

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 6.2

Site: Former Plymouth College Site, Hartley Road

Application Number: I7/00426/S73

Applicant: Mr Kevin Briscoe

Pages: 13-26

Public Comments

The public consultation period expired on 6th March. Five public comments were received. These raise objections to the proposals on the following grounds:

1. Loss of privacy in neighbours' gardens and rooms facing the development.
2. The roof terraces are not sufficiently set back to prevent overlooking directly down into gardens and houses of neighbouring properties.
3. Loss of outlook.
4. The development amounts to a 5th storey and constitutes overdevelopment, the scale and density of which is unreasonable. The total building height will exceed 14.5 metres once the balustrades and stairwell have been taken into account. A 5 storey flat development was originally viewed by officers as 'overdevelopment of the site harmful to the appearance and character of the area.'
5. The development is out of character with the surrounding area.
6. Only one building in a kilometre range exceeds three storeys in height, i.e. the EDF building near the A38; together with the terraces, which are more in keeping with the Hoe, the development is out of character in this residential area.
7. The glass balustrades to the south, east and west will reflect sunlight and create an adverse visual impact across wide area of Plymouth. If 1.75 metre high balustrades are visually impenetrable they must constitute an additional storey.
8. The roof garden is a social area where people from both top flats will gather, which will allow much more scope for invading privacy.
9. Due to its elevated position there is likely to be noise disturbance affecting a wide area.
10. The developments here and on the adjacent site do not set a precedent for further development.
11. The proposed terraces will have no benefit to housing provision and cannot be justified on these grounds.
12. The top two flats already have outside amenity space in the form of balconies and communal space, which questions the need for the proposed terraces.
13. Contrary to the officer's report on the previously withdrawn application the setting back of the glass balustrades and stairwell will be ineffective when viewed from Kingsland Garden Close, which is at a higher level.
14. The proposals fail to conform to Policy CS34 in the Local Development Framework that requires a development to be 'compatible with its surroundings in terms of style, siting,

layout, orientation, visual impact, local context and views, scale, massing, height, density, materials and detailing.

15. Reflection and glare from the glazing will make this development more conspicuous. The quality of light nearby will also be reduced.
16. There is concern regarding the height of the building in relation to the adjacent school and the potential for noise pollution.
17. Concerns that there may be glare on the school playground, in the garden and in the classrooms. Will this be a problem?

The majority of these issues are referred to in public comments received in respect of the previous application (ref 16/02413). One of the recent comments argues that the setting back of the terraces does not actually prevent overlooking of the houses in Pine Gardens. However, in officers' view the setting back is considered to be a mitigating factor, rather than a measure that prevents any overlooking.

The issue of glare and reflection from the proposed glazed balconies has also been raised. While it is hard to say whether the proposed glazing will produce glare and reflections greater than the glazing in the flats, it is noted that the proposed glazing is set back from the edges of the building, which should reduce the potential for reflection and glare.

The need for the extra space has also been queried. While the terraced area may not be necessary to provide required amenity space, this in itself would not warrant refusal. Persons may wish to enhance their properties without 'need' as such.

With regard to outlook, the proposed extensions to the building are considered by officers to be far enough away from neighbours to avoid any unreasonable loss of outlook.

No changes are therefore proposed to the officer recommendation.