

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 6.3

Site: 134 VAUXHALL STREET, PLYMOUTH

Application Number: 16/00007/FUL

Applicant: Mr Manoch Bahmanzadeh

LATE LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION

A further 11 letters of objection have been received since completion of the officers report. These letters do not raise any new issues than those already identified in the report, mainly objecting to the loss of the existing building and some to the proposed students.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT OFFICERS COMMENTS

For the purposes of clarity the LPA Historic Environment Officer has commented on the scheme and recommended refusal as per the recommendation. Their comments have been integrated within paragraphs 7 to 19.

DRAINAGE

A drainage strategy has now been submitted with this application. The submitted modelling and detailed design shows that surface water from the development can be discharged to Sutton Harbour through the existing surface water system by upsizing a section of pipe. The pipe will be upsized using no-dig technology to minimise disruption to the local residents and the public. South West Water, the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority have confirmed this is an acceptable strategy and have removed their objections, therefore the refusal reason for drainage is now not considered applicable.

SEQUENTIAL TEST

The submission of a sequential test has now been submitted with this application. The aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. This identifies the Sutton Harbour Area Action plan as the boundary, which is in line with discussions with the Environment Agency. A review of reasonably available sites within this area has been undertaken. In conclusion, it is not considered that there are any sequentially preferable reasonably available sites for student accommodation in Sutton Harbour. Overall, sufficient information has now been submitted for the LPA to review the sequential test, and this confirms that there are no sequentially preferable sites for this specific proposal.

ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

The Shopping Centres Supplementary Planning Document should also be listed as a relevant planning consideration.

REFUSAL REASON REMOVED

On the basis of the above, it is now considered that the 2nd reason for refusal has been addressed, there are no remaining concerns regarding flooding or drainage and therefore the 2nd reason for refusal can now be removed from the recommendation. The recommendation for refusal does however remain and refusal reason one is unaltered.