



#plymplanning



Democratic and Member Support

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

Please ask for Helen Rickman/ Jamie Sheldon

T 01752 398444/ 304001

E helen.rickman@plymouth.gov.uk/

jamie.sheldon@plymouth.gov.uk

www.plymouth.gov.uk/democracy

Published 27 June 2018

PLANNING COMMITTEE

ADDENDUM REPORTS

Thursday 28 June 2018

4.00 pm

Council House, Plymouth

Members:

Councillor Stevens, Chair

Councillor Tuohy, Vice Chair

Councillors Corvid, Derrick, Johnson, Kelly, Loveridge, Morris, Neil, Nicholson, Mrs Pengelly, Smith and Winter.

Please find enclosed additional information for your consideration under agenda items 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3.

Tracey Lee

Chief Executive

Planning Committee

1.1. 95 Durnford Street Plymouth PL1 3QW - 17/02444/FUL **(Pages 1 - 2)**

Applicant: Dominic Robinson
Ward: St Peter & The Waterfront
Recommendation: Grant Conditionally

6.2 16 Torland Road Plymouth PL3 5TS - 18/00508/FUL **(Pages 3 - 4)**

Applicant: Mr Michael Michaelides
Ward: Peverell
Recommendation: Grant Conditionally

6.3 Colebrook House 51 Newnham Road Plymouth PL7 4AW - **(Pages 5 - 8)**
17/02471/FUL

Applicant: Mr David Matthews
Ward: Plympton St Mary
Recommendation: Grant Conditionally

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 6.1

Site: 95 Durnford Street, PL1 3QW

Planning Application Number: I7/02444/FUL

Applicant: Plymouth Lighthouse Project

Pages: 7-21

Letter from Applicant

The applicant is unable to attend the Planning Committee to speak, but has submitted a letter in place of this which has been summarised below:

- The Bideford Lighthouse Project opened its doors on 1st March 2016 and provided a 'peaceful and anonymous presence on in its quiet residential street', funded purely on housing benefit.
- Two independent professionals viewed the Bideford project and asked if the directors and funders would support the opening of a similar project in Plymouth.
- The model aims for high standards of accommodation in an area with peaceful street ambiance.
- The Bideford Lighthouse Project is running extremely well and does not require 24 hours staff to do so. The previous committee discussed an idea of 'night staff' that was based on groundless projections and it was not acknowledged or accepted that staffing levels in Bideford are completely adequate. The committee's process negatively projected using addicts as getting up to no good, or badly behaved untrustworthy people causing problems, when these ideas bare no similarity to the real world lived truth and proven track record in Bideford.
- The Lighthouse Project was designed specifically to solve the kind of negative culture the Planning Committee were right to be concerned about within Plymouth's current provision.

Letters of Representation

A further three letters of representation have been received and are summarised below.

- Concern over level of management of the property
- High levels of HMOs in surrounding area
- Concern that applicant will not adhere to management plan and consultation with Stonehouse Residents Association
- Disproportionate level of rehabilitation facilities in the area
- Confusion over the original listing of the terrace by Historic England, which included no.95.

These matters have been addressed in the main report, with the exception of the Historic England listing of the terrace.

The latest information available on the Historic England website, alongside the Council's records and the advice of the Historic Environment Officer, show that only nos.85 to 93 Durnford Street and attached forecourt walls and railings are Grade II Listed. This listing does not include the application site of no.95.

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 6.2

Site: 16 Torland Road, PL3 5TS

Planning Application Number: I8/00508/FUL

Applicant: Mr Michael Michaelides

Pages: 23-35

Letter from Applicant

A letter from the applicant has been submitted providing some background to the applicant and addressing concerns from neighbouring properties. The letter has been summarised below:

- The treehouse was built approximately 30 years ago for children and is now being updated for grandchildren.
- The uprights supporting the tree house on one side needed changing and it was decided that it would be a suitable place to locate an outbuilding to store timber and equipment for use in the garden.
- There are other outbuildings in the surrounding area, with the proposed outbuilding being taller than them to allow support to the tree house.
- The existing tree house and previous balcony had been in place for a number of years, but had become more visible after tree works were undertaken following falling branches and the eventual death of the tree.
- The tree house is at the bottom of the garden and does not overlook no.14 Torland Road, with cladding proposed on the side boundary to prevent overlooking from the balcony.
- Properties on Mannamead Road can only see part of the treehouse, with existing trees and ivy obscuring it at times, which will further increase as the trees and ivy grow.

No further amendments are proposed to the officer report following the receipt of this letter.

This page is intentionally left blank

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 6.3

Site: Colebrook House, 51 Newnham Road, Plymouth, PL7 4AW

Planning Application Number: I7/02471/FUL

Applicant: Burrington Estates Ltd

Pages: 37-65

I. Amendments to Conditions

Since the publication of the Officers Committee report the applicant has requested that Officers consider amendments to the list of proposed planning conditions. The proposed amendments and the Officers recommendations are as follows:-

Condition 3

The applicant has requested that the reference to demolition is omitted. They note that Condition 7 (Contaminated Land) cannot be discharged until the house has been demolished and this needs to happen first. In addition, the applicant has requested that this condition includes a reference to the approved Flood Risk Assessment (Ref: I7125 FRA).

Officers have reviewed this request and consider the proposed amendment acceptable and not harmful to the development process should planning permission be granted. Therefore, Condition 3 shall now read as follows:

CONDITION: GEOTECHNICAL VERIFICATION - DRAINAGE

PRE-COMMENCEMENT

Other than providing site welfare, no development shall take place until a suitably qualified geotechnical engineer or engineering geologist has reviewed the proposed surface water drainage design and associated mitigation and produced a report to confirm and verify that the proposed drainage works will prevent on or offsite flooding by way of water re-emergence or other means as is noted in the submitted documents and has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage works shall be implemented in strict accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (Ref: I7125 FRA) any supplementary information following the verification assessment, and prior to the occupation of any dwelling hereby approved.

In the event that the Geotechnical Verification Report is unable to demonstrate to the Local Planning Authority's satisfaction that re-emergence will not occur then a revised drainage strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any approved works shall be implemented in strict accordance with the approved details, and prior to the occupation of any dwelling hereby approved.

Reason:

To ensure that satisfactory drainage works are provided in accordance with Policy CS22 of the Plymouth Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2006-2021) 2007, Policy DEV37 of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan and paragraphs 94 and 100-103 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Justification: To ensure that the development does not result in any unacceptable on or off site flooding as a result of unsuitable drainage proposals.

Condition 4

It has been agreed that this condition is not required and will be deleted. Condition 3 already gives the Local Planning Authority sufficient control when considering site flood risk and drainage matters. Therefore this condition would not appear on the decision notice if planning permission was granted.

Condition 8

The applicant has requested that this condition be changed to Pre-Damp Proof Course. Officers have reviewed this request and consider the amended trigger point acceptable as it would not adversely impact the protection of ecological features or delivery of biodiversity enhancements and landscape management should planning permission be granted. Therefore, Condition 8 shall now read as follows:

CONDITION: LANDSCAPE AND ECOLOGICAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

PRE-DAMP PROOF COURSE (DPC)

A Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the development proceeding past the DPC stage. The content of the LEMP shall include the following

- a) Description and evaluation of features to be managed.
- b) Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management.
- c) Aims and objectives of management.
- d) Set out maintenance operations for the first year following implementation of the scheme and for a further 4 years following establishment for achieving aims and objectives.
- e) Preparation of a work schedule.
- f) Body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan.
- g) Monitoring and remedial measures.

The LEMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(s) responsible for its delivery.

The plan shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the LEMP are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme.

The approved plan will be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason:

In the interests of the retention, protection and enhancement of wildlife and features of biological interest, in accordance with Policies CS01, CS19 and CS34 of the Plymouth Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2006-2021) 2007, Policies SPT11 and DEV28 of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan and paragraphs 109 and 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Condition 12

This condition is remaining however it has been agreed to incorporate the requirement of condition 15 into this condition. Condition 15 refers specifically to gate locks, which would form part of the Secure by Design Silver Award standards. Therefore, Condition 12 shall now read as follows:

CONDITION: SECURED BY DESIGN SILVER AWARD

PRE-OCCUPATION

Prior to the occupation the building hereby approved the applicant, developer or their successor shall demonstrate to the Local Planning Authority in writing that, as a minimum, the Secured by Design Silver Award (formally known as Part 2 of the Secure by Design Award) has been achieved. This shall include ensuring that all gates to private pathways and ones giving access to side and rear gardens, shall have locks with key access.

Reason:

To ensure that satisfactory measures are put in place to help design out crime, in accordance with Policy CS32 of the Plymouth Local Development framework Core Strategy (2006-2021) 2007, Policy DEV20 of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan and paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Condition 15

This condition is no longer required as it has been incorporated into condition 12, as shown above.

In the event that amendments to the conditions, as suggested above, are approved by the Committee and planning permission is subsequently granted, Officers will ensure that re-numbering is undertaken prior to formal decision notice being issued.

2. Letters of Representation

Since the publication of the Officers Committee report, the Local Planning Authority has received 4 letters of representation however no new issues have been identified. For clarity, the letters make the following comments:

- Neither the developer or the officers have adequately considered the local highway issues which are currently dangerous
- Junctions are unsafe with too much traffic
- Colebrook Lane cannot cope with the additional traffic
- Drainage issues on the area are not being resolved

This page is intentionally left blank