

# ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



## Item Number: 4

**Site: "Sherford New Community" Land South/Southwest Of A38**

**Planning Application Number: I7/00998/S73M**

**Applicant: Sherford New Community Consortium**

### Section 5 - Consultation Responses

Further consultation responses have been received following the re-advertisement of the revised material.

#### Devon and Cornwall Police – Police Designing Out Crime Officer

Comments relate to car parking, and highlights how improperly considered layouts can lead to chaotic street scenes. These additional comments also highlight that spaces situated too far away from dwellings, as well as insecure parking courts, can also exacerbate chaotic parking outcomes as people choose to use highway or pavement spaces.

#### Brixton Parish Council

Brixton Parish Council were consulted by South Hams under reference I593/I7/VAR, and have provided an amended consultation response. The Parish supports the variation in principle but raise a number of issues relating to the subsequent application, due later in the year. They raise the more following detailed comments in respect of the revised Town Code;

- Parking – welcomes the options presented within the Town Code, and accepts that car parking needs to be adequately provided within new developments. However, they have concern with 'option 2' stating that end-on-end parking is not acceptable;
- Renewable Energy and construction standards – welcomes any changes to the energy strategy through improved building technology. The Parish would also wish to see 100% of construction waste being recycled;
- Neighbourhood Design Codes – should include a requirement that civic buildings are included in such documents;
- Better clarification is sought in terms of the location and quantity of Civic Spaces, the Land use strategy, Green Strategy Plan, Urban Parks, Semi Natural Green Space, Community Park;
- Further more specific comments are made relating to apartment blocks which should be located near to open spaces, and should be allowed to have balconies as well as dwellings to have gardens. Civic buildings need to be multi-purpose and used flexibly. Shop front design should also stand the test of time.

### Section 6 – Representations

Two further letters of representation have been received since the publication of the Agenda papers. The first of these has come from Red Tree, who were the original promoters of the site,

and who object to this application. Red Tree state that exceptional design was a critical component of the proposals to develop Sherford and to overcome local opposition, and therefore was a key focus of many years of work and investment. They question why this is all being sacrificed so early in the development.

In terms of the proposed Code, it is suggested that by removing all of the prescription, there is no reference point, or clear set of rules in which to guide proposals and enforce against when the next level of design work takes place. They highlight a number of areas where prescription is removed, notably street scenes, trees, set-backs, roof pitch, building materials, window openings, ceiling heights, distribution of mandatory retail, build types etc, but do not highlight everything they believe to have been stripped out. They suggest that it would be better to address specific issues individually within the context of the current Code framework, rather than by making such fundamental changes.

They also suggest that removing the Sherford Review Panel (SRP) will mean that the dedicated body that can advise both developers and the LPA on design will be lost. It also questions whether the Councils have the resources and skills on this complex matter, to be able to deliver high quality design outcomes particularly if much of the prescription is lost.

The second letter relates to proposals to provide a cycle/pedestrian route through the King George V playing fields.

## Responses

1. The comments raised by Red Tree raise similar points to that of the Prince's Foundation, and these are already therefore addressed within the Officer's Report. In particular, paragraph 17 of the Officers report identifies topics within the proposed Code that have been reinserted to address the concerns of Officers.
2. A section on parking arrangements has been included within the proposed Town Code, and this is reported at paragraph 27 of the officer's Report. In terms of the comments made by the both the Police, and Parish Council, it should be recognised that the Code identifies the types of parking arrangements that could be provided at Sherford. Precise arrangements can however, only be considered at the detailed design stage. Members should also note that planning conditions attached to the original outline planning consent requiring a maximum of 2 spaces per dwelling will not change.
3. In response to the Parish Council's comments surrounding renewable energy, members are reminded that this element of the application has been withdrawn, and therefore no longer relevant.
4. Officers are satisfied that the proposed chapter headings that set out what is required by a Neighbourhood Design Code is appropriate. This includes a requirement to identify Civic Buildings.
5. Requirements for Civic Spaces, Land use, Green Strategy, urban parks, Semi natural Green Space and the Community Park are set out within the original Masterplan, outline planning conditions and the principal S106 agreement. These will still form key components of the outline planning permission, for which the revised Town Code will need to be read alongside. Officers are therefore satisfied that the Code would help to shape the form that those features would come forward to, rather than dictate quantity.
6. Further comments relate to aspects of detailed design which will be controlled through the preparation of Neighbourhood Design Codes.

7. The comments raised in respect of King George V playing fields are not relevant to this application, as the variation relates solely to the amendment of the Town Code and conditions 20 and 21. Other aspects of the outline permission are not being reassessed.

#### **Revision 4**

Members' attention is also drawn to the submission of a revision 4 version of the Town Code. There are no substantial additions or amendments, but makes 74 alterations to tighten the precision of wording, for example amending "should" to "must".

#### **Recommendation**

In conclusion, no amendments are proposed to the Officer's recommendation as a result of the items highlighted within this Addendum report.

#### **Conditions**

The proposed draft conditions will need to be amended to recognise that the Town Code is at revision 4.