

Public Document Pack



Democratic Support

Plymouth City Council
Civic Centre
Plymouth PL1 2AA

Please ask for Katey Johns/ Helen Rickman

T 01752 307815/ 398444

E katey.johns@plymouth.gov.uk/

helen.rickman@plymouth.gov.uk

www.plymouth.gov.uk/democracy

Published 19 November 2014

#plymplanning

PLANNING COMMITTEE

ADDENDUM REPORTS

Thursday 20 November 2014

4 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 NOS. 6.2, 6.4, 6.6 AND 6.7.

Tracey Lee

Chief Executive

PLANNING COMMITTEE

6.2. RIDGEWAY SCHOOL, MOORLAND ROAD, PLYMOUTH 14/01809/FUL **(Pages 1 - 2)**

Applicant: Ridgeway School
Ward: Plympton St Mary
Recommendation: Grant Conditionally

6.4. 6 CATALINA VILLAS, PLYMOUTH 14/01952/FUL **(Pages 3 - 6)**

Applicant: Ms J Mikus
Ward: Plymstock Radford
Recommendation: Grant Conditionally

6.6. WOODFORD PRIMARY SCHOOL, LITCHATON WAY, PLYMOUTH 14/01913/FUL **(Pages 7 - 8)**

Applicant: Plymouth City Council
Ward: Plympton St Mary
Recommendation: Grant Conditionally

6.7. 162 MANNAMEAD ROAD, PLYMOUTH 14/01861/FUL **(Pages 9 - 10)**

Applicant: Pixie Land Nursery
Ward: Compton
Recommendation: Grant Conditionally

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 6.2

Site: RIDGEWAY SCHOOL, MOORLAND ROAD PLYMOUTH

Planning Application Number: I4/01809/FUL

Applicant: Ridgeway School

Page: 15-24

Councillor Nicholson referred the application to committee however subsequent discussions have confirmed that his concerns can be resolved by condition and informative and therefore Councillor Nicholson now supports this application with the existing conditions and additional informatives detailed below.

Representations

Following the drafting of the report one further letter of representation was received, from the Chairman of the Plympton and District Civic Society (this representation was outside of the normal consultation period)

The society raised concerns about the level of car parking provided at the school. It is considered to be insufficient and this has impacts on the surrounding area.

Analysis – Traffic Impact

The committee report addressed the issues raised during the consultation period but subsequent discussions with the local member (and the letter of representation from the local Civic Society) raised further concern in regard of the level of parking which is provided for the school.

As discussed in the committee report, the proposed development will not impact on the number of car parking spaces within the grounds, nor will it increase the number of children who attend the school. As such the proposals will not impact traffic or car parking during school hours. However, the use of the car parking outside of school hours is of relevance to the use of the sports hall and discussions regarding the use of the parking and its availability for users of the sports hall have been held.

The school manage the use of their parking across the site and specifically seek to maximise its use to avoid parking on nearby streets. Outside of school hours the school seek to retain the use of the car park adjacent to the sports hall for users of the sports hall and will continue to do so.

It was suggested that conditions be imposed on this proposal to control the use of car parking in the adjacent car park. However, it is the view of officers that such conditions would not meet the tests of relevance, enforceability or reasonableness.

As such it is proposed to include the material as Informatives to reconfirm the intent of the school and the council that parking be managed within the school, outside of school hours, to minimise the impacts on surrounding areas.

Suggested informatives:

INFORMATIVE: USE OF ADJACENT CAR PARKING

3) Outside of normal school hours, the use of the car park immediately adjacent to the sports hall should only be used in conjunction with the activities within the hall and associated accommodation. It is expected that, when there are no extra curricula activities using the sportshall and associated accommodation, the car park will be secured by the school in order to prevent unauthorised use.

INFORMATIVE: USE OF SCHOOL CAR PARKS

4) Outside of normal school hours, car parking on the school site but not adjacent to the sportshall should be made available to members of the public attending events and activities at the school. This should include any/all car parking spaces within the school site which are unavailable to the public during school hours.

Both informatives have been discussed with and agreed by the school and the local member.

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 6.4

Site: 6 Catalina Villas, Plymouth, PL9 9XQ

Planning Application Number: 14/01952/FUL

Applicant: Ms J Mikus

Page: 29-34

Representations

Further to the 6 letters of objection received before the publication of the officer's report in the Committee agenda pack, a further 20 letters of objection have been received, 6 letters of support, two observations and a letter requesting that the application be deferred to the next Planning Committee. (Total of 36 representations.) The majority of these letters have been written by local residents, although some are from properties outside the vicinity of the site.

In addition to the grounds of objection set out in the officer's report, the additional grounds of objection have been raised:

- The proposal sits outside the line of sweep of two-storey development in Lawrence Road – detrimental impact on this streetscene – unduly dominant relative to the road and entrance of Catalina Villas – dominant corner plot.
- Loss of light ('cast a shadow') to 41 Durwent Close house and garden
- Overlooking of 41 Durwent Close, Lord Louis Crescent, visitors to Catalina Villas and Mount Batten House.
- Loss of visual amenity for visitors and properties adjoining Lawrence Road, including 41-47 Durwent Close.
- Insufficient information/detail on submitted plans – proximity to boundaries and no. 41's conservatory not shown.
- Further extension and another balcony contrary to NPPF.
- Result in cramped and ugly view from seaward side.
- Impact on 6 Durwent Close – 12 metres away.
- Detrimental implications for 6 Catalina Villas.

Many of the letters referred to the planning history of the Catalina Villas site, noting plot 6 is smaller than the other plots in this development and is a smaller house, referring to the difficulty in positioning no. 6 and suggesting the proposal is contrary to the planning brief for the development in 1999/2000. One letter comments that in this proposal no consideration has been given to the sensible thinking that originally determined the height, position and location of no.6.

Letters in support of the proposal did so on the following grounds:

- This second application takes into account all issues raised and meets criteria for planning consent.
- The proposal does not impede the vision corridors and a view from a property is not protected by planning policies.
- It cannot be considered to be overbearing and not true that it will overshadow due to change in ground level.
- The proposal is in keeping with the existing building and does not detract from Catalina Villas.
- No reason for precedent as Catalina Villas properties are individually designed.

Several of the letters of support also commented about the overlooking of the application site by 41 Durwent Close due to the difference in ground level and alterations to that property since it was built.

One letter suggested that the proposal be amended to include a hipped roof to reduce the impact – and provided a drawing to illustrate this.

Letters also referred procedural matters, including:

- The need to ensure probity in the planning system (Members declaring conflicts of interest) and that a decision should be made on planning criteria and not personal grounds.
- The short timescale between the end of the consultation period and the presentation to planning committee.

The request for the determination of the application to be deferred to a later Planning Committee is to allow for due consideration by Members and by interested members of the public, of all representations received by the consultation period expiry date of 18 November 2014. The letter refers to Plymouth City Council's Planning Committee Code of Practice, *Probity in Planning*, adopted September 2013 which requires the Committee agenda and accompanying papers to be made public five days prior to the Planning Committee (paragraph 11.1).

Analysis

1.0 Main issues

1.1 The main issues raised from since the published officer's report in the Committee agenda pack are whether the proposal is contrary to policy and guidelines in terms of the streetscene and whether the impact of the proposal on the neighbour properties amenities is acceptable in accordance with Plymouth's Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy policy CS34, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and guidelines contained in the Development Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) First Review 2013 and the National Planning Policy Guidelines (NPPG).

2.0 Streetscene

2.1 Attention has been drawn in letters of objection to the proposal being outside the line of sweep of two-storey development in Lawrence Road. This line was considered as part of the approved proposal for no. 6 in 2000 (application reference 00/01291/FUL) and is illustrated on the drawing 551/30 from that application.

2.2 Due to the rising ground level to the east, and curve in Lawrence Road, the rear and side of the application site is relatively prominent when viewed from Lawrence Road, near the junction with Catalina Villas. Officers have carefully considered the guidelines on rear extensions and corner plot extensions and consider that the proposal complies with Development Guidelines SPD. On the approach from the west, the proposed extension will be viewed against the backdrop of the existing buildings and on the approach from the east, the proposal will appear subordinate to the existing building due to the set-down of the ridge from the main ridge. In Officers' opinion, the proposal will be dominant when viewed from only a short section of Lawrence Road in the immediate vicinity of the site. In these circumstances, the proposal is not considered to warrant refusal on the basis of the limited harm to this streetscene.

2.3 The comments in the officer's report at paragraph 4.1, therefore still stand.

3.0 Neighbouring amenities

3.1 Neighbouring amenities are addressed in the officer's report at paragraphs 2.1 and 2.2, page 32 of the agenda report pack. However letters of representation have quoted conflicting separation distances between the proposed extension and the main habitable room windows of no. 41. Letters of objection state that the distance is less than 12 metres, whilst a letters of support quotes the distance from the proposed wall to the boundary wall between no. 6 and no. 41 to be around 16 metres. From the Ordnance Survey digital plan used by the Council, the separation measures around 14.5 metres. An on-site measurement will be taken by officers and reported to the Committee.

3.2 The layout of the no. 41's house and garden takes advantage of the slope in the road and views across to Plymouth Sound. The proposal will be prominent when viewed from main habitable room windows of no. 41 and its garden, however, Officers have carefully considered the proposal against the guidelines set out in the Development Guidelines SPD relating to outlook and consider the proposal accords with these guidelines given the separation distance and taking into account the lower ground levels of the application site, and therefore refusal of this proposal is likely to be difficult to defend at appeal on grounds of visual impact.

4.0 Other issues

4.1 Looking at the additional issues raised in letters of representation, a number of issues have already been considered and addressed in the published officer's report. Addressing them in turn:

- Loss of light to 41 Durwent Close house and garden
– see paragraph 2.1 agenda report.

- Overlooking of 41 Durwent Close, Lord Louis Crescent, visitors to Catalina Villas and Mount Batten House
 - no unreasonable loss considered to result given separation, difference in ground levels and position of existing windows and roof terrace.
- Loss of visual amenity for visitors and properties adjoining Lawrence Road, including 41-47 Durwent Close
 - no unreasonable detrimental impact considered to result, accords with Development Guidelines SPD
- Insufficient information/detail on submitted plans – proximity to boundaries and no. 41's conservatory not shown
 - the plans submitted are drawn to a metric scale and combined with a site visit, Officers consider there is sufficient information to determine the application, however officers have sought further clarification on the proposed roof layout on the western elevation. The absence of the conservatory on the adjoining property is taken from the Ordnance Survey extract.
- Further extension and another balcony contrary to NPPF
 - for clarification, there is an existing balcony/roof terrace and the proposal includes a Juliet balcony which has no outside area.
- Result in cramped and ugly view from seaward side
 - proposal will be viewed in the context of existing development from distant views and not demonstrably harmful in officers' view.
- Impact on 6 Durwent Close – 12 metres away
 - 6 Durwent Close is not impacted in Officers' opinion – perhaps this reference was intended to cite 6 Catalina Villas.
- Detrimental implications for 6 Catalina Villas
 - no demonstrable harm to this property considered to result given the separation and the open nature of the existing front garden area.

Recommendation

There is no change to the Officer recommendation from the agenda report.

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 6.6

Site: Woodford Primary School, Litchaton Way, Plymouth

Planning Application Number: 14/01913/FUL

Applicant: Plymouth City Council

Page: 43-54

Members are advised that this application has not received more than five letters of representation and therefore in accordance with the Council's Constitution it is not necessary for the application to be considered by the committee.

This page is intentionally left blank

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 6.7

Site: 162 Mannamead Road, Pixieland Nursery

Planning Application Number: 14/01861/FUL

Applicant: Mrs Caroline Francis

Page: 55-62

Concerns had been raised over the accuracy of the plan. A revised plan was requested and has been received that shows the 'step' of the south elevation of the single storey building; therefore condition 2 shall now be:

Conditions

Approved Plans

(2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed plans and elevations Rev B 14005 L02.01 B

Reason:

For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of good planning, in accordance with policy CS34 of the Plymouth Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2006-2021) 2007, and paragraphs 61-66 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

This page is intentionally left blank