



#plymplanning

Democratic and Member Support

Chief Executive's Department
Plymouth City Council
Ballard House
Plymouth PL1 3BJ

Please ask for Lynn Young
T 01752 304163
E lynn.young@plymouth.gov.uk
www.plymouth.gov.uk/democracy
Published 28 September 2016

PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDENDUM REPORTS

Thursday 29 September 2016
2.00 pm
Council House, Plymouth

Members:

Councillor Wogens, Chair

Councillor Mrs Bridgeman, Vice Chair

Councillors Cook, Sam Davey, Fletcher, Kelly, Martin Leaves, Morris, Mrs Pengelly, Sparling, Stevens, Jon Taylor and Tuohy.

Please find attached addendum reports in respect of agenda items 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3.

Tracey Lee

Chief Executive

Planning Committee

AGENDA

PART I – PUBLIC MEETING

6.1.9 Berry Park Road, Plymouth - 16/01439/FUL (Pages 1 - 2)

Applicant: Mrs Elliott
Ward: Plymstock Radford
Recommendation: Grant Conditionally

6.2. Home Park Football Ground, Outland Road, Plymouth - 16/01409/FUL (Pages 3 - 4)

Applicant: Mr Gary McGuire
Ward: Peverell
Recommendation: Grant Conditionally

6.3. 134 Vauxhall Street, Plymouth - 16/00007/FUL (Pages 5 - 6)

Applicant: Mr Manoch Bahmanzadeh
Ward: St Peter and the Waterfront
Recommendation: Refuse

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 6.1

Site: 9 Berry Park Road

Planning Application Number: 16/01439/FUL

Applicant: Mrs Elliott

Pages: 7-13

Since the Case Officer's report was written 5 additional letters of representation have been received. All letters refer to the re-advertised amended plans and raise objections on the following grounds;

- Changes to the character of the area
- Roof shape is out of character with other bungalows
- Oversized and dominant
- Increase in overlooking and loss of light and privacy
- Increase in traffic problems.
- Roofline would be dominant and create a precedent
- The fourth bedroom could be reinstated by the addition of a window later on.

With the exception of the last point all these matters have been addressed in the Case Officer's report.

In relation to the last point bedroom 4 was part of the original scheme and would have been located at the rear of the upper floor. When the amended scheme was submitted the roof was lowered and bedroom 4 was removed. Officers are not concerned that this bedroom could be reinstated by the addition of a window, as a condition removing permitted development rights has been attached. This means that planning consent would be required for the addition of any new windows.

This page is intentionally left blank

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 6.2

Site: Home Park Football Ground, Outland Road

Planning Application Number: 16/01409/FUL

Applicant: Mr Gary McGuire

Pages: 15-21

Since completion of the officers report the applicant has advised that, following ground tests, the area allocated for the proposed changing room extension, has been found to be unsuitable because of instability and the presence of a large number of services. Due to the additional costs and associated difficulties they have decided not to pursue this option.

With regards to the hospitality marquee the original planning permission (03/01057/FUL) was granted for 2 years. This expired on 23 February 2006. This means that the marquee has been in operation for more than 10 years and is therefore now immune from enforcement action. Paragraph 004 of the National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance sets out the time limits for enforcement action.

“Development becomes immune from enforcement if no action is taken:

- Within four years of substantial completion for a breach of planning control consisting of operational development;
- Within four years for an unauthorised change of use to a single dwellinghouse;
- Within ten years for any other breach of planning control (essentially other changes of use).

These time limits are set out in section 171B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.”

Since the changing room extension is no longer viable and the hospitality marquee is not subject to planning control the applicants have decided to withdraw the application.

This page is intentionally left blank

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 6.3

Site: 134 VAUXHALL STREET, PLYMOUTH

Application Number: 16/00007/FUL

Applicant: Mr Manoch Bahmanzadeh

LATE LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION

A further 11 letters of objection have been received since completion of the officers report. These letters do not raise any new issues than those already identified in the report, mainly objecting to the loss of the existing building and some to the proposed students.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT OFFICERS COMMENTS

For the purposes of clarity the LPA Historic Environment Officer has commented on the scheme and recommended refusal as per the recommendation. Their comments have been integrated within paragraphs 7 to 19.

DRAINAGE

A drainage strategy has now been submitted with this application. The submitted modelling and detailed design shows that surface water from the development can be discharged to Sutton Harbour through the existing surface water system by upsizing a section of pipe. The pipe will be upsized using no-dig technology to minimise disruption to the local residents and the public. South West Water, the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority have confirmed this is an acceptable strategy and have removed their objections, therefore the refusal reason for drainage is now not considered applicable.

SEQUENTIAL TEST

The submission of a sequential test has now been submitted with this application. The aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. This identifies the Sutton Harbour Area Action plan as the boundary, which is in line with discussions with the Environment Agency. A review of reasonably available sites within this area has been undertaken. In conclusion, it is not considered that there are any sequentially preferable reasonably available sites for student accommodation in Sutton Harbour. Overall, sufficient information has now been submitted for the LPA to review the sequential test, and this confirms that there are no sequentially preferable sites for this specific proposal.

ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

The Shopping Centres Supplementary Planning Document should also be listed as a relevant planning consideration.

REFUSAL REASON REMOVED

On the basis of the above, it is now considered that the 2nd reason for refusal has been addressed, there are no remaining concerns regarding flooding or drainage and therefore the 2nd reason for refusal can now be removed from the recommendation. The recommendation for refusal does however remain and refusal reason one is unaltered.