

Public Document Pack



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

www.plymouth.gov.uk/democracy

Date: 28/07/10 Telephone Enquiries 01752 307990 / Fax 01752 304819
01752 307815
Please ask for Ross Jago / Katey Johns e-mail ross.jago@plymouth.gov.uk /
katey.johns@plymouth.gov.uk

PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE: THURSDAY 29 JULY 2010
TIME: 1.00 PM
PLACE: COUNCIL HOUSE, ARMADA WAY, PLYMOUTH

Members –

Councillor Lock, Chair
Councillor Roberts, Vice Chair
Councillors Mrs Bowyer, Browne, Delbridge, Mrs Foster, Mrs Stephens, Stevens,
Thompson, Tuohy, Vincent and Wheeler

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

Members and Officers are requested to sign the attendance list at the meeting.

BARRY KEEL
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

PLANNING COMMITTEE

6.3. HM NAVAL BASE, SOUTH YARD, DEVONPORT, **(Pages 1 - 4)**
PLYMOUTH 10/00640/FUL

Applicant: Princess Yachts International
Ward: Devonport
Recommendation: Grant conditionally subject to S106 Obligation,
Delegated authority to refuse if S106 not signed
within 3 months of the committee date

6.4. TORR HOME, THE DRIVE, PLYMOUTH **(Pages 5 - 6)**
10/00555/FUL

Applicant: Torr Home
Ward: Peverell
Recommendation: Grant Conditionally

6.7.3 HILLSIDE AVENUE, PLYMOUTH 10/00715/FUL **(Pages 7 - 8)**

Applicant: Mr Matthew Conyers
Ward: Drake
Recommendation: Grant Conditionally

6.8. THE RIDGEWAY, PLYMPTON, PLYMOUTH **(Pages 9 - 10)**
10/01045/24

Applicant: Vodafone Limited
Ward: Plympton Chaddlewood
Recommendation: Defer for Advert Period – Delegated authority

ADDENDUM REPORT PLANNING COMMITTEE 29 JULY 2010**Item: 6.3****Site: HM Naval Base, South Yard, Devonport****Ref: 10/00640/FUL****Applicant: Princess Yachts****Page: 17- 52****1. Corrections**

Updated plan nos.

08676_EX01D; 08676_EX02; 08676_EX03; 08676_EX04; 08676_EX05;
08676_EX06; 08676_EX07; 8676_EX08B; 088676EX09; 08676EX10;
08676_EX11; 08676_EX12; 8676_EX13; 08676_EX14; 08676_EX15;
08676_EX16; 08676_EX17; 08676_SD01U; 08676_SD02H; 08676_SD03F;
08676_SD04F; 08676_SD05; 08676_SD06; 08676_SD07; 08676_SD08;
08676_SD09; 08676_SD20F; 08676_SD21E; 08676_SD22; 08676_SD23;
08676_SD24A; 08676_SD25A; 08676_SD30; 08676_SD31; 08676_SD32;
08676_SD33; 08676_SD34; 08676_SD40A; 08676_SD41C; 08676_SD50A;
08676_SD51A; 08676_SD52A; 08676_SD53A; 08676_SD54A & 08676_SD55A.

2. Additional Consultations

The following consultation responses have been received since the report was written:

2a. Highways Agency

Transport Assessment (TA)

Following submission of the original TA, the Highways Agency requested that justification be provided for assessment of the storage yard as existing B8 development. Unfortunately, the case presented in the letter received from the applicant does not provide sufficient evidence to support this assessment methodology. The Agency does however acknowledge that the quantum of proposed development assessed within the TA is now consistent with that set out in the planning application. The Agency also notes the incorporation of sensitivity tests using alternative trip rate parameters and amended peak hours, at the request of Plymouth City Council.

Section 6.6 of the TA provides an estimation of trip distribution in the vicinity of the site based on 2001 census travel to work data. However, the potential distribution of trips onto the Strategic Road Network (SRN) is only described in the supporting letter (sent 2/07/10) and is based on assumption and undocumented census comparison. Given the peak hour net trip impact anticipated, and regarding comments made above in relation to assessment of existing storage area trips, the Agency has undertaken further analysis to determine the potential impact on the SRN. As such we are now in a position to conclude that the volume of trips anticipated to impact on the SRN can be

sufficiently mitigated through a robust Travel Plan such that the proposed development would not result in a detrimental impact on the SRN.

Travel Plan (TP)

The TP currently provides a good description of existing site characteristics and sustainable transport infrastructure. Ideally, the full TP will contain a greater level of detail regarding the measures, including how they will be implemented and timescales for each stage. The Agency notes the inclusion of a car sharing scheme among the proposed measures, with potential benefits in terms of a reduction in trips on the SRN. It is also stated that Princess Yachts will support the use of local buses with the offer of free/discounted bus passes. The Agency requested further details as part of the full TP to understand the routes that would be covered by these passes. The Agency will require confirmation in the full TP that the full range of measures will mitigate impact on the SRN wherever possible.

Following previous comments from the Agency regarding the TP, it is acknowledged that the current car mode share figures have been amended and are now representative of the census car driver figure for the Devonport Ward. However, the full TP would benefit from further detail on the proposed monitoring framework, including details of the survey techniques to be used.

The acceptability of the full TP will need to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and Local Highway Authority in consultation with the Highways Agency acting on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport, in advance of the occupation of the development.

Conclusion

The Highways Agency has no objection to the application, and directs that a condition regarding production of a full TP must be attached to any planning permission this Authority might be minded to grant.

To expedite production of the travel plan, the Agency understands that the Council intends to hold a meeting with the applicants and that the presence of the Agency is welcomed. The Agency considers that a meeting to discuss the requirements of the TP with both the Highway Authority and the applicants would be beneficial to all parties. In this regard, the Agency is happy to host this event, although, regardless of venue, the Agency will welcome early discussion such that a date and time can be set at the earliest convenience of all attendees.

2b. English Heritage

English Heritage have:

(i) pointed out that their comment on trees were made as a result of a plan shown on the Council's webpage (the source of this plan is unknown, but the architect has clarified that there are no trees proposed, only a row of lamp standards)

(ii) informed the Council that they have received, and are considering, an application for the listing of No. 3 slip.

3. Comment:

None of the above substantially alters the report or recommendation.

Listing application

The application made to English Heritage to list the No. 3 slip does not impinge upon the Planning Committee's authority to determine this application. In the event that English Heritage decide to list No.3 slip, and the listing is confirmed, a separate listed building consent would be required to dismantle the raised head and implement the current proposal.

Noise conditions

No further comment has been received from Public Protection Service (PPS) in relation to the provision noise conditions - condition 14 (noise mitigation scheme) and condition 15 (implementation of noise mitigation scheme). They are awaiting the results of the ambient noise survey before commenting further. In the circumstances, delegated authority is sought by officers to adjust the wording of these conditions if necessary, after the survey has been completed and on the advice of PPS.

Travel Plan condition

The Highways Agency have recommended a travel plan condition that is very similar to that recommended by the Highway Authority. In order to avoid unnecessary duplication, it is proposed to substitute proposed condition 26 (Travel Plan) with the Highways Agency wording, slightly amended to add the Highways Authority clauses. The new wording of the condition 26 is set out below.

4. RECOMMENDATION remains as per the report (with amended wording condition 26 substituted - see below) and delegated authority to officers to adjust the wording of conditions 14 and 15.

(26) A comprehensive Travel Plan will be developed for all elements of the development hereby permitted. The acceptability of the Travel Plan will need to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and Local Highway Authority (in consultation with the Highways Agency acting on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport), in advance of occupation of the development.

The Travel Plan will need to be prepared in line with prevailing policy and best practice and shall as a minimum include:

- identification for targets for trip reduction and modal shift
- methods to be employed to meet these targets
- mechanisms for monitoring and review
- mechanisms for reporting

- penalties to be applied in the event that targets are not met
- mechanisms for mitigation
- implementation of Travel Plan to an agreed timescale or timetable and its operation thereafter
- mechanisms to secure variations to the Travel Plan following monitoring and review
- appointment of a Travel Plan Coordinator
- measures to control the use of permitted parking areas

The Travel Plan shall be entered and monitored through the I trace travel plan management tool.

The Travel Plan shall be operated from the date of first occupation of any part of the development. A review of the target shall be undertaken within 3 months of the occupation of the development, and annually thereafter at the time of submission of the annual Travel Plan Report.

Reason:

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, such measures need to be taken in order to reduce reliance on the use of private cars (particularly single occupancy journeys) and to assist in the promotion of more sustainable travel choices, in accordance with Policy CS28 of the Plymouth Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2006-2021) 2007, and to ensure that the operation of the Strategic Road Network is protected and that sustainable travel objectives for the site are managed and maintained.

ADDENDUM REPORT PLANNING COMMITTEE 29 July 2010**Item: 4****Site:** Torr Home, The Drive, Hartley, PL3 5SY**Ref:** 10/00555/FUL**Applicant:** Torr Home**Page:**

This addendum report updates on the condition of Tree 101 which is scheduled for removal as part of the proposal. At the time of writing the main report, your officers had requested further information from the applicant to support their findings on the condition of this landmark tree which is visible from a number of locations in the surrounding area.

The second tree report that was submitted by the applicant from Evolve Consultancy stated that "the risks associated with this tree would be minimal if it were not for the extensive decay within the stem and the associated sparse crown indicating considerable dysfunction within the roots."

Further testing has now been carried out and this does not support the initial conclusions that there is extensive decay within the stem. Evolve Consultancy carried out a detailed and invasive inspection on 27 July 2010 in the presence of Jane Turner, Tree Officer for the Council, when seven drillings were made using a Resistograph F300. The findings of this testing indicate that generally there is no decay of the stem, although at 1.5 metres on the southern side some limited decay was present. There was certainly no evidence of extensive decay as previously suggested.

Evolve Consultancy believes that the crown thinning is a much more significant issue and indicative of a decline in biological function most likely attributable to root disturbance. However, no evidence has been submitted to support these conclusions, i.e. presence of decay fungi, ground disturbance or visible root decay. In the opinion of your officers, the crown thinning is the likely result of exposure to the prevailing winds and this is supported by the condition of other trees on site. In addition, the dry conditions that have been experienced this year are also likely to have contributed to the sparse appearance of the crown.

As a result of the further information submitted, the application is now recommended for refusal of permission. Tree 101 is a tall, landmark tree which provides amenity value to the surrounding neighbourhood and will continue to do so for many years to come. There may be alternative locations for an Elderly Mentally Infirm (EMI) Unit within the site, which would allow for the retention of Tree 101, and these other options should be explored in a fresh application. The loss of Tree 101 would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and the application is therefore recommended for refusal for the following reason:

LOSS OF IMPORTANT TREE

(1) The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed building, by virtue of its position, would result in the removal of a landmark protected tree which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. The tree is a large, mature beech tree on the western side of the lawn which, due to its height, is visible from a number of locations outside the application site, thus contributing to the character and visual quality of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CS18 and CS34 of the adopted City of Plymouth Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2006-2021) 2007.

Relevant Policies

The following (a) policies of the Plymouth Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2006-2021) 2007 and supporting Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Documents (the status of these documents is set out within the City of Plymouth Local Development Scheme) and the Regional Spatial Strategy, and (b) relevant Government Policy Statements and Government Circulars, were taken into account in determining this application:

(List as in original recommendation)

ADDENDUM REPORT PLANNING COMMITTEE 29 JULY 2010**Item: 6.7****Site: 3 Hillside Avenue, Plymouth****Ref: 10/00715/FUL****Applicant: Mr. Matthew Conyers****Page: 92-102**

Members are advised that five further letters of representation were received. Four of these, from/on behalf of Nos.10, 16, 27 and 31 Hillside Avenue, raise objections on the grounds that the street/area has more than its fair share of students at the expense of families and that problems of rubbish, loud noise and parking occur (more student lets means more cars). Neighbours object to the changing character of the area via student intensification. The issues of the area's character, noise and disturbance and parking are addressed in the report analysis, but that of rubbish is not. It is considered that recommended condition 6 (siting of refuse bins) is sufficient to address this issue.

One letter of support has been received, which states that students constitute a large percentage of trade for a local café; students are valuable to many businesses in Plymouth and the application will have a positive impact on the immediate area as well as local businesses. Whilst the strategic importance of the city-wide student population may be a material planning consideration, in cases such as this it is the impact on the character of the local area and residential amenity that is more pertinent to the Authority's decision.

This page is intentionally left blank

ADDENDUM REPORT PLANNING COMMITTEE 29 JULY 2010

Item: 6.8

Site: The Ridgeway, Plympton, Plymouth

Ref: 10/001045/FUL

Applicant: Vodafone Limited

Page: 103-106

Members are advised that Transport have no objections to the proposals and that the Public Protection Unit do not wish to comment on the application.

This page is intentionally left blank