



From: Fiona Fitzgerald
Sent: 15 January 2018 10:36
To: Planning.Responses
Cc: Anita Gardner
Subject: WA/88/17/PL

Hi Anita,

Could you forward the following questions to the applicant please?

1. The application letter states “there are no proposed works to the attached Burger King unit” but the plans show a 48 sq m triangular extension. Which is correct? Is Burger King being extended or not?
2. I note that the applicant is applying for 24hr use for the drive-thru. However, no indication of how intense the use will be, how many customers, the likely number of cars and times has been provided. Please could this information be provided?
3. Further to point 2, no noise assessment has been undertaken. The application letter states that “given the lack of nearby housing or other sensitive receptor, the proposal will not result in any harm to residential amenity”. However, the nearest resident property (measuring from the boundary of BK/KFC car park to the boundary of the residential premises) is only 60m. There are also other houses on the opposite side of Arundel Road at 80m distant that appear not to have been taken into account. Please could a noise assessment be undertaken to provide information on whether or not this proposal is likely to cause detriment to residential neighbours.
4. Can the applicant confirm whether they consider the number of wash-hand-basins in the KFC kitchen to be sufficient (2 no.).
5. Please could the applicant confirm the number of covers for this premises, so that Environmental Health can assess whether the sanitary provision is sufficient.
6. Finally, there is no detail of the boundary works between the proposed premises and the existing Travelodge. There is a current rat infestation, located primarily in the bank between the Little Chef/BK and Travelodge and a large part of the problem is to do with harbourage for rats in this bank, which is riddled with rat holes. This issue is recurrent, and when it happens, severe. Although there is no current evidence that pests are present within the premises, there is a strong potential this this will occur. Given the potential litter issues which may be associated with a drive-thru premises, and the current continued problems with rats in this area, Environmental Health would be very concerned if this issue is not dealt with in this application. I would suggest that the bank be removed entirely and replaced with a wall.

At present, due to the issues raised above, Environmental Health would **object** to this application.

Regards

Fiona Fitzgerald