

ADDENDUM REPORT PLANNING COMMITTEE 1st APRIL 2010

Item: 04
Site: Plymouth Airport Runway Approach Site, Glenfield Road, Glenholt
Ref: 09/01652
Applicant: Cavanna Homes (Cornwall) limited
Page: 43

Representations

The Council received 12 written representations following the re-consultation on the amended drawings. Several are still under the misapprehension that the development is for 77 dwellings and not 72. They are still concerned that the density is too high. They also raised points 3, 4, 6, 7 and 28 at page 46 of the report. Other issues stated are:

39. The buildings should not be higher than two storeys;
40. Disagrees with the report that traffic leaving Elmwood Close mainly turns left; much turns right to go to The George Park and Ride to avoid the queues on Plymbridge Road as does other traffic coming up Plymbridge Road from the south east;
41. The applicant did not undertake community involvement;
42. The recent meeting with the applicant was hindered because officers were unable to attend because of annual leave; and
43. The site should include a community garden.

Alison Seabeck MP wrote stating:

She attended a public meeting with the local residents and applicant. She accepts the need for the housing development and hopes the concerns raised will be considered by the committee. The developer has made concessions for some residents. But other occupiers in St Anne's Road are concerned about overlooking. There were worries about the sewerage infrastructure, she has contacted South West Water and believes the matter is in hand.

Residents are concerned that the final finishes to the houses has not been finalised. It was not clear if the changes to the parking standards would impact on the scheme. The shortage of playspace on site was also raised. Could the covenants in the area be transferred to the new homes that include hedge heights?

Comment

The applicant arranged a meeting with the Glenholt Residents Association (GRA) on 25 March. Officers could not attend owing to prior annual leave commitments. The applicant states that it did not previously decline to meet with the GRA. Most of the issues raised were not reserved matters ones or have been addressed in the amended layout.

Plot 50 has an unusually large garden. The local planning authority can not attach a condition to a reserved matters approval preventing a landowner or applicant from applying to develop the land in the future. The LPA can attach an informative stating that if this were to occur, such an application would be

determined with the utmost care. The new permitted development rights enable a house owner to carry out considerable extensions to the house and erect buildings in the garden that need to be controlled to prevent over-development of this plot and to protect the residential amenities of the area.

On the issue of the sewerage the applicant has checked with South West Water and it has confirmed that the system has capacity to accommodate the proposal.

Recommendation:

The recommendation is the same as the report with the additional condition and informative.

CONDITION 4 - RESTRICTIONS ON PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT - PLOT 50

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No.2) (England) Order 2008 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order or the 1995 Order with or without modification), no development falling within Classes A and E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 to that Order shall be carried out at plot 50 unless, upon application, planning permission is granted for the development concerned.

Reason:

To prevent overdevelopment of this plot and in order to protect the visual and residential amenities of the area in accordance with Policy CS34 of the Plymouth Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2006-2021) 2007.

INFORMATIVE 2 – PLOT 50

The applicant is advised that plot 50 is unusual in having an extremely large garden. Any future proposals to alter the development of this part of the site would be considered with the utmost care by the local planning authority given the history of the evolution of the approved development and the impact it could have on adjoining properties.