

ADDENDUM REPORT PLANNING COMMITTEE 28 APRIL 2011

Item: 6.1

Site: 8 St. Maurice Road

Ref: 10/01802/FUL

Applicant: Mr Stephen Darke

Page: 9-16

For clarification members are advised that the following four paragraphs are added to the Analysis section of the report:

‘Waste from the premises and vermin would not be planning matters and would, if the need arose, be matters for the Council’s Public Protection Service.

With regard to the presence of similar uses elsewhere and the perceived detrimental impact on the Ridgeway shopping centre, it is considered that the scale of the proposed hot food takeaway would not detract from the viability of other shopping centres and in this respect would not have any more impact than the existing shop and hairdressers nearby. The number of hot food takeaways in other areas of Plympton is also not considered a sustainable reason for refusing this application.

The view that fish and chips are not a healthy eating option is considered to be a matter that is outside the remit of landuse planning considerations.

With regard to the application at No.6 St. Maurice Road, it is considered that the decision to refuse that application does not set a precedent to refuse the current proposals because that decision was based on the particular location of the proposed hot food takeaway in relation to residential neighbours.’

A further two letters were also received, which raise objections on the grounds of:

1. Filters will not eradicate the smell of fried food.
2. There will be noise that will have a detrimental affect on the use of neighbour’s garden.
3. Litter and vermin associated with litter.
4. The use of the parking spaces will be unsafe. Vehicles speed on the road despite traffic calming measures.
5. Fast food is unhealthy.
6. The existing off-street car parking spaces are not adequate to cater for the proposed use.

Members are advised also that further plans were submitted that show a reduced size extract flue and this is considered acceptable in visual terms. Assurances have been given that the effectiveness of the extract system has not been compromised and that noise would not be an issue. PPS advice is that as long as the system is maintained (i.e. the odour neutraliser is used, filters and ducting are cleaned as per manufacturers guidance), the different flue should not have a negative impact with reference to odour. PPS also advise that judging by what the applicant has outlined, the revised extract detail is determined as acceptable with regard to not introducing, or increasing, a likelihood of noise nuisance.

If members are minded to approve the application the decision notice will need to reflect the amended plans of the extract system.