

Public Document Pack



BARRY KEEL
Chief Executive
Floor 1 - Civic Centre
Plymouth
PL1 2AA

www.plymouth.gov.uk/democracy

Date: 03/02/10 Telephone Enquiries 01752 304469 / 01752 307815 Fax 01752 304819
Please ask for Ross Jago / Katey Johns e-mail ross.jago@plymouth.gov.uk / katey.johns@plymouth.gov.uk

PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDENDUM REPORTS

DATE: THURSDAY 4 FEBRUARY, 2010
TIME: 2.30 P.M.
PLACE: COUNCIL HOUSE, ARMADA WAY, PLYMOUTH

Members –

Councillor Lock, Chair.
Councillor Mrs. Stephens, Vice-Chair.
Councillors Mrs. Bowyer, Delbridge, Fox, Nicholson, Roberts, Stevens,
Thompson, Tuohy, Vincent and Wheeler

*PLEASE FIND ATTACHED ADDENDUM REPORTS FOR CONSIDERATION
UNDER AGENDA ITEM NOS. 6.1, 6.3 AND 6.4.*

BARRY KEEL
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

PLANNING COMMITTEE

6.1 224 SOUTHWAY DRIVE, SOUTHWAY, PLYMOUTH 09/01407/FUL (Pages 1 - 2)

Applicant: Mr Andrew Morris
Ward: Southway
Recommendation: Grant Conditionally

6.3 1 ST LAWRENCE ROAD AND 14 HOUNDISCOMBE ROAD, PLYMOUTH 09/01302/FUL (Pages 3 - 4)

Applicant: Mr Dave Hendy
Ward: Drake
Recommendation: Grant conditionally subject to S106 Obligation

6.4 WIDEWELL PRIMARY SCHOOL, LULWORTH DRIVE, PLYMOUTH 09/01496/PRDE (Pages 5 - 6)

Applicant: Mr James Welsh
Ward: Southway
Recommendation: Issue Certificate - Lawful Use Cert (Ex)

ADDENDUM REPORT PLANNING COMMITTEE 4th February 2010**Item: 1****Site: 224 Southway Drive****Ref: 09/01407/FUL****Applicant: Mr Andrew Morris****Page: 9-14**

The neighbour requested that an officer visit be undertaken to her property so that the impact of the proposal could be viewed from inside 222 Southway Drive. This request was made after the officer's recommendation had been published. The neighbour had already made written representations that were considered in the officer's report.

A site visit to 222 Southway Drive was carried out on the 27th January 2010 at approximately 16:30.

The site visit revealed that:

- The outlook from the front window (north) is restricted by the elevated road and terraced garden and the light entering into this window is likely to also be restricted.
- There is a second standard sized south facing window serving the living room.
- The south facing window has a good outlook and source of light.

Analysis

The impact to the neighbour's window from the proposal is not considered to result in a significant loss of light or outlook as assessed against the 45 degree guidance (please see original report).

In addition, the window impacted by the proposal is not the only light source into the room. This further reduces the impact of the proposal.

Conclusion

It is considered that the site visit did not raise any additional issues to support a refusal of the application that have not been already been considered in the officer's report. The presence of two windows to serve the living room supports the approval of the proposal. The other considerations addressed in the officer's report remain appropriate.

The recommendation therefore remains as per the original report and is to **Grant Conditionally**.

This page is intentionally left blank

ADDENDUM REPORT PLANNING COMMITTEE 4th February 2010**Item: 3****Site:** 14 Houndiscombe Road and 1 St. Lawrence Road – 09/01302/FUL**Applicant:** Mr Dave Hendy**Page:** 23-34

Nine further letters of representation (eight of these being from one person) have been received which raise the following issues:

- Parking and highway safety issues
- Visual impact
- No need for further student accommodation
- Loss of employment site not properly considered
- Application in conflict with the aim of creating sustainable, mixed communities
- Proposed management condition is impractical

These issues have been covered in the main body of the report; however in order to address additional points raised, further explanation is offered below.

The objector notes that Parking Zone J in which the application property is located is currently oversubscribed by 71 vehicles. The objector considers that this raises both parking and highway safety issues and believes that granting this application will only exacerbate the current situation. However the Highways Authority has not raised any objections to the proposal and residents will be excluded from obtaining parking permits which is proposed to be highlighted to the applicant by means of an informative. Cycling will be promoted as a sustainable means of transport through the provision of secure cycle storage.

Concern has also been raised that the proposal will lead to the degradation of an attractive, Victorian property of historical interest. The objector's comments are noted; however the property is not listed or located within a conservation area, therefore as stated within the report it is considered that the proposal is acceptable and will cause no significant harm to the aesthetics of the area.

The objector has also commented that there is not a further need for this type of university accommodation. It is noted that the university primarily wishes to expand its base of institutional accommodation to meet changing student demand however there is still a general demand for increasing the overall accommodation base. Furthermore whilst the proposal is not for purpose-built student accommodation, the development does provide accommodation limited to students and allows the Local Planning Authority to impose conditions to control the building, and this is very different to students just renting standard private housing.

It has been stated that the loss of the employment site, 14 Houndiscombe Road, which has most recently been used as offices, has not been fully considered. The subject property is located in close proximity to Mutley Plain where a range of alternative office accommodation can be found. The loss of this particular run-down office space is not considered to jeopardize the economic vitality of the area and does not contribute to the needs of Plymouth's priority economic sectors.

The further letters of representation make reference to the concept of "sustainable, balanced communities" which are referred to in both national planning policy and Policy CS01 of the Core

Strategy. It is noted in the main body of the report that there are high numbers of students in the area; however the desire is for student accommodation to be located in and around the university and city centre. No.1 St Lawrence Rd already has consent for a 12-bed HMO. This proposal will result in the number of residents in both properties (1 St Lawrence Road and 14 Houndiscombe Road) being approximately 27. It is considered that this number will not unacceptably affect the balance in the area and, with the use of a management plan condition, student behavior could be controlled effectively.

The issue of the management plan has also raised concerns. The objector considers that the management plan will be insufficient to adequately deal with residents' behavior at the property. The Local Planning Authority is aware of the problems which can arise from students in the area, which have been highlighted through the objections received in relation to this application. The Local Planning Authority will therefore seek measures which it considers necessary to address all appropriate concerns. The objector has also highlighted that the applicant is in breach of a current S106 agreement; whilst this is noted it cannot be considered as part of this application.

The recommendation remains to Grant Conditionally.

ADDENDUM REPORT PLANNING COMMITTEE 4th February 2010

Item: 4

Site: Widewell School

Ref: 09/01946/PDRE

Applicant: James Welsh

Page: 35-44

Since the report to committee was finalised further correspondence has been received from members of the public. 123 standard letters of support have been received. The letters raise concerns about the way the Lawful Development Certificate application is being handled, and state the opinion that the development is lawful, but do not otherwise raise issues that are relevant to the consideration of this application. There have also been three additional letters of objection. One of the letters considers that the fence is adjacent to the highway and because it is more than one metre in height would need planning permission. These letters also raise issues that are not relevant to the consideration of this Lawful Development Certificate application.

This page is intentionally left blank