



#plymplanning



**Democratic and Member Support**

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

Please ask for Helen Rickman  
T 01752 398444  
E [helen.rickman@plymouth.gov.uk](mailto:helen.rickman@plymouth.gov.uk)  
[www.plymouth.gov.uk/democracy](http://www.plymouth.gov.uk/democracy)  
Published 03 May 2017

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

### ADDENDUM REPORTS

Thursday 4 May 2017  
2.00 pm  
Council House, Plymouth

**Members:**

Councillor Wogens, Chair

Councillor Mrs Bridgeman, Vice Chair

Councillors Ball, Cook, Sam Davey, Fletcher, Mrs Foster (substitute for Councillor Kelly), Kelly, McDonald, Mrs Pengelly, Sparling, Stevens, Tuffin (substitute for Councillor Sparling), Tuohy and Winter.

**Please find attached additional information for consideration relating to agenda item numbers 6.2 and 6.3.**

**Tracey Lee**

Chief Executive

# Planning Committee

## Agenda

### Part I – Public Meeting

#### 6. Planning Applications for consideration

The Assistant Director for Strategic Planning and Infrastructure will submit a schedule asking Members to consider Applications, Development proposals by Local Authorities and statutory consultations under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

6.2 7 Tor Crescent, Plymouth, PL3 5TW - 17/00329/FUL **(Pages 1 - 2)**

Applicant: Eric Davis  
Ward: Peverell  
Recommendation: Grant Conditionally  
Case Officer: Mrs Liz Wells

6.3 Land off Lake View Close, Plymouth - 16/02295/OUT **(Pages 3 - 4)**

Applicant: Ms D Forshaw  
Ward: Budshead  
Recommendation: Refuse  
Case Officer: Mr Simon Osborne

# ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



**Item Number: 6.2**

**Site: 7 Tor Crescent, Plymouth,**

**Planning Application Number: 17/00329/FUL**

**Applicant: Mr E Davis**

**Pages: 13-22**

With reference to section 6 of the Officer's report, Representations, further representations have been received since the committee agenda was published. The total number of representations now received in respect of the amended plans totals 9.

The comments reiterate many of the concerns/objections already addressed in the published Officer's report. Additional points of objection made are listed below (the numbering continues from the numbering in the published report):

6. shadow study misleading as fails to show the other side windows on no. 9 (four windows in total)
7. Metal cladding noisy when it rains
8. Location of kitchen next to adjoining semi and potential drainage problems
9. No fire escape to rear
10. Covenant about front stone walls - reinforcing the overall 'feel' of the street, including external finish and colour
11. removal of slated canopy over front door

Several of the letters acknowledge that the amended plans are an improvement but do not overcome their concerns and clarify that they do not object to the rear extension of roof extension – only the two storey side extension and the external finish.

One letter suggests that if the application is approved, then conditions relating to the hours of construction, parking and loading/unloading should be imposed to make impact during construction bearable/safe. (point 12)

Officers have responded to these additional points in turn below.

6. The shadow study focuses on the single habitable room window on the side elevation of no. 7. The other windows serve a bathroom, landing and w/c. Little weight is afforded to the loss of light to non-habitable rooms (as set out in section 2.2.33 of the Development Guidelines SPD). As such, Officers do not consider the shadow study to be misleading in this context.

7. Officers do not consider that the proposed metal cladding on the rear extension will result in unreasonable levels of noise. The cladding will be insulated which is likely to dull the noise of falling rain drops.

8. Already addressed in Analysis section of the Officer's report in paragraph 18.

9. The proposal has rear doors and windows leading into the garden and therefore it would appear this comment refers to the removal of the existing side access gate. The proposal will be subject to a Building Regulations application which will assess the escape routes in case of fire in line with current regulations. Fire escape routes are not considered to be a material planning consideration.

10. The Local Planning Authority does not enforce covenants and covenants are not a material planning consideration. The proposed external materials are addressed in the Analysis section of the Officer's report in paragraph 6.

11. It is proposed to remove the canopy over the front door as part of the work, and replace it with a simple horizontal canopy. Whilst not in keeping with the existing, this work is justified in the original Design and Access Statement, which advises that this change is in connection with the external wall insulation (EWI) to simplify the penetrations through the render and avoid unsightly and complex junctions. The simpler single plane porch with wire supports allows for a porch to be reinstalled. Officers consider that this change, whilst not in keeping, could be carried out this change under current permitted development allowances, and therefore it would be unreasonable to insist on a slated canopy roof.

12. Suggested conditions for hours of construction and parking during construction are not generally applied to Household applications. All construction projects are expected to adhere to the Council's Code of Practice for Construction and Demolition sites, which includes working hours. If this is not adhered to, the Council may take action under Environmental Health legislation.

In conclusion it is proposed that no changes are made to the officer recommendation.

# ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



**Item Number: 03**

**Site: Land Off Lake View Close Plymouth**

**Application Number: I6/02295/OUT**

**Applicant: Ms D Forshaw**

## Letters Of Representation

A further 17 letters of objection has been received since publication of the officer's report.

A number of these are from residents who wish to support the Joint Local Plan allocation and re-iterate comments they have already raised on this planning application.

The majority of issues raised have already been addressed in the report. An additional comment has been made regarding the lack of jobs in the area and the need to travel further for work. The highway impacts have already been addressed in the report.

## Joint Local Plan representations

As detailed in the report the site is allocated as a Strategic Landscape Area (policy DEV26) and Local Greenspace (policy DEV29) in the emerging Joint Local Plan (JLP). The JLP has now been subject to a 6 week consultation period pursuant to Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations. At least 32 letters of support have been received specifically regarding this parcel of land (this does not include any representations that may have been received in paper form which are still being processed). An objection from the land owner has also been received which has raised the following issues:

- Questions the Objectively Assessed Need (This relates to the housing need).
- Considers the site can be developed, boosting housing supply whilst not adversely impacting the landscape.
- Considers the present proposal demonstrates that the site can be developed in such a way so as to fulfil the requirements of the Landscape Impact Assessment which forms part of the JLP evidence base.
- Questions whether the allocation of this site is necessary as the site should be considered under paragraph 74 of the NPPF in any case.

When determining the weight to be given to the emerging JLP members should be mindful of these representations and the unresolved nature of the site.

## Corrections

1. The last sentence in the '5 year housing land supply' section should read:  
'Paragraph 14 of the NPPF is therefore engaged and substantial weight must be accorded to the need for housing in the planning balance when determining **housing applications**'.
2. The reference to policy **PLY58** in paragraph 4 of the analysis section should be **deleted** as it is not relevant to this application.

### **Plans**

For the avoidance of doubt the plans being considered are as follows:

I568 S-01/A

I568 (PL)01/C

I568 (SEPT 16)

04489-TCP-B-2016

I568 (PL-)02/A

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The recommendation remains as within the report.