

Public Document Pack



Democratic Support

Plymouth City Council
Civic Centre
Plymouth PL1 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 8 October 2014

#plymplanning

PLANNING COMMITTEE

ADDENDUM REPORTS

Thursday 9 October 2014
4.00 pm
Council House, Plymouth (Next to the Civic Centre)

Members:

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

Please find attached addendum reports for consideration under agenda item numbers 6.3, 6.4 and 6.5.

Tracey Lee
Chief Executive

PLANNING COMMITTEE

6.3. ROYAL EYE INFIRMARY, APSLEY ROAD, PLYMOUTH 14/01228/FUL **(Pages 1 - 2)**

Applicant: Eagle One Homes Ltd
Ward: Drake
Recommendation: Grant Conditionally

6.4. 9-10 ERMINGTON TERRACE, PLYMOUTH 14/01685/FUL **(Pages 3 - 4)**

Applicant: The Harbour Centre
Ward: Compton
Recommendation: Grant Conditionally

6.5. 1 AMITY PLACE, PLYMOUTH 14/01656/FUL **(Pages 5 - 6)**

Applicant: Mr Daniel Fellows
Ward: Drake
Recommendation: Grant Conditionally

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 6.3

Site: Royal Eye Infirmary, Apsley Road, Plymouth.

Planning Application Number: I4/01228/FUL

Applicant: Eagle One Homes Limited.

Page: 27-50

Conditions

It is proposed to delete condition 15, as the requirements of this condition are covered in condition 18.

This page is intentionally left blank

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 6.4

Site: 9 TO 10 ERMINGTON TERRACE PLYMOUTH

Planning Application Number: 14/01685/FUL

Applicant: The Harbour Centre

Page: 51-58

Consultation response

The Police Architectural Liaison officer has no objections to the proposal

Representations

In total 23 letters of representation has been received regarding this proposal. 12 of the representations were against whilst 11 were in support of the application. The main objections were:-

- Imbalance the community
- Saturation of HMOs
- Loss of a community
- Anti- social behaviour
- Noise concerns
- Crime
- Type of clientele that the proposed use will attract

With regards to the saturation of HMOs within the area Article 4 is not considered to be relevant to this proposal since Article 4 specifically relates to the loss of a family dwelling (Class C3) whereas at present 9-10 Ermington Terrace is currently used as a clinic (D1). Furthermore, since this site is currently used as by the Harbour Centre as a clinic it is considered that it will not create any further imbalance to the existing community.

Officers consider that the applicant has tried to minimise the impact upon the residential area by including manager's accommodation at ground floor and having a management arrangement that can be enforced through a condition. It is considered that this will minimise any noise concerns and anti-social behaviour that may occur.

It is noted that the main concerns for objectors were the clientele that the proposed development would attract. A number of letters suggested that this use would be better served out of the city centre. The Harbour Centre already has an established use on these premises and it is therefore not considered that the change of use will change the clientele. The comings and goings of the proposed use will be significantly less that those associated with the current D1 clinic use.

With regards to crime this issue has not been raised as a concern by Devon and Cornwall Police and therefore it would be difficult for officers to conclude that a recommendation for refusal could be made based on anticipated incidences of crime, disorder or anti-social behaviour in the local community.

No amendments are therefore proposed to the recommendation to Planning Committee.

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 6.5

Site: I AMITY PLACE

Planning Application Number: 14/01656/FUL

Applicant: Mr Daniel Fellows

Page: 56-66

Representations

Nine letters of representation were received regarding this application. Out of the nine received one was in support and eight were objecting. The objections related to:

- Loss of Community Asset
- Imbalance of community
- Overcrowding

The loss of a Community Asset has been assessed and is discussed in paragraph 8 of the report. It is noted that whilst a Community Asset has the capability of being a material planning consideration in this particular application little weight is being given to the ACV designation as there is little prospect of any community use being reinstated on the site. It is considered that the loss of the community use of a public house on this site is not sufficient enough to refuse the application.

With reference to the overcrowding and imbalance of a community it is noted that the area has a high student population however given that the surrounding area is predominantly residential it is considered that the proposal would not have a negative impact upon the character of the area. The planning statement submitted with the application states that there are a number of bars and pubs within walking distance situated on North Hill. With this in mind it is not considered that the loss of a pub will have a detrimental, impact upon the community nor will it add to overcrowding of a predominantly residential area.

No amendments are therefore proposed to the recommendation to Planning Committee

This page is intentionally left blank