

ADDENDUM REPORT PLANNING COMMITTEE 28 June 2012

Item: 6.4

Site: Dorsmouth, Drunken Bridge Hill, Plymouth

Site ref: 12/00778

Applicant: Mrs. Maureen Lawley

Page: 49-64

Members are advised of the following matters:

Letters of representation

A further nine letters were received, which raise the following objections and concerns:

1. The development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.
2. Impact on the Plympton Covert and Conservation Area, including the scenic natural backdrop to the Conservation Area.
3. Vehicle congestion and disruption for local residents; road changes may lead to the loss of a parking facility.
4. Concerns regarding access.
5. Potential for flooding.
6. Letter from Plympton Pathfields Preservation Group, who object on the grounds of the impact on the visual qualities of the wooded area of Dorsmouth and the Plympton Covert and the historic landscape backdrop to the Conservation Area. The dwelling would be in constant shade and the new entrance to Dorsmouth would require the destruction of a large section of hedge and would further erode the historic character of the ancient lane. Several trees would be removed and this would be a great loss to the community and there is concern that there could be consequences for other large significant trees on the site, particularly those on the high bank of Drunken Bridge Hill. It is also stated that traffic movements would adversely affect the tranquillity and amenity of the adjacent Plympton Covert and that there is the prospect of additional hazards on this narrow road, which is steep near the entrance and where vehicle speeds are high. The metallic and preformed panel materials are considered out of character in the area and would further detract from the natural setting. It is considered that development on surrounding protected green spaces will further erode Plympton St. Maurice, which is a unique and precious local and regional asset.
7. The application seeks to build on a Greenscape (on the Local Plan Map) and Plympton St. Maurice Conservation Area. Building on the greenscape area would compromise the definition between the built environment and the greenscape.
8. Removing the hedge at the entrance would not improve road safety and construction traffic would lead to further hazards.
9. The size, height and design of the dwellings are out of character in the area and would be visually incongruous in this prominent area of wooded hillside.
10. The building appears to have a greater footprint than that shown on the previous outline consent and there is no detail of the relevant heights of the buildings and how they relate to the immediate area.
11. The use of panel cladding, trespa panels and zinc roof would not be in keeping with surrounding buildings.
12. The development would be detrimental to Dorsmouth and its grounds.
13. Loss of trees and concern that trees on the Drunken Hill boundary may become vulnerable.

14. Allowing these semi-detached houses could give the green light for the other outline application on this site, which would be harmful to the western boundary of the site.
15. There are springs in the area that lead to icy roads in winter.
16. An Inspector in an appeal in 1982 said that the area south of Fore Street should not be disturbed so it forms the boundary of the Conservation Area.
17. The application two years ago appeared to be for bungalows and now two-storey dwellings are proposed. This must increase the footprint of the development.
18. Construction will endanger the natural habitat.
19. The arboricultural plan is out of date.

A number of letters refer to the previously granted outline planning permission (reference 10/01814), which is also referred to in the officer's report. One of the questions that arises is whether granting the current application would mean that the outline permission could be implemented, particularly 'dwelling 2', which on the outline plans is below the existing bungalow at Dorsmouth. Having considered this matter further the following points arise:

- a) If planning permission is granted for the current application, and the development is implemented, then it would not be possible to submit a reserved matters application for dwelling 2 alone because that would be a departure from the outline approval.
- b) If members approve the current application, but development is not implemented, then a reserved matters application for the two dwellings approved at outline stage can be submitted.
- c) If planning permission is granted for the current application then a new full application could still be submitted for dwelling 2. This would be considered on its merits taking account of previous permissions

With regard to other points raised in these letters of representation, the impact on the character of the area, including the setting of the Conservation Area and the greenscape, design and materials, highway issues and flooding are addressed in the officer report. The impact on significant trees is also considered in the report and the improvements to the entrance are not considered to affect trees on the hedgebank.

With regard to nature conservation, condition 16 of the recommended approval anticipated the submission of an Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement Strategy to update the Strategy referred at the time of the previous outline application. However, the updated version has not yet been received and therefore it is recommended that this condition is re-worded as follows:

(16) Unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, the development shall be carried out in accordance with an up-to-date Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement Strategy for the site.

Reason

In the interests of the retention, protection and enhancement of wildlife and features of biological interest, in accordance with policies CS01, CS19 and CS34 of the Core Strategy of Plymouth's Local Development Framework April 2007 and Government advice contained in Planning Policy Statement 9 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation).