



#plymplanning

Oversight and Governance

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

Please ask for Democratic Support
T 01752 305155
E democraticsupport@plymouth.gov.uk
www.plymouth.gov.uk/democracy
Published 17 June 2020

PLANNING COMMITTEE – ADDENDUM REPORTS

Thursday 18 June 2020
4.00 pm

Members:

Councillor Stevens, Chair

Councillor Tuohy, Vice Chair

Councillors Allen, Mrs Bridgeman, Corvid, Michael Leaves, Morris, Nicholson, Mrs Pengelly, R Smith, Vincent, Ms Watkin and Winter.

Please find enclosed additional information for your consideration under agenda item numbers 7.1 and 7.5.

Tracey Lee

Chief Executive

Planning Committee

7.1. 15 Cherry Park, Plymouth, PL7 1PF - 20/00539/FUL **(Pages 1 - 2)**

Applicant: Mr B Crocker
Ward: Plympton Erle
Recommendation: Refuse

7.5. Turnchapel Wharf, Barton Road, PL9 9RQ - 19/01810/FUL **(Pages 3 - 8)**

Applicant: Mr Ryan Bonney
Ward: Plymstock Radford
Recommendation: Grant Conditionally

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 7a

Site: 15 Cherry Park, Plymouth, PL7 1PF

Planning Application Number: 20/00539/FUL

Applicant: Mr Crocker

Officers would like to refer Members to the following updates in the officer report. The officer recommendation remains unchanged.

Representations

Section 6: Representations of the Officer's report (page 5) states eleven letters of representation had been received, two objecting, nine in support. Since writing the report, the number of letters of representation received have increased to thirty nine, thirty seven in support, two objecting. Seven letters of representation were received outside of the 21 day public consultation period.

Reasons for support include:

- The dormer does not look out of place with the character of the area;
- The change in cladding colour will help blend the development in further;
- The expansion to an existing home is positive; and
- The dormer is not considered greatly different to other dormers in the area.

41% of letters of representation were received from the immediate PL7 area; 93% from PL postal codes; and 7% from outside of Plymouth.

Further, the applicant has provided two letters of support that were sent to Plymouth City Council prior to the submission of the retrospective application (not included in the calculations above).

Window Alignment Paragraph 10

Officers make comment on the alignment of the windows not being in-keeping with the alignment of those of the main dwelling. The applicant has since stated verbally on 16th June 2020 that they would be willing to alter the window alignment for a more unified exterior.

Relevant Planning History

The applicant has recently submitted examples of dormers in the area, including one that is a box-like dormer overlooking a residential garden visible from the public highway; and one that runs flush with the side elevation. Addresses include: 55 Erle Gardens, 22 Cherry Park, 26 Cherry Park and 85 St Maurice Road.

This page is intentionally left blank

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 05

Site: Turnchapel Wharf, Barton Road, Plymouth, PL9 9RQ

Planning Application Number: 19/01810/FUL

Applicant: Ryan Bonney

Representations

Since the Officer's Report was published, an additional 11 representations have been received; all of which object to the application. In total, the Local Planning Authority has received one letter of support and 157 objections from 79 individuals. These representations have raised some new objections, which will be addressed below and in some cases addressed through proposed changes / additions to the conditions. However the officer's recommendation remains as outlined in the officer report.

1. The application site is located on the site of an early nineteenth century graving/dry dock, which has been infilled. The proposal could damage its remains.

The development will be bolted to the concrete hardstanding, thus there will be no foundations, and groundworks are considered minimal. However, the applicant may be required to divert an underground combined sewer if South West Water does not permit development to take place over its sewer. Officers therefore propose to include a new condition to ensure that no part of the development shall commence until a construction methodology and schedule of works has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for consideration. If intrusive groundworks are required, for example to divert the combined sewer, then development should take place in accordance to a written scheme of investigation that has been approved by the Local Planning Authority. The proposed condition is outlined in the 'Conditions' section of this Addendum Report.

2. The development should be located on another part of the site.

Officers have challenged the applicant regarding the location of the development, and whether it could be accommodated elsewhere on the site. There are a substantial number of underground services, including under the car parking areas, on the eastern part of the site, which may require diverting. With exception to the aforementioned South West Water sewer, the southwest part of the site is understood to be free from underground services.

In addition, the western part of the site is required to crane materials over the western boundary and into the water, therefore should be kept clear.

3. Concerns regarding impacts on the setting of the stonewall that forms the boundary of the Turnchapel Conservation Area. One objector stated that planning regulations prevent new buildings from being higher than 5 metres if within 10 metres of the curtilage boundary.

Officers consider the stone wall and iron railings a feature that contributes towards the special interest of the Conservation Area. Paragraphs 20-41 of the committee report address heritage impacts and conclude that the proposal will result in substantial harm to designated heritage assets.

The planning regulation highlighted in the representation refers to permitted development rights for warehouses and industrial buildings. Permitted development rights are not considered relevant to this full planning application.

4 The impacts would be less if the development had a flat or low profile roof, which was no higher than the stonewall on Boringdon Road.

Officers have challenged the applicant to reduce the height and profile of the development. The applicant has reduced the height by 1 metre but it is not prepared to make further reductions that may compromise use of the development. Officers understand that the dual-pitched roofs are required to accommodate gantry cranes that enable autonomous technologies to be fitted to vessels outside of the water.

Officers consider that reasonable efforts have been demonstrated to mitigate the harm and the applicant has reduced the harm as far as is reasonable to allow a marine employment use to be realised in line with the JLP site allocation.

5. The unit is not required/necessary as there is a unit available at Mount Batten and there will be new units available at Oceansgate Phase 2 from November 2020.

Officers consider that Turnchapel Wharf provides a secure location for sensitive research and development for the defence sector, by virtue of its former MOD use. In addition, the company that is likely to occupy the unit, already occupies Units 5, 10 and 16 at Turnchapel Wharf, therefore the application site provides access to its offices, data, research and equipment. The applicant has clarified that the proposed occupier has rejected the unit at Mount Batten for the above reason.

Furthermore, Oceansgate Phase 2 does not have access to the water, thus it is considered unsuitable for the proposed use. Oceansgate Phase 3 will have access to the water but units will not be available for some time yet. The Economic Development Department was consulted on the application and advised that the application site is considered complimentary to other marine employment sites in the City.

6. The consultation response supplied by the Economic Development Department has been challenged, specifically the number of jobs created and typical salaries in the marine and defence sectors.

The employment figures have been supplied by the applicant on the basis that the unit is occupied by Thales. These job numbers have been corroborated by Thales.

According to the Advanced Modelling of Regional Economies (AMORE) Tool (Impact, 2018), the GVA per FTE in the marine and defence sector was £58,043 per annum in 2017. The average salary in the marine and naval defence sectors was £30,500 per annum in 2019. It is important to note that GVA and typical salaries are not the same. Therefore officers cannot ensure that salaries of £58,043 will be realised by the development.

7. On the 8th May 2020 the planning use class was amended from B1c business (industrial) to B1b business (research and development) use. The representation suggests that research and development may be experimental, therefore it may generate health and safety concerns. Representations referred to potential fire hazards from batteries that may be required by autonomous vessels.

The site is not considered a major hazard site, a licensed explosive site or a nuclear installation. Separate health and safety laws are in place that require businesses to have policies for managing health and safety. Therefore health and safety concerns shall be managed under this health and safety legislation.

8. The proposal will result in the loss of jobs at Turnchapel Wharf as there will be significantly less space available.

The existing unit is used for storage by a company that is located in Roborough. Officers understand that the existing storage unit does not employ any staff, therefore it is unlikely that any jobs will be lost at Turnchapel Wharf. On the contrary, officers consider that the proposal will result in an increase in the number of employment opportunities on the site.

9. Representations challenge the accuracy of the 3D Visualisations that have been supplied by the applicant. More specifically, representations suggest that the development appears smaller than in the elevation plans, and with viewpoints that do not provide a true perspective of the massing.

The 3D Visualisations are not scaled drawings, but visual representations of how the development may appear from various viewpoints. The images have enabled officers to gain a better understanding of the relationship between the development, the streetscene and character, setting and significance of designated heritage assets. Using the scaled plans and 3D Visualisations, officers have concluded that the development will result in substantial harm to grade II listed buildings and the Turnchapel Conservation Area.

10. The application presents a danger to health and safety as there are no pavements on Barton Road. In addition, HGV's towing boats are unable to manoeuvre around the mini roundabout at the junction of Reddicliff Road and Hooe Road in Hooe.

The applicant has indicated that the existing unit generates around 2 two-way HGV movements per month. Officers understand that the proposed development will generate around 1 two-way HGV movements per month and 16-20no. two-way vehicle trips per day. The applicant has indicated that the site will provide sufficient car parking for its employees.

The Local Highways Authority was consulted on the application and raised no objections, stating that the application site has an established and unrestricted business use along with its associated vehicle movements and traffic attraction, which will permit and allow for significant daily traffic fluctuations and unrestricted traffic increases associated with the permitted use. The increase in traffic is considered modest and unlikely to give rise to any significant impacts in capacity or cause highway safety concerns. As such, the development does not satisfy the three tests for requiring planning obligations as set out in Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010) and paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

In addition, the Street Services Department was consulted and has no knowledge of any specific issues or problems with HGV's in Hooe.

Amendments to the Officer's Report

It is proposed that the following amendments are made to the officer report as a consequence of the additional objections received and further consultation:

Paragraph 18 of the officer's report has been amended as follows:

18. The applicant has proposed that the steel framed building will be clad with profiled metal sheeting panels to the walls and roof with translucent roof panels providing natural lighting. Internally, the unit will be separated by three folding or sliding partitions to create three separate units, each served by roller shutter doors to the front and steel doors to the front and rear of the building. The unit will be industrial and utilitarian in appearance with the design, colour and materials closely matching those of the adjacent modern warehouses located on the southern part of the site. Officers recommend securing a condition that requires the applicant to submit to **the Local Planning Authority** further details of the external materials prior to commencement of development. Notwithstanding the details submitted by the applicant, all the materials will be

subject to approval by the Local Planning Authority in accordance to condition 3 (External materials).

Paragraph 48 of the Officer's Report has been amended as follows:

48. The application proposes to provide 6 car parking spaces in addition to the 110 spaces that are already provided on the Turnchapel Wharf site. The applicant has provided a Transport Statement which includes information on the number of vehicular trips along Barton Road during the Royal Marine's occupation of the site, as identified by the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO). The Statement indicates that there were 40-60 HGV movements per day consisting of predominantly 6-8 tonne trucks. There would typically have been 100 cars parked on site per day, which would have generated around 200 two-way trips, with significantly more around ten times a year during military operations. These figures are significantly more than the 16-20 two-way 12 car movements per day and one two-way HGV movement per month suggested by the applicant ~~Transport Statement~~ for this proposal.

Conditions

It is proposed that an amendment is made to Condition 3 (External Materials). In addition, officers propose to add a new condition regarding archaeology as outlined below:

Condition 3: External Materials

Pre-commencement

Notwithstanding the submitted information, no development shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason:

To ensure that the materials used are in keeping with the character of the area in accordance with Policy DEV20 of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan 2014-2034 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

Justification:

To ensure that the development can reasonably accommodate the external materials that are acceptable to the local planning authority.

(New) Condition 12: Archaeology

Pre-commencement

No part of the development shall be commenced until a construction methodology and schedule of works has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for consideration. Should the construction methodology and schedule of works deem it necessary to conduct subsurface investigations, alterations or the addition of services not currently identified as part of the

planning application, then a programme of archaeological work should be undertaken in accordance with a written scheme of investigation that has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of development. The development shall be carried out at all times in strict accordance with the approved scheme

Reason:

The site is considered likely to contain archaeological deposits that warrant appropriate investigation and/or recording in accordance with Policy DEV21 of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan 2014-2034 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

Justification:

To safeguarded likely archaeological deposits should intrusive groundworks, including the relocation of services, be necessary to implement the planning permission.

Recommendation

The recommendation remains to Grant Conditionally.