

## **ADDENDUM REPORT PLANNING COMMITTEE 16<sup>th</sup> OCTOBER 2008**

**Item: 6.10**

**Site: STOKE DAMEREL COMMUNITY COLLEGE, SOMERSET PLACE**

**Ref: 08/00984/FUL**

**Applicant: Plymouth City Council**

**Page:115**

Since writing the recommendation report, 6 letters of representation have been received in response to the amended plans and details regarding the re-provision of parking spaces, and the proposed art screen received 22.09.08. The letters are from the nearby residents, the Penlee Vale Residents' Association and the Stoke Damerel Conservation Society.

The letters raise objection to:

- (i) the replacement of 8 marked spaces, whereas over the years more than 8 vehicles are regularly parked in the area concerned (one author wrote he has seen 11 or 12 vehicles parked in this area on a fairly regular basis)
- (ii) the on-street parking problem has been further aggravated by the increase in Sixth Form students now attending the college, some of whom drive cars to school and park on adjoining roads as no provision has been made for them to park within the college grounds
- (iii) 4 of the replacement parking spaces are within the City Business Park and not available for the exclusive use of the College
- (iv) the planning application should not be considered for approval without the robust implementation of the School Travel Plan linked to planning application 07/02128/FUL
- (v) the proposed screen (whilst having no views on the design) being a complete waste of public funds for a building that has no architectural merit and a condition of the temporary building is for five years. Money would be better spent on additional/improved access to car parking at the school.

Other issues are raised in these letters but they repeat issues raised in previous letters of objection which have already been taken into consideration in the Officer's report.

Issue (i) is discussed in the officer's report and is one reason why the Planning Committee voted to defer the application for further information. The Case Officer considers it to be reasonable to request 8 spaces to be re-provided, as this is the number of marked spaces, and the recommended condition reflects this.

Issue (ii) is a material planning consideration, however the proposal is not directly linked to the number of Sixth Form Students, so it is considered that little weight can be afforded to this allegation. In addition, it is considered that Sixth Form students should be encouraged to use sustainable modes of transport rather than making it easier for them to park on site by providing them with car parking spaces. One of the actions in the existing School Travel Plan is to reduce students arriving in cars. In conclusion, this issue is not considered to alter the recommendation.

With regards to issue (iii) and the 4 parking spaces within the City Business Park not being available for the exclusive use of the College, the Case Officer has checked with the City Business

Park Manager who has confirmed that 'none of the spaces will be marked but there is capacity and there are plenty of spaces available now so it won't be an issue'. The available capacity of the City Business Park car park appears to have been a recurring theme in discussion with the applicants and nearby residents throughout the course of this application. As such, whilst the issue raised is correct, it is not considered to be a cause for concern. In addition, the justification from the school makes comment about the shift pattern of the staff and possibility of cross-over, so non-allocated spaces within a car park with spare capacity would allow for flexibility, to the benefit of the intended car park users.

With regards to issue (iv) regarding the robust implementation of the School Travel Plan (STP) linked to planning application 07/02128/FUL, the Case Officer has confirmed with the School Travel Plan Officer that the STP is 'complete' to the Council's satisfaction, however travel plans are by their very nature a step-change process and therefore it is difficult to say when a travel plan is 'fully implemented'. The first steps in the school's travel plan implementation have begun. In conclusion, the suggestion in the letter of representation is not considered to alter the recommendation.

With regards to the proposed screen and issue (v) objecting to it for being a waste of public funds, the cost of the proposal is not considered to be a material planning consideration. The impact of the proposal on the character of the area is one of the main considerations in assessing the acceptability of the proposal addressed in the Officer's Report. This states 'the building itself is not considered to represent a positive contribution to the school or area's identity due to its modular and utilitarian design'. For this reason, without the screen the proposal is considered to be contrary to policies CS02 and CS34.