

For links to PCC web sites regarding Planning and Licensing please see  
the addendum at the end of this report.

~~~~~  
**LICENSING APPLICATIONS**

None  
~~~~~

**PLEASE NOTE:**

PCC have made it clear in recent planning applications that residents feedback of objections via HNF objection letters, usually after discussion at a monthly meeting, are not seen as significant if they are not supported by residents' personal public objections. Therefore, if you wish the HNF to object to a planning application then please take the time to follow that up with a personal objection.

See Addendum A at the end of this report for how to submit an objection, or a supporting comment, to the PCC planning department.  
~~~~~

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Ongoing)**

**26/00144/LBC - Flats 1, 5, 8, 9 & 11, 5 - 6 Elliot Terrace**

Internal repair works to a number of flats following previous water ingress.

This application was previously discussed as a Pre-application at the Jan meeting.

**Comments by 3<sup>rd</sup> Mar**  
~~~~~

**26/00140/FUL - Flat 15 to 53, Holyrood Court Holyrood Place**

New uPVC windows. "Replacement of existing brown uPVC and aluminium windows with new white uPVC windows and associated works."

Holyrood Court, Willow Tree Housing Partnership - The site is a part 4-storey, part 5-storey building consisting of 20 self-contained residential apartments.

The current fenestration consists of a mixture of brown uPVC and aluminium windows with a combination of opening arrangements. The windows are in poor condition and have become difficult to maintain. The proposals will also improve the buildings thermal and energy performance; these are significant benefits of the proposal.

It should be noted that uPVC windows are already fitted to other houses in the street, but we recognise that the flats are in a Conservation Area close to many Listed Buildings.

**Comments by 3<sup>rd</sup> Mar**  
~~~~~

**26/00030/LBC & 26/00029/FUL - 24 Lockyer Street**

Change of use of ground/lower ground floors from night club to commercial unit (Class E)

Change of use of first floor from tattoo parlour to 2-bed flat (Class C3)

Change of use of second/third floors from manager's accommodation to 6-bed HMO (Class C4) (part retrospective).

The proposals seek to make better usage of this centrally located property. The external alterations are minimal, the materials will be matching the existing vernacular and will cause minimal impact to any surrounding properties.

**General design and layout**

The plan indicates one self-contained flat, a six bed HMO and commercial premises,

**Lower Ground floor** - is proposed to consist of commercial premises (class E), with a store and w/c rooms. one of the w/c rooms has multiple w/cs. Ground floor - is proposed to consist of commercial premises (class E) with access to the rear courtyard. There is also a separate entrance that leads to the first floor.

**First floor** – is proposed to be of a self-contained flat consisting of two bedrooms, a lounge diner a bathroom and a kitchen. The flat has access to the communal outside area.

**Second and Third floor** is proposed to consist of a six-bedroom HMO. The second floor of the HMO consists of two bedrooms, a lounge kitchen diner and a bathroom. There is access to the outside communal area via an external staircase. The third floor consists of 4 bedrooms and a bath/shower room.

**Comments by 3<sup>rd</sup> Mar**  
~~~~~

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Ongoing)**

**26/00021/LBC & 26/00020/FUL - Lower Ground Floor Flat, 2A The Esplanade (Grade II\*)**

Replacement of basement front door

The applicant wishes to replace the existing red painted timber door with an olive green painted timber door to the entrance of the property. The style of the door is the same as the existing, however it is proposed to incorporate glass to the top four panels to allow light into the property.

The scale and visual appearance will be unchanged and will be in keeping within the conservation area and listed status of the property. The existing door being replaced is in a poor condition and as such the new proposed door will provide better weather proofing and thermal efficiency. This improvement therefore will protect the internal and external fabric of the property. In addition, draught proofing, sound insulation and security measures will all be improved.

**Comments by 3<sup>rd</sup> Mar**

~~~~~

**25/01212/LBC - Flat 2, 216 Citadel Road**

Installation of extractor fan unit and associated works.

This application was previously discussed as a Pre-application at the Jan meeting.

**Comments by 17<sup>th</sup> Feb**

~~~~~

**25/01448/LBC - 3 Elliot Terrace**

Repairs to existing roof including new roof covering and insulation and associated gutter and lead works  
Replacement of flat roof covering to the rear of the property. The flat roof will include an increase in the height, due to meeting the building regulations Part L. The existing roof will remain in place and the new covering will be installed over it to increase insulation values.

**Existing materials and finishes:**

Rear Tenement combined Terrace Flat Roof Existing: Bitumen felt roof covering. Cast iron railing posts; Lead flashings

**Proposed materials and finishes:**

Rear Tenement combined Terrace Flat Roof Proposed: Fully coat entire flat roof surfaces, applying enhanced adhered bitumen primers. Supply and install new high performance felt system, comprising of underfelts and polyester strand reinforced cap sheet; including UV surface protection granules. All new felts to fully cover and waterproofing the integral gulley sump. Wrap and seal the base of railing posts with the application of waterproof liquid compounds. Chase and redress existing lead flashings. The insulation will raise the roof by 130mm and the integral gully by 30mm.

**Comments by 10<sup>th</sup> Feb**

~~~~~

**PTO**

## **PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Ongoing)**

### **25/01654/FUL - Plymouth Register Office, 49 Lockyer Street**

Demolition of existing building and construction of residential development with commercial (use class E) on ground floor and associated works. This application was discussed at the Jan meeting.

### **New information submitted since Jan meeting**

#### **Historic England**

Historic England accepts the principle of a larger replacement building on this site. However, given the prominence of the site, the proximity of the conservation area and many important heritage assets, we consider that the design should be modified to better reflect its context. We recommend that amendments are made to address our heritage concerns outlined below:

We support the principle of development, and the creation of new dwellings within Plymouth's core. The proposed scheme will have an immediate impact on the surrounding Victorian terraces, both on Lockyer Street and Osborne Place. The settings of the various listed buildings along the adjacent streets has been thoughtfully considered. The composition and rhythm of the façade of the four lower storeys seems to respond well to the scale and composition of the existing urban grain. However, the current design of the two upper "mansard storeys" does not sit as comfortably with the surrounding designated and protected townscape as the lower four.

The 3D rendered visualisations, that were provided, were very helpful for understanding the massing of the building; but, the selected viewpoints did not show the new design in context with its neighbours, from street level and at an appropriate distance, particularly the various listed buildings and other designated heritage assets.

Appreciating these relationships from street level will be critical in understanding whether the new proposed block integrates with its neighbours, or not. Given the lack of this critical contextual analysis, we are concerned that the design and massing of the proposed upper two storeys would appear incongruous and out of scale with the surrounding townscape. This may cause harm to the setting of the various listed buildings, monuments and to the Conservation Area in general.

Therefore, we recommend further viewpoints are provided, and a revised design for this element, if required. Failing this, we consider that a single-storey "mansard" is likely to cause less impact and less harm than the proposed two-storey "mansard", a strategy which would reduce the overall height and impact.

The proposed new development would also impact the setting of the Naval War Memorial (grade I listed), the Drake statue (grade II\* listed), and the Armada Memorial (grade II\* listed). Again, visualisations are needed to better appreciate the proposal in the background of views (from ground level) that frames these heritage assets. This would either offer reassurance that no serious harm was impacting the settings of these assets, or indicate that the massing and design need further refinement.

#### **Summary**

We support the development of this site in principle, particularly as it accords with the emerging City Centre Masterplan. However, we have concerns that the proposed upper two floors make the development appear top heavy. The massing should be reconsidered, either through redesign of this element or the loss of one storey. Longer views of the development, in its context, should be provided, in addition to the close views and drone footage provided to date.

Furthermore, the materiality of the development should be high-quality to ensure longevity. The proposed palette of a limestone plinth, GRC cladding, aluminium windows and curtain wall suggest a good strategy; but, care should be taken in the final specification to ensure that the materials and finishes are robust enough to withstand this exposed maritime location.

Given the aspirational transformation that the City Centre is about to embark on, it is important for early design exemplars, such as this, to set the standard for future redevelopment opportunities. Therefore, the local authority should reassure themselves that the final specification of the GRC cladding truly expresses the aspiration for "natural stone tones" that matches the quality of the grand historic buildings found in this part of the Conservation Area.

Finally, we welcome the desk-based archaeological study; however, the underground car park will require archaeological evaluation and we strongly recommend that you seek input from your archaeological advisors.

## **PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Ongoing)**

### **25/01654/FUL - Plymouth Register Office, 49 Lockyer Street (Continued)**

#### **Historic Environment**

While the principle of redevelopment at this location remains acceptable, the proposal in its current form is unsatisfactory and cannot be supported without amendment or clarification.

Key concerns relate to:

- Inconsistencies and omissions within the submitted design and visual assessment material.
- Potential adverse effects on the setting of multiple designated heritage assets.
- The proposed use of GRC cladding, which is not considered appropriate in this sensitive historic context.
- Questions regarding the accuracy of the visualisations, particularly in relation to established building lines.

These issues limit the ability to undertake a robust assessment. The Historic Environment Team therefore maintains an objection at this stage, pending submission of clarified and revised information.

This part of the Conservation Area is defined by its strong historic building lines, the surviving planned townscape by Foulston and Wightwick, and its consistent use of high-quality traditional materials. Within this context, we have three principal concerns:

#### **(a) Materiality**

Earlier pre-application work proposed natural stone tiling, which was considered appropriate. The shift to GRC cladding is not supported. Concrete-based materials have previously been identified in the CAAMP as detrimental to the character of the Hoe (e.g. Crowne Plaza, former Quality Hotel both featuring a negative factors even though Crowne Plaza is not technically within the CA it is within the setting), and GRC poses known long-term maintenance and weathering challenges in Plymouth's maritime climate. Its introduction here risks repeating negative precedents and eroding some of the character afforded by high-quality materials. We would encourage reconsideration of the proposed cladding material to stone or ceramic which would minimise harm in this regard.

#### **(b) Building lines and townscape character**

Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) viewpoints—particularly Views 2 and 5—suggest that the building may project forward of the established building line, contrary to earlier design discussions. There is also projecting bays or balconies displayed on the plans/elevations of the east side of the proposed buildings that break the established building line. This would erode the axial view along Lockyer Street and potentially visually disrupt the transition from the residential street to the Hoe Park that contributes to the Conservation Area's significance.

#### **(c) Reliability of submitted visual information**

Inconsistencies between the VIA and the architectural visualisations create uncertainty regarding the true massing, materiality, and street relationship of the proposal. This requires clarification and reassurance before any definitive assessment can be made.

Given the inadequacies within the submitted information and the likelihood of harm to multiple designated heritage assets, the Historic Environment Team advises that the proposal is unacceptable without amendment. The application is currently contrary to Policy DEV21, the NPPF (2024), and the statutory duties under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. We would welcome the opportunity to review further iterations once the issues highlighted above have been addressed.

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Ongoing)**

**25/01654/FUL - Plymouth Register Office, 49 Lockyer Street (Continued)**

**South West Water**

The applicant should demonstrate to your LPA that its prospective surface run-off will discharge as high up the hierarchy of drainage options as is reasonably practicable (with evidence that the Run-off Destination Hierarchy has been addressed, and reasoning as to why any preferred disposal route is not reasonably practicable):

1. Water re-use (smart water butts, rainwater harvesting, grey flushing toilets)
2. Discharge into the ground (infiltration); or where not reasonably practicable,
3. Discharge to a surface waterbody; or where not reasonably practicable,
4. Discharge to a surface water sewer, highway drain, or another drainage system; or where not reasonably practicable,
5. Discharge to a combined sewer. (Subject to Sewerage Undertaker carrying out capacity evaluation)

**Plymouth Public Health**

The impact of the development proposal is that it will lead to additional population growth which places greater pressures on existing health services including primary care such as general practice, community pharmacy, dental and optometry services and secondary care through hospitals and specialists. Furthermore, there is insufficient capacity in the existing infrastructure to meet the needs of this population growth. As outlined below, the Council's preferred use of S106 funds is the development of a network of Wellbeing Hubs across the city. They provide an additional health and wellbeing resource and reduce the burden on existing healthcare infrastructure. The nearest Wellbeing Hub to the development proposal is the City Centre Wellbeing Hub. At an average 2.2 people per household, the proposed 56 dwellings will potentially increase the local population by a further 124 persons. Additionally, the development will present wider impacts on the capacity of community pharmacy, dental, optometry services and secondary care through hospitals and specialists across the city, all of which are under pressure in delivering services to the existing population. In order to mitigate the impacts, and to contribute to the delivery of sustainable communities, it is considered appropriate that this development proposal should make a contribution towards necessary improvements in the city's health infrastructure.

The sum of £29,852 is being sought to pay for the costs of the development's impact on the health infrastructure of the city.

**Right of Light Assessment** (Submitted by the applicant)

An assessment of the impact of the development on the light receivable by the neighbouring properties of Windsor Villas, Hoe Court, 11/12 Osborne Place (Hotel) and Windsor Place has been carried out.

The results demonstrate that the proposed development will have a relatively low impact on the light receivable by its neighbouring properties. Non-compliance with the BRE recommendations is limited to the daylight and sunlight to windows test in respect of windows 30, 31, 33 & 34 at 15 Windsor Place, windows 38 and 39 at 14 Windsor Place and window 93 at 13 to 17 Hoe Court and the sunlight to gardens test at 14 & 15 Windsor Place.

In our opinion, the proposed development is consistent with the local, national and regional planning policy, which seeks to ensure the efficient use of land whilst ensuring that acceptable living standards will be maintained.

Having regard to the overall high level of compliance with the BRE recommendations, planning policy, the development context and the mitigating factors discussed in section 4 of this report, we are of the opinion that there are no daylight, sunlight and overshadowing reason for which planning permission should be refused.

**NOTE:** BRE 209 (2022) guidelines provide UK standards for daylight and sunlight, recommending that new developments maintain at least 50% of an outdoor amenity area receiving 2+ hours of sun on March 21st, and ensure existing windows retain at least 80% of their previous Vertical Sky Component (VSC).

**Public objection**

One public objection has been raised by a resident in Windsor Place regarding being directly overlooked by some of the flats into the rooms at the rear of their property as well as a loss of light.

**Comments by 10<sup>th</sup> Feb**

~~~~~

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS** (Closed)

**26/00003/LBC & 26/00002/FUL - 71 Citadel Road**

Change of use of hotel (Class C1) to 12-bed HMO (Sui Generis) and associated works (part retrospective)

For reference:

This terrace, Nos 59-73 are all Grade II listed and No.71 was formally The Retreat Guest House.

**Awaiting decision**

~~~~~

**25/01639/FUL - Rivage Apartments, Hoe Road**

Removal and replacement of existing combustibile cladding and external wall elements with new non-combustible and associated works.

**Awaiting decision**

~~~~~

**25/01631/FUL - Former Quality Hotel Site, Cliff Road West Hoe**

Temporary change of use for the storage of public realm construction materials on the entire site for a period of 18 months (retrospective).

**Granted**

~~~~~

**25/01485/LBC - Apartment 18, The Grand - 24 Elliot Street**

Replacement windows, Air Source Heat Pump to rear elevation and associated interior works.

**Awaiting Decision**

~~~~~

**25/01465/LBC - 67 Citadel Road**

**25/01466/LBC - 69 Citadel Road**

Both applications are for the replacement of a single rear door in each property.

**Awaiting Decision**

~~~~~

## **ADDENDUM A**

### **Planning** – Viewing applications

You can view any of the planning applications listed below by visiting

<https://planning.plymouth.gov.uk>

and searching using the planning application number or address shown below.

~~~~~

### **Planning** - Commenting on applications

Comments can be submitted to Plymouth City Council by the methods below. Please include your name, address and the application number and clearly state if you 'Object' or 'Support' the application

1. Email to: [planningconsents@plymouth.gov.uk](mailto:planningconsents@plymouth.gov.uk)
  2. By post to: Strategic PCC Planning and Infrastructure, Floor 2, Ballard House, West Hoe Road, Plymouth, PL1 3BJ
  3. PCC Public Access Portal – You will need to have, or set up, a personal account for PCC access
- ~~~~~

### **Planning** – Reporting unauthorised developments:

<https://www.plymouth.gov.uk/report-alleged-unauthorised-development>

~~~~~

### **Licensing** - Commenting on applications

<https://licensing.plymouth.gov.uk/1/WcaHome>

~~~~~

### **Report Noise Issues** (businesses or neighbours)

<https://www.plymouth.gov.uk/noise>

---