

## **ADDENDUM REPORT PLANNING COMMITTEE 1<sup>st</sup> APRIL 2010**

**Item: 03**  
**Site: Former Plymouth College Preparatory School Hartley Road Plymouth**  
**Ref: 09/01930**  
**Applicant: London & Westcountry Estates Limited**  
**Page: 19**

### **Representations**

The Council received two more letters of representation raising mainly transport and highway concerns:

23. the local highway authority (LHA) does not refer to the "Manual for Streets". Notes that with a recent application at Hill Lane (09/01906) one of the reasons for refusal was because the access was not to adoptable standard serving five or more dwellings. Hartley Road is not adopted, there are five dwellings with vehicular access to it close to the junction with Mannamead Road. How can these requirements be met?
24. LHA is silent on the danger on the road and believes the traffic movements will be more than seven at each peak; there will be movements throughout the day increasing danger at the Mannamead Road junction;
25. LHA does not take into account the possible development of the playing field;
26. believes that on street parking will continue to occur on Hartley Road;
27. no reference to the emergency services;
28. the lack of street lighting is not addressed;
29. pedestrian access to Hartley Road from properties in Kingsland Gardens Close is not addressed;
30. believes the applicant's accident records are an under-estimate owing to the long vacancy of the school site and the redevelopment of Trengweath. The writer has seen numerous near misses at the junction with Mannamead Road and believes these would increase if the site was developed;
31. the Council should install a footpath along Hartley Road;
32. will the Council consider installing traffic lights at the Mannamead Road junction;
33. how will the street furniture affect the protected trees; and
34. if there are challenges in the future use and development of the playing field these should be addressed before this application is determined;

Cognita Schools, the owner of Kings School, supports the application as the proposed designated footway would improve safety and security for the school's pupils, parents, staff and visitors.

## **Comment**

### Transport

The LHA has responded to points 23 – 29 as follows:

23. With regard to the site referred to at Hill Lane, it confirms that the highway recommendation of refusal of that application was based upon a reason relating to a sub-standard access road and not on the basis of the suggested reason that there would be more than 5 properties off a private drive.

The provision of limiting the number of properties off a private drive is to protect purchasers against the cost of private street works for the future maintenance of such roads which would not be highway maintainable at public expense. In respect of Hartley Road there is no possibility of the Highway Authority ever adopting the road and consequently the applicant has confirmed that there would be a Management Company in place that would be responsible for the maintenance of all highway areas within the site thus protecting purchasers against private street works.

At a site recently approved at Crownhill Baptist Church (app. no. 09/00226) which proposed 20 dwellings off a private drive. No highway objections were raised in respect of this proposal.

24. In terms of traffic impact the focus is on the peak hours as, by their very nature, these are the periods of greatest traffic activity. It is accepted that the residential development will generate trips throughout the day but most of these movements will occur in the peak hours. Issues regarding the trip generation figures are covered in the report.

25. The Highway Authority can only comment upon the proposals put forward before them. The re-development of any further areas of land would need to be considered as part of any future planning application submission.

26. This point has been addressed previously in the report.

27. Whilst there was no requirement to consult with the emergency services on this proposal, the situation would have been no different to when the school previously occupied the site in terms of access by emergency services. Indeed the situation would now be improved in view of the fact that the proposal results in a reduction in traffic movements.

28. The provision of a footway is a substantial improvement (in terms of pedestrian safety) upon the existing situation where pedestrians walking along Hartley Road have no safe areas and have to compete with vehicular traffic.

29. The provision of existing traffic calming along Hartley Road helps to keep traffic speeds down. This coupled with a reduction in traffic movements on Hartley Road (as a result of the change of use of the site from a school to residential) is likely to result in Hartley Road being a safer environment in which to walk out onto.

### Gradients and trees

The issue of gradients is referred to in the report at page 24, paragraph 4 and page 27, paragraph 5. Care will be required in establishing the lawned area by plot 5 under supervision to avoid root damage. A retaining wall will be built to the west of the two Turkey Oaks but there are no roots here. The area around the trees must be robustly fenced off and protected during construction. There must be no drainage infrastructure, site office or storage of materials within the construction exclusion zones. Subject to these safeguards the change in gradients to the turning heads should not harm the protected trees.

### **Recommendation**

The recommendation is the same as the report with the additional conditions:

#### **29. PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS TO HARTLEY ROAD**

No occupation of any dwelling accessed off Hartley Road shall take place until improved pedestrian facilities in the form of a new footway have been provided along Hartley Road in accordance with details as indicated and shown on Scott Wilson Drg. No. D115462/T/001 Rev. 01.

#### **Reason**

In order to provide a satisfactory means of access to the development for pedestrians in the interests of pedestrian safety and sustainability to comply with policy CS28 of [the City of Plymouth adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document, 2007](#).

#### **30. MANAGEMENT COMPANY**

Details of the Management Company that will be established to control and maintain the access roads and footways and landscaped areas and trees that are not within curtilages at the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any of the dwellings is occupied.

#### **Reason:**

To ensure that the access roads and footways are constructed to a satisfactory standard in the interests of safety and visual amenity and that the trees are safeguarded and the landscaped areas kept to an acceptable standard in the interests of visual amenity to comply with policies CS28, CS18, CS02 and CS34 of [the City of Plymouth adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document, 2007](#).

### **FURTHER DETAILS**

(31) No work shall commence on site until details of the following aspects of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, viz:- the screening to the patio, balcony and terrace of plot 14. The works shall conform to the approved details.

Reason:

To ensure that the privacy and residential amenity of 17 Beechfield Grove is protected in accordance with Policy CS34 of the Plymouth Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2006-2021) 2007.