

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 03

Site: LAND AT PLYMBRIDGE ROAD, BORINGDON PLYMOUTH

Planning Application Number: I4/02401/OUT

Applicant: Linden Limited

Page:

Further Transport Consultation Response

Members are advised that the applicant submitted further technical information relating to the additional traffic generation (4th November). The Local Highway Authority have considered this new information and the Local Planning Authority's view remains unchanged, therefore reason 4 for refusal (Local Transport Considerations) still stands. The Transport Assessment submitted by the Applicant concludes that while additional traffic will be generated by the development particularly using Larkham Lane this will not result in a severe impact, is therefore in accordance with the NPPF, and can be reasonably mitigated through upgrading of traffic signal junctions along the corridor as secured through other recent developments in the area. Your officers are not however currently in a position to be able to support this conclusion. While some points have been partly addressed there remains questions about the validity of the base data used for the traffic modelling and hence the scale of impact of the development on key junctions along the Plymouth Road corridor particularly at Larkham Lane, and Cothill. There are also concerns about the scale of impact at the Glen Road/Ridgeway junctions.

Garden Trust Consultation Response

Members should also be aware that further correspondence has been received from the Garden Trust following a late consultation and a copy is available to see on the planning website. The Gardens Trust, formerly The Garden History Society, is the Statutory Consultee on development affecting all sites on the Historic England *Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest*. Their response does not raise any additional issues in detailing their concerns about the adverse visual impact of the proposed residential development on the heritage assets of the highest significance, (namely Boringdon House, listed Grade I, the Boringdon Arch, listed Grade II*, the scheduled Boringdon Deer Park, and the Grade II* Registered designed landscape at Saltram). They recommend that refusal is warranted as the proposal clearly conflicts with national planning policy with regard to the conservation of the historic environment. Salient points from their Conservation Officer in the following extract from their response are: "The role, and significance, of the Boringdon Arch to Saltram has subsequently been confirmed in the appeal decision of 29 June 2015 for the proposed wind turbine at Boringdon Golf Club (APP/K1128/A/14/2229204). In relation to the Boringdon Arch, the Inspector stated:

"The significance of this asset is primarily derived from its design as an eye-catcher to be seen from Saltram House, as well as a focal-point when viewed from a number of locations around the designed landscape to the house, including the Grade II listed mid 18th century Amphitheatre."*

The Historic Environment Assessment, which forms part of the planning application, is therefore both inaccurate and misleading in the assertion *"that there are no longer any views from Saltram House or its environs towards the triumphal arch, and therefore the anticipated intrusion of the proposed development within its designed view does not remain a consideration."* (para 8.9). We would advise that this document should be disregarded by the local planning authority in assessing this application, as it clearly demonstrates a fundamental misunderstanding of the aesthetic design of Saltram.

The Boringdon Arch was the focal point of the overall landscape design, linking the new seat of the Parkers at Saltram with their ancestral seat at Boringdon, and framing spectacular views across the new landscape. The Boringdon Arch is only some 290 metres to the north west of the application site. The replacement of open countryside by the proposed suburban housing estate of up to 280 dwellings would intrude into the designed views from Saltram seriously detracting from the rural setting of the Boringdon Arch. There is no doubt that the proposed development would challenge the visual dominance of the Boringdon Arch in its open setting, part countryside and part golf course, and would form an unacceptable element in the designed views of the Boringdon Arch in its role as eye-catcher from Saltram. The housing estate would also replace the rural setting of Boringdon House, thereby causing harm to the significance of the heritage asset."

Additional Letters of Representation

Members are advised that objections from local residents continue to be received. In addition to the letters of representation that were received in respect of the revisions to the application, additional late letters of representation have been received more recently:

- from the occupiers of 54, Plymbridge Road and 53, Rashleigh Avenue objecting to the proposal on the grounds covered in the report (traffic volume . flooding /drainage, undue pressure on local schools/GP surgeries) and
- from the occupier of 27, Wheatridge objecting on the same grounds as above plus concern about proximity to national trust property, risk to wildlife. Adverse impact of heavy construction traffic, disregard for the views of existing residents.
- from the occupier of 10 Ashcombe Close objecting to the proposal on the same traffic grounds as above and expressing strong concerns/annoyance with the applicants suggested Heads of Terms/S106 package that would not help Woodford residents.
- from the occupier of 45, Cranfield objecting that the proposal would bring no environmental value and, despite what the applicant's state, there would be a loss of habitats in the area once the bulldozers move in.
- from the occupier of 10 Farm Close objecting on local traffic grounds pointing out the delays to the bus service at times of existing congestion and that further approved developments in the area will, when operational, add to the problem and suggesting that brownfield sites should be used first (querying whether building at Coypool should take place).

It is considered that the points raised have been taken into account in considering the merits of the planning application and the recommendation in the Planning Committee report.