normal practice would be to carry out some public consultation on proposals to relocate respark to the Monk Bar car park. Alternatively it may be possible to provide a solution within any future development scheme. Any future development will need to account for party wall issues and maintain secure boundaries with its neighbours.
4. Buildability (this includes the impact of ground conditions, existing services, boundary and party wall issues, flooding, planning and highway constraints upon the built solution; and accessibility during construction.)	The outline feasibility undertaken has proved both the feasibility and viability of a new build scheme on this site. The site is big enough to meet the requirements of the brief and allow for vehicular access and egress from the site in accord with highways advice.
5. Affordability (This includes the impact upon development cost of shape of site, planning constraints, highway constraints, archaeology etc as outlined above	The costs including reasonable abnormals can be contained within the budget allocated for this project.
6. Deliverability (This considers the impact of all of the above upon the current programme for redevelopment of the Hungate site)	Vacant possession could be achieved immediately and construction of the new Peasholme Centre, should it be selected, completed within the programme for redevelopment of the Hungate area.