



Democratic Support

Plymouth City Council
Ballard House
West Hoe Road
Plymouth
PL1 3BJ

Please ask for Helen Rickman/
Lynn Young
T 01752 398444/304163
E helen.rickman@plymouth.gov.uk/
lynn.young@plymouth.gov.uk
www.plymouth.gov.uk/democracy
Published 13 January 2016

#plymplanning

PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDENDUM REPORTS

Thursday 14 January 2016
4.00 pm
Council House, Plymouth (Next to the Civic Centre)

Members:

Councillor Stevens, Joint Chair in the Chair

Councillor Nicholson, Joint Chair

Councillors Mrs Bowyer, Mrs Bridgeman, Darcy, Sam Davey, K Foster, Jarvis, Kelly, Ricketts, Jon Taylor, Kate Taylor and Tuohy.

Please find enclosed additional information in respect of agenda items 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4

Tracey Lee

Chief Executive

PLANNING COMMITTEE

AGENDA

PART I – PUBLIC MEETING

6.2. SIGNS AT THE ROYAL WILLIAM YARD - I5/02028/ADV **(Pages 1 - 2)**

Applicant: Urban Splash
Ward: St Peter & The Waterfront
Recommendation: Grant Conditionally

6.3. COOMBE HOUSE, THE QUAY, PLYMOUTH - I5/02098/FUL **(Pages 3 - 4)**

Applicant: Mr and Mrs R Tooze
Ward: Plymstock Radford
Recommendation: Refuse

6.4. FORMER CHINA CLAY MARSH MILLS WORKS, COYPOOL - TPO506 **(Pages 5 - 6)**

Applicant:
Ward: Plympton St Mary
Recommendation: To confirm TPO 506 with modification to order map.

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 6.2

Site: Royal William Yard

Planning Application: 15/02028/ADV

Applicant: Urban Splash

Page: 7-14

Letter of representation

1. A late letter of representation has been received identified as an “observation” to the application. The points made state that the signs are out of keeping, too numerous, are “illiterate” (due to the text being in lower case) and provide minimal useful information. No amendment to the recommendation is proposed as a result of this late letter of representation.

Historic England

2. Officers have received a consultation response from Historic England which states that it has considered the application against the signage strategy produced by Gillespie Yunnie on behalf of Urban Splash in 2011. Whilst Historic England does not see the need to comment in detail it wishes to point out that the application deviates from the strategy and is therefore for the Council to consider whether appropriate justification has been provided to support the current application
3. For clarification Urban Splash’s signage strategy was never formally adopted by the Council and therefore should be treated as an evidence base only for the consideration of this application. However a very similar proposal was approved previously in 2011 under application no. 11/00155/ADV which was designed in consultation with Historic England. Officers consider the current application, whilst different from the previously approved scheme, is still acceptable when considered against the signage strategy.

Condition relating to illumination

4. Officers propose a rewording to Condition 7 which relates to the controlling of the brightness levels. The reason for the change follows consultation on the wording with the applicant. The original wording refers to a photo cell. However, if this part of the condition was adhered to it would result in the need for a change in design that would be unacceptable in historic environment terms. Therefore it is proposed that Condition 7 is amended to read:

(7) A scheme for the control of the intensity of the illumination of the advertisement, to include a dimmer control mechanism to adjust brightness accordingly, shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing by the Local Planning

Page 2

Authority within one month of the date of this decision. The advertisements shall be displayed in accordance with the agreed scheme thereafter.

Reason: To protect amenity in accordance with policy CS34 of the Plymouth Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2006-2012) 2007 and paragraph 67 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 6.3

Site: COOMBE HOUSE, THE QUAY

Planning Application Number: 15/02098/FUL

Applicant: Mr and Mrs R Tooze

Page: 15-24

1. Members will note that the second refusal reasons relates to the proposed first floor balcony, which does not provide the required 2.4m clearance over the highway. The applicant has submitted a revised plan (Proposed Plans and Elevations - P673-02 Rev C) which replaces the first floor balcony with a Juliet balcony. The Local Highways Authority has reviewed this amendment, and considers the specific details acceptable as it will not interfere with the highway. Furthermore, the alteration does not demonstrably harm the appearance of the proposal.

Therefore it is proposed that the following is REMOVED as a refusal reason:-

Part of the proposed first floor balcony structure on The Quay that would over-sail the public highway fails to provide the minimum clearance of 2.4 metres required between the underside of the lowest part of the supporting struts of the balcony and the surface of the highway to ensure public safety; and would result in an unacceptable impact, therefore the proposal is contrary to Policy CS34.7 of the adopted Local Development Framework Core Strategy adopted April 2007; including paragraph 16.14.

2. Members are advised that two additional letters of representation has been received, both objecting to the proposal. The letter raises similar issues to the other letters of objection, however for clarity the following points have been noted:-
 - This application is completely inappropriate, and will introduce three extra dwellings into an already congested area.
 - The potential for an increase in vehicle numbers will exacerbate an already strained parking situation in the area and will result in residents finding it harder to park their vehicles in a reasonable distance of their homes.
 - The proposed dwellings are to be placed in an area where roads are only suitable to allow one car through at a time, and as such there is potential for these dwellings to increase congestion and cause undue stress to pre-existing residents.

No amendment is proposed as a result of these additional letters of representations. In total, seven letters of representation have now been received with respect to this planning application; three in support, and four objecting

This page is intentionally left blank

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 6.4

Site: Former Marsh Mills China Clay Works, Coypool

Planning Application: Tree Preservation Order no.506

Objector : Concise Construction

Page: 25-32

Aspect Tree Consultancy has been instructed by their client, Concise Construction, to formally withdraw the previously submitted Tree Preservation Order (TPO) objection to the making of the above TPO, following detailed on site discussions; on condition that the boundary of the woodland order (W1), as detailed in the report, is modified to accurately reflect the true extent of the woodland.

In addition they state that:-

- *the current decontamination works are not yet complete and therefore it may be necessary to review the Order at a later date depending on additional as yet unforeseen circumstances outside of the control of my client.*
- *The boundary woodland has areas/compartments of varying quality, structure and condition. W1 generally, and in particular the woodland edges, have scope for improvement with appropriate management; such as light sculpting to create more 'edge', replanting with transitional native woodland-edge tree species and a degree of age/species restructuring to increase overall value and diversity. The forthcoming proposed development of this site provides an opportunity to make an investment in the boundary woodland areas to improve the overall condition. This can be achieved without denuding or having a significant impact on current amenity value. The future management of the tree population on site will be discussed and then secured during the planning application process.*

The Local Planning Authority is happy to amend the boundary of the woodland part of the TPO as agreed and indicated in the report. The Local Planning Authority has no issue with reviewing the TPO if necessary or working with owners to improve the overall quality and diversity of the woodland in the future. If the site is developed in the future, such improvements can indeed be secured through the planning process.

This page is intentionally left blank