

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 11 February 2015

#plymplanning

PLANNING COMMITTEE

ADDENDUM REPORTS

Thursday 12 February 2015

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 NOS. 6.2, 6.4 AND 6.5.

Tracey Lee

Chief Executive

PLANNING COMMITTEE

6.2. FORT HOUSE, FORT TERRACE 14/01815/FUL

(Pages 1 - 4)

Applicant: Senate Properties (SW) Ltd
Ward: Budshead
Recommendation: Grant Conditionally

6.4. VAUXHALL QUAY 14/02332/FUL

(Pages 5 - 6)

Applicant: Sutton Harbour Services LTD
Ward: St Peter & the Waterfront
Recommendation: Grant Conditionally subject to a S106 Obligation, with delegated authority to refuse in the event that the S106 Obligation is not completed by 30/04/2015.

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 6.2

Site: Fort House, Fort Terrace, Plymouth, PL6 5BU

Planning Application Number: 14/01815/FUL

Applicant: Senate Properties (SW) Ltd

Page: 13

Additional Representations Received;

A further four letters of representation have been received as a result of the recent re-advertisement of the amended scheme, and commenting as follows;

Three objecting as follows;

- Changes to Plots 1-4 do not lessen impact on outlook from Crownhill Fort.
Officer response – the substitution of two storey houses in place of the originally proposed three storey houses results in a reduction in the overall height of these four buildings by approximately 1.0 metre, and significantly reduces the visual bulk & massing of these buildings by virtue of the roof design changes.
- Reduction in height of buildings on Plots 1-4 will be less than 1.0 metre.
Officer response – the design changes do result in a reduction of the height of the buildings as described above, but this is accompanied by other significant beneficial changes to these proposed buildings as well.
- Photomontages are misleading in that they do not show true extent of the visual impact of the proposed development.
Officer response – the applicant’s submitted photomontages are particularly helpful in illustrating the form of the proposed development in comparison to the impact of the existing buildings on the land, but it must be recognised that these cannot be expected to show every feature of the proposed development in full detail.
- Removal of trees rear of 29 to 31 Oak Drive will affect privacy of those properties and these trees should be kept as a green buffer area.
Officer response - A line of large laurels is proposed to be removed (and a few have already been removed by the landowner) as they currently stand along the line of the proposed rear elevations of houses on Plots 1-4. There is however a second hedge on the actual boundary between the land and the existing neighbouring properties in Oak Drive and this is proposed to be supplemented by additional hedge planting in order to provide adequate screening on the boundary.
- House and garage on Plot 4 should be reversed (to match proposed dwelling on Plot 8) to improve the relationship with 29 Oak Drive.

Officer response – There is adequate distance between proposed house (Plot 4) and existing dwelling (29 Oak Drive), in excess of 21 metres, which is sufficient to ensure an acceptable relationship between these properties in terms of privacy, and outlook, for both properties.

- Transport Statement has been carried over from previously withdrawn application 14/01621/FUL and underestimates the number of vehicle movements that would be generated given each dwelling would have 4 parking spaces.

Officer response – The previous application was withdrawn in order to prepare further supporting information, but the scale of development proposed remains exactly the same as in the original application (14 dwellings) and so it is entirely reasonable for the applicant to carry over the same transport report into this current application.

One supporting as follows;

- Happy with scheme and querying when work will start.
Officer response; The standard 3 year development start time condition is proposed, and so if approved, the development may lawfully commence at any time within this period.

Distance between existing houses in Oak Drive and proposed houses on Plots 1-4;

Paragraph 12 of the Planning Committee report comments on the distances between the existing and proposed houses in relation to Plots 1-4. The situation in this respect has changed following the house type changes, and the exact position is that there would be a distance of 21 metres in respect of the separations between Plots 4, 3 and 2, and 29, 30 and 31 Oak Drive, respectively. This meets the distance recommended in the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance Design First Review 2013. The distance is less between Plot 1 and 32 Oak Drive, at just over 19 metres, excluding its garage, but the existing property presents an entirely windowless flank wall to the application site, and so this reduced level of separation is acceptable in this context.

Planning History;

Planning Application 14/01621/FUL (14 houses) was received by the Council on 27 August 2014, but was then withdrawn by the Applicant on 11 September 2014, prior to the submission of the current application.

Additional Condition Recommended;

In order to ensure that any future significant alterations, including balcony/window installations, to the amended dwellings (on Plots 1-4 inclusive) should require express planning permission from the Council, an additional condition is recommended stating as follows;

Condition 7

Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 and Class A of Part 1 to Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional windows or extensions to the approved buildings on Plots 1-4 inclusive, including any roof alterations and/or roof extensions, shall be subsequently added at any time unless planning permission has first been granted by the Council for any such works.

Reason:

In order to protect the privacy enjoyed by the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings in accordance with Policy CS34 of the Plymouth Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2006-2021) 2007, and paragraph 61 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Community Infrastructure Levy;

Provisional estimates indicate that the development would attract a CIL charge in the region of £50,000 to £100,000 based on the provision of 14 no. 4 and 5 bedroom dwellings.

This page is intentionally left blank

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 6.4 & 6.5

Site: VAUXHALL QUAY, PLYMOUTH

Application Numbers: I4/02332/FUL & I4/02334/LBC

Applicant: Sutton Harbour Services Ltd

Page: 39

1.0 Natural England

Natural England had requested further information about construction impacts on the Plymouth Sound and Estuaries Special Area of Conservation and the Dartmoor Special Area of Conservation. In response to further information provided by the applicant a further consultation response has been received from Natural England as follows:

“Thank you for sending through the detailed response from the applicant about the issues that Natural England raised regarding potential impacts on the Dartmoor SAC and the Plymouth Sound and Estuaries SAC. In particular we were unable to rule out any likely significant effect on these sites resulting from underwater noise and the potential for suspended sediments entering the Plymouth Sound and Estuaries SAC.

Having seen the proposed methodologies it appears that it will be possible to pin down an approach to this work that will mitigate for these potential impacts. We understand that the applicant is unable to finalise the method statement at this stage and therefore in order to remove any likely significant effect on the two SACs we recommend that the following conditions are included within the planning permission:

- *Prior to commencement of the works a pollution prevention method statement is agreed by Plymouth City Council.*
- *Prior to commencement of the works a Construction Environmental Management Plan is agreed by Plymouth City Council.*

Natural England advises that we are consulted prior to the sign off of both of these documents to ensure that mitigation is in place to protect the designated sites.”

Officers can confirm that the above conditions are already included in the Planning Application Report.

2.0 Public Access

The Council's Senior Lawyer advises that public access to the Boardwalk could be secured as part of the S106 legal agreement in a similar way to that which was put in place with the Sutton Harbour Lock Bridge. The applicant is in agreement with this approach and officers recommend that public access be secured in this way.

3.0 Briefing Event for Members and Ward Councillors

The applicant invited Members and Ward Councillors to a briefing event about the planning applications at Sutton Harbour Holdings' offices at Tin Quay House on 05/02/15. The Case Officer attended to ensure Members complied with the Code of Good Practice for Planning Committee.

4.0 Recommendation

No change is proposed to the recommendation in the report.