



#plymplanning

Democratic and Member Support
Chief Executive's Department
Plymouth City Council
Ballard House
Plymouth PL1 3BJ

Please ask for Helen Rickman/Lynn Young
T 01752 398444/01752 304163
E helen.rickman@plymouth.gov.uk/
lynn.young@plymouth.gov.uk
www.plymouth.gov.uk/democracy
Published 31 May 2017

PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDENDUM REPORTS

Thursday 1 June 2017
2.00 pm
Council House, Plymouth

Members:

Councillor Wiggins, Chair

Councillor Mrs Bridgeman, Vice Chair

Councillors Ball, Cook, Sam Davey, Fletcher, Kelly, Mrs Pengelly, Sparling, Stevens, Kate Taylor, Tuohy and Winter.

Please find attached additional information in respect of agenda items 7.2 and 7.4.

Tracey Lee
Chief Executive

Planning Committee

AGENDA

PART I – PUBLIC MEETING

**7.2. Blake Lodge, Seymour Road, Mannamead, Plymouth, (Pages 1 - 2)
PL3 5AS 16/02073/FUL**

Applicant: Mr Andy Atkinson
Ward: Compton
Recommendation: Grant Conditionally
Case Officer: Mr Jon Fox

**7.4. Plymouth Speedway, St Boniface's College Sports (Pages 3 - 6)
Ground Coypool Road, Marsh Mills, Plymouth
17/00648/S73**

Applicant: Mr M Phillips
Ward: Plympton Erle
Recommendation: Refuse
Case Officer: Mr Jon Fox

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 7.2

Site: Blake Lodge, Seymour Road, Mannamead

Application Number: I6/02073/FUL

Applicant: Mr Andy Atkinson

Members' attention is drawn to the comments of the Council's Historic Environment Officer.

Historic Environment Officer (HEO) Comments:

Key points

- To the south of the main house, within the grounds of the Lodge, there is a mid-20th century flat roofed concrete building which until recently has been used as a fitness centre. This was built prior to the main house being listed in June 1996.
- The original access from Mannamead Avenue was blocked up in the 1970's and the ground levels substantially raised.
- The principle of developing the site with flats specifically for the use of the Deaf Association is supported, and if consented, the residents will have use of the communal garden space shared with the main house.
- At pre-application stage it was noted that the floor area of the proposed new development was considerably larger than the existing building, and this was considered over-development of the site. The floor area has therefore been reduced very slightly, but is still significantly larger than the existing fitness centre and the site therefore appears rather densely developed. Further consideration should be given to reducing the number of flats from 10 to 8 which would allow more space for access and landscaping, and it would help to reduce the impact on the neighbouring properties.
- To help address the mass and the impact of the proposed development, it is intended to significantly reduce the ground levels in this part of the site, and thought has been given to how the flats will appear from the main house, so for example, a green roof has been introduced to soften their visual impact. However, it is not clear how this will work with the proposed photovoltaic panels. Combined with a carefully thought through planting scheme, this should help to screen the flats from the neighbouring dwellings.
- The proposed materials are generally well thought through, although the use of slate hanging would be discouraged as although it is found in parts of the city, is it not a familiar cladding material in the Mannamead Conservation Area. Natural zinc cladding is suggested instead along with the smooth render finish, and we would encourage the use of the render systems that are less prone to staining. Further consideration may also need to be given to the windows on the west side of the flats to avoid issues of overlooking. Rainwater goods should be powder coated aluminium and not PVC-u, and the materials proposed for the balconies may require further thought as the use of timber effect planking is not considered appropriate.

- There may also be some scope to introduce more natural limestone plinths, particularly where the render is at present proposed to come to ground level, and possibly also to break up the north elevation. The green roofs will help to soften the appearance of the flats from the main house. Other details such as the glass balustrades should be simple and lightweight.

Southern Boundary Wall

- To the south of the site dividing it from the neighbouring property “Woodville”, there is a high limestone rubble wall. Although not listed in its own right, this wall and the others forming the boundary to the garden and the entrance from Mannamead Avenue are curtilage listed, and therefore need to be treated as if they were listed.
- This wall is currently supported on the north side by the higher ground level but obviously this support will be reduced when the ground levels are lowered. This wall is covered in vegetation in places and in a poor state of repair generally with tree stumps growing through it. A detailed method statement will be required to show how this wall will be partly taken down, the roots and vegetation removed and then it will need to be partially rebuilt.
- Details will also be required to show exactly how the levels of the land will be altered and how the entrance on to Mannamead Avenue will be widened to accommodate vehicles and pedestrians. It is expected that the existing gate piers will both be retained and reused.

Summary of response

These proposals will undoubtedly have some impact on the Conservation Area and the neighbouring properties, but on balance this impact is felt to be less than substantial. Proposals within Conservation Areas to develop or redevelop sites should aim to preserve or enhance the character of the area and to contribute positively to its wider regeneration. New development is expected to be of the highest quality design and to positively respect and enhance the special interest and character of the Conservation Area.

There is no doubt that the proposals are a substantial improvement on the existing fitness centre, and that they will in time help to regenerate Blake Lodge. Although the proposed development is considered a little too large for the site, considerable thought has been given to its appearance and lessening its impact. It will help to support the Deaf Association and hopefully allow them to maintain and remain at Blake Lodge for many years to come, and therefore in this instance the benefits are felt to outweigh the harm.

The HEO's comments include a number of recommended planning conditions. The report before members includes a condition to ensure that the southern boundary wall is constructed in the best interests of the listed building and the amenities of the neighbour. Additional natural stone has been negotiated to certain parts of the building and the previously proposed hanging slate has been replaced with natural zinc, in accordance with the HEO's views.

No amendments are proposed to the officer recommendation as a result of the Historic Environment Officer's comments.

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 7.4

Site: Plymouth Speedway, St Boniface's College Sports Ground Coypool Road, Marsh Mills

Application Number: 17/00648/S73

Applicant: Mr M Phillips

Members are advised that, following the Public Protection Service's (PPS) objections, the applicant has offered to remove that part of the proposal which extends the racing time from 2145 hours to 2200 hours.

PPS were advised of this change, which still leaves in place the proposed extended training times and dates as well as the proposal to start racing at 1900 hours, instead of the extant 1915 hours.

The PPS appreciate the applicant's compromise, but still recommend refusal. In their opinion the biggest impact local residents will face should this application be granted, is the proposal to extend the training season which currently runs from 15th March – 31st October (currently alternate Saturdays) to all year round (excluding the Christmas period – continuing to take place on alternate Saturdays). Local residents are already exposed to noise created from the Speedway's activities however, should this application be accepted, the Council would be exposing residents to noise all year round. This is likely to cause annoyance and lead to complaints as residents will be affected throughout the entire year – throughout November, part of December and January, February and part of March on top of what they are already exposed to.

PPS previously stated that they had reviewed their complaints record and found details of a total of 27 noise complaints that had been logged, some of which were mail merged i.e. more than one complainant per case. PPS have reviewed the records again to obtain further information of each case and can confirm the previous figure was incorrect. There have in fact been 53 noise complaints since June 2006 – July 2016.

To PPS, this suggests that a high number of residents in the locality have previously been disturbed by the Speedway which would suggest considerable impact on local amenity. They feel that extending the hours, increasing the number of races and altering the training season to become an all year round event will only exacerbate this.

Further PPS comments are as follows:

- The most recent monitoring undertaken during the 2014 season suggested that the noise caused by The Speedway did have the potential to be a nuisance. Despite a statutory nuisance not being determined at the time, it is of upmost important to note the difference between the Planning Considerations and Statutory Nuisances/ Nuisance.
- When considering nuisance one must consider factors such as time, duration, frequency, nature of the noise and the nature of the area etc. This application seeks to alter the time, duration and frequency which does have the potential to create a nuisance in the future.
- It is also important to note that when a statutory nuisance has been identified as being caused by a business, the business has to demonstrate they are doing everything they can that is reasonably practicable to mitigate the nuisance – this is called a Best Practicable Means (BPM) defence. If a business demonstrates they have a BPM defence they may use this defence if served with a Noise Abatement Notice i.e. the PPS department may not be able to take action against the business in order to resolve the nuisance.
- When considering the location of the Speedway and nearby residents as well as the lay of the land, PPS believes it is potentially likely the only way to mitigate against noise could be to enclose the entire stadium. Mitigation of this scale would be costly and may be deemed disproportionate to expect the Speedway to incur costs of this nature. In simple terms the PPS department may not be able to take action against the Speedway should a nuisance be determined (if planning permission is granted) and are therefore reliant upon controls/ conditions put in place via the Planning process to protect nearby sensitive receptors.
- PPS considers that the Planning Committee must consider the impact on the amenity, and not whether the activities at the Speedway create a statutory nuisance. In a case like this where a nuisance has not yet determined, does

not necessarily mean the activities at the Speedway do not have a considerable impact on local amenity, as can be demonstrated by the sheer number of complaints received.

PPS feel the application is not acceptable and therefore recommend it is not granted permission because the noise created from The Speedway has the potential to negatively impact noise sensitive receptors by:

- 1) Potentially creating a statutory nuisance
- 2) Diminishing the general amenity of the locality
- 3) Create noise that could be deemed persistent and continuing in nature
- 4) Affect the use and enjoyment to noise sensitive receptors within their homes and gardens.

No amendments are proposed to the officer recommendation as a result of the PPS comments.

This page is intentionally left blank