## **Public Document Pack**





Democratic Support Plymouth City Council Civic Centre Plymouth PLI 2AA

Please ask for Katey Johns/ Helen Rickman/ Lynn Young T 01752 307815/ 398444/ 304163 E katey.johns@plymouth.gov.uk/ helen.rickman@plymouth.gov.uk/ lynn.young@plymouth.gov.uk www.plymouth.gov.uk/democracy Published 10 September 2014

#plymplanning

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

## ADDENDUM REPORTS

Thursday 11 September 2014 4 pm Council House, Plymouth (Next to the Civic Centre)

Members:

Councillor Stevens, Chair Councillor Tuohy, Vice Chair Councillors Mrs Bowyer, Darcy, K Foster, Mrs Foster, Jarvis, Morris, Nicholson, Stark, Jon Taylor, Kate Taylor and Wheeler.

PLEASE FIND ATTACHED ADDENDUM REPORTS FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER AGENDA ITEM NOS. 6.1, 6.2 AND 6.3, 6.5 AND 7.

Tracey Lee Chief Executive

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

6.I	LAND OFF ABERDEEN AVENUE PLYMOUTH 14/00152/OUT		(Pages I - 2)
	Applicant: Ward: Recommendation:	Beavertail Ltd Eggbuckland Grant Conditionally Subject to a S106 Obligation, with delegated authority to refuse in the event that the S106 Obligation is not completed by 2 November 2014	
6.2 & 6.3	26 LONGBROOK STREET PLYMOUTH 14/01144/FUL 26 LONGBROOK STREET PLYMOUTH 14/01145/LBC		(Pages 3 - 4)
	Applicant: Ward: Recommendation:	Mr Steve Vitali Plympton Erle Grant Conditionally	
6.5	LAND ADJACENT YARDLEY GARDENS ESTOVER PLYMOUTH		(Pages 5 - 6)
	Applicant: Ward: Recommendation:	Mr Andrew Mitchelmore Moor View Grant Conditionally	
7.	OBJECTIONS FRO PRESERVATION C AVENUE	(Pages 7 - 8)	

The Strategic Director for Place will submit a report outlining objections received in respect of a Tree Preservation Order application at 242 St Pancras Avenue.

Planning Committee



### Item Number: 6.1

Site: Land off Aberdeen Avenue, Manadon Park, Plymouth.

### Planning Application Number: 14/00152/OUT

Applicant: Beavertrail Ltd.

Page: 7

#### **Agronomists report**

The agronomists report has now been received and makes 2 recommendations:

#### Option I

- Improvements to surface levels through targeted importation and grading of topsoil.
- Construction of an 8 pitch cricket square.
- Installation of a non-turf cricket pitch.
- 12 months initial agronomic maintenance.

#### Option 2

- Improvements to surface levels through targeted importation and grading of topsoil.
- Installation of a non-turf cricket pitch.
- 12 months initial agronomic maintenance.

The total costs for Options I and 2, inclusive of preliminaries, 10% contingency and 12-months agronomic maintenance post-construction, but excluding VAT, are anticipated to be in the region of **£95 k** (option 1) and **£60 k** (option 2) respectively.

#### Sport England Comments

Sport England has provided further comments in their letter dated 9<sup>th</sup> September 2014. They state that the application should be refused, due to loss of playing pitches at the site. They do, however, provide comments on the proposed mitigation package and state that Option I (of the agronomists report) should be implemented if planning approval is granted. They also require an input into the design of the proposed Pavilion building and the inclusion of cricket nets at the site. These requests will be incorporated into the Section 106 Agreement.

#### Highways

It is proposed to delete condition 25 which refers to the removal of the bus gate and traffic regulation Order at the Frobisher Approach junction. This is not required as the proposed development is no longer required to use the Frobisher Approach junction as an access to the site (via Aberdeen Avenue).

This page is intentionally left blank

**Planning Committee** 



Item Number: 6.2 and 6.3 Site: 26 Longbrook Street, Plymouth, PL7 INJ Planning Application Number: 14/01144/FUL and 14/01145/LBC Applicant: Mr Steve Vitali Pages: 43-52 and 53-60

#### Representations

A further letter of representation has been received from a nearby residential in support of the application 14/01145/FUL.

#### Consultations

A letter has been received from the Society of the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) commenting on the development of the scheme from previous proposals and concluding they are content to accept that this new scheme constitutes a suitable solution to the problem of adding additional accommodation on this challenging site.

#### Recommendation

There is no change to the Officer recommendation.

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Committee



### Item Number: 6.5

Site: Land adjacent Yardley Gardens, Estover, Plymouth

Planning Application Number: 14/01317/FUL

Applicant: Mr Andrew Mitchelmore

**Page:** 75

For the sake of clarity it is proposed that a further condition is added as outlined below:

#### BIODIVERSITY

(9) Unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations in the Preliminary Ecological Assessment (dated September 2014) for the site. For the avoidance of doubt this shall include the recommendations for:

- Replacement tree planting,
- Tree protection during construction,
- External lighting,
- Bat boxes,
- Bat access panels,
- Vegetation clearance during bird nesting season,
- Bird boxes,

#### Reason

In the interests of the retention, protection and enhancement of wildlife and features of biological interest, in accordance with Core Strategy policies CS01, CS19, CS34 and Government advice contained in the NPPF.

#### Recommendation

The recommendation should read "Grant conditionally subject to a \$106 Planning Obligation"

This page is intentionally left blank

**Planning Committee** 

## Item Number: 7

**Subject:** Objections from Mr Hulcoop to Tree Preservation Order No. 500: 242, St. Pancras Avenue

### **Page:** 87

Tree 2 of Tree Preservation Order No. 500 was inspected by Chris Knapman (Tree Officer) on  $4^{th}$  September 2014 to assess reports from the tree's owners that there was a stem defect. A small area of solid dysfunctional wood was found between 2 of the buttress roots, but was not considered significant to the structural integrity of the tree. In addition it was noted that branches on the side of the tree facing the house had been removed a long time ago at around 3 metres above ground level, leaving half of the tree's crown, that has now grown back over the trunk and the tree's centre of gravity.

The old pruning wounds appeared sound and there was no evidence that the tree poses a threat to the adjacent property.







The following advice was also provided concerning tree work the Council would support on application. (Notwithstanding considering any other work the owners wish to apply for.)



TI Oak- Sever Ivy- no consent required as not part of tree.

T2 Oak- No work at present.

T3 Beech- Crown lift to 4-5 metres above ground level, shorten back lower to mid-crown branches (the lower third to half of the tree's crown) by 2-3 metres.

The owner indicated that she would still like to remove tree T2. It was explained that an application could be made for this work, but based on condition and that the tree could potentially be accommodated alongside future development, it was confirmed by the Tree Officer that the recommendation to retain the tree and confirm the Order without variation would stand. It was also confirmed that, if Planning Committee agree the officer recommendation the Council would be unlikely to support a felling application without evidence that this was necessary based on the tree's condition.

Concerning plans for a future house extension, it was advised that, through the pre application process officers would be able to discuss design options that allow retention of the trees in a suitable design relationship.