

#plymplanning



Oversight and Governance

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

Please ask for Joshua Longstaff T 01752 668000 E democraticsupport@plymouth.gov.uk www.plymouth.gov.uk/democracy Published 23 April 2025

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Thursday 24 April 2025 4.00 pm Council Chamber, Council House

Members:

Councillor Stevens, Chair

Councillor Penrose, Vice Chair

Councillors Allen, Mrs Bridgeman, Darcy, Freeman, Goslin, McCarty, McNamara, Ney, M. Smith, Sproston and Ms Watkin.

Members are invited to attend the above meeting to consider the items of business overleaf.

This meeting will be webcast and available on-line after the meeting. By entering the Council Chamber, Councillors are consenting to being filmed during the meeting and to the use of the recording for the webcast.

The Council is a data controller under the Data Protection Act. Data collected during this webcast will be retained in accordance with authority's published policy.

You can watch any of our webcast meetings on <u>YouTube</u>. For further information on attending Council meetings and how to engage in the democratic process please follow this link – <u>Get Involved</u>

Tracey Lee
Chief Executive

Planning Committee

6.3. 25/00274/FUL - 11 Derry Avenue, PL4 6BH (Pages I - 2)

Applicant: Mr Hicks

Ward: Drake

Recommendation: Grant Conditionally

6.4. 24/01455/FUL - Land Adjacent to 38 Parsonage Way, PL4 0LY (Pages 3 - 4)

Applicant: Ms Susan Beesley Ward: Sutton and Mount Gould

Recommendation: Grant Conditionally

6.5. 24/01479/FUL - The Old Dairy School Lane, PL7 INQ (Pages 5 - 6)

Applicant: Mr Nathan Stonecliffe

Ward: Plympton Erle

Recommendation: Grant Conditionally

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item: 03

Site: II Derry Avenue

Planning Application Number: 25/00274/FUL

Applicant: Mr Hicks

A further letter of representation from a planning consultant, supporting the application, was received 16 April 2025. The letter of representation highlights how the development is not contrary to policy and as an established HMO, how DEV10 and DEV11 of the JLP should be irrelevant in the assessment of the development with the addition of a bedroom not initiating a change of use.

No changes are proposed to the Officer's recommendation.



ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 6.4

Site: Land Adjacent To 38 Parsonage Way, Plymouth, PL4 0LY

Planning Application Number: 24/01455/FUL

Applicant: Ms Susan Beesley

Since the Case Officer's report was written, an additional letter of representations has been received. The issues raised in the letter include:

- The distances between the front windows of the proposed dwelling and the rear windows of the adjacent flats;
- Visibility from the retained western parking spaces; and
- The useability of the proposed parking spaces.

To accompany the letter, annotated plans have been provided.

The first point has been discussed in paragraph 8.6.6. and the reduced distance is considered to be acceptable. The wider field of view annotated is noted, but it is considered that the angle between the two sets of windows would limit any meaningful privacy concerns – as views are not directed square on to the southern windows. It is noted, too, that it is not uncommon for properties' windows to be similar distances apart, and in fact square on, in the local area – for example on the adjacent, older terraced streets.

To address the second point, whilst it is accepted that the visibility of the retained spaces would be reduced, the length of the spaces would allow cars to slowly move forward to the edge of the site to gain visibility before pulling out — and it is noted that the site is towards the end of a private cul-de-sac where vehicle and pedestrian movements are likely to be limited. The visibility when exiting the spaces is also likely to be similar to the visibility of exiting the existing parking spaces adjacent to the southern flats' stairwells — which are very close to the site. As such, similar situations are already present on the street and the western end of the street, which does not have a footway, has a shared space feel where all users need to be aware of their surroundings. The Highway Authority did not raise any visibility concerns when considering the proposal.

To address the third point, Officers consider that the proposed spaces are adequate. The quote the Highway Authority:

The plan shows 2 off-street parking spaces; each is 2.4m in width and exceed 4.8m in length which is considered to be acceptable. In addition, in line with local policy, a minimum of 5.5m is required for adequate reversing space. Due to the location of the pillars on Queen Anne's Quay, reversing space appears to be limited to 5.2m at the narrowest point. However, as the car parking spaces exceed

minimum length required, 5.5m can be achieved and therefore the reversing space is considered to be acceptable.

Notwithstanding this, Officers consider that there is sufficient space around the site to access the spaces – even if multiple manoeuvres may be required for bigger cars. Due to the site's location towards the end of a private cul-de-sac the potential need for additional manoeuvres and turning within the street is not considered to be a concern. Additionally, if a car was to park in front of the proposed hardstanding – then this would only replicate the parking arrangement which sometimes occurs at the site as referenced in paragraph 8.7.3. The loss of such a parking opportunity was raised as a concern elsewhere in other Letters of Representation and has been addressed in the report.

No changes are proposed to the Officer's recommendation.

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 6.5

Site: The Old Dairy, School Lane, Plymouth, PL7 INQ

Planning Application Number: 24/01479/FUL

Applicant: Mr Nathan Stonecliffe

Since the Case Officer's report was prepared, an additional letter of representation has been received. This representation comprises a report by a structural engineer who has conducted an inspection of the general structural condition of the wall.

The engineer's report concludes the following:

- The wall is reasonably true to line but exhibits historic undulations and inclinations. These
 are not considered structurally significant, provided the wall is properly maintained.
- A localised, low-level bulge was observed in the stonework on the western side, indicating some minor delamination of the stonework. While the area currently appears stable, it should be monitored.
- Although the wall is deemed stable and the engineer does not consider lowering it essential, slight inward inclinations are present towards the southern end. Given the wall's height and slender profile, concerns about its stability are understandable.
- Lowering the top of the wall, as proposed, would improve stability. However, an alternative solution could involve localised rebuilding and reinforcement.
- As a compromise, the engineer suggests reducing the wall height by 0.75 to 1.00 metres, combined with bed joint reinforcements to strengthen the head.
- The report also highlights the risk of vehicular impact due to the wall's potential vulnerability and recommends installing a bollard on the northern side of the driveway entrance.

Officers note that this report does not undermine the findings of the applicant's supporting structural assessment. Both reports agree that, although the wall is not at immediate risk of collapse, it is structurally vulnerable—particularly at its southern end where an inward lean is apparent. The newly submitted report also introduces concerns regarding additional risks originating from vehicular conflict.

Furthermore, the submitted report supports a reduction in wall height of up to 1 metre as a reasonable compromise to address the applicant's concerns.

In the opinion of officers, given the limited nature of the proposed reduction, the material difference in visual and heritage impact of lowering the wall by 1.5 metres rather than 1 metre is negligible.

No changes are proposed to the Officer's recommendation.