

**ITEM NO: 4**

**COMMITTEE DATE: 03/10/2016**

**OFFICER'S UPDATE REPORT**

**EXPIRY DATE: 30 June 2016**

**PLANNING OFFICER: HHS**

**APPLICATION NO: 16/0405/03**

**LOCATION: Stagecoach Devon Ltd, Belgrave Road, Exeter, EX1 2LB**

**PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing buildings. Redevelopment to provide student accommodation (Sui Generis), ancillary facilities, and ground floor uses in classes A1 (shops), A2 (financial and professional services), A3 (restaurants and cafes), A4 (drinking establishments), D1 (non-residential institutions) and D2 (assembly and leisure), with cycle parking provision and public realm improvements.**

This supplementary report is an update to the report on this planning application that was considered by Planning Committee on 5 September 2016, the decision being deferred at that committee. The original report follows as Appendix 1.

#### **Previous consideration by Planning Committee**

Ms Goddard, General Manager of the Unit 1 nightclub, spoke against the application expressing concern that potential noise from the night club had not been adequately addressed and complaints from future residents of the development might lead to pressure for restrictions on the business. Mr Yeates spoke in support of the proposal for the applicant responding to Member questions regarding noise, consultation with representatives of Unit 1 and travel and parking issues.

The draft minute notes:

*'Members recognised the issues raised in relation to noise and car parking but were of the view that these would be associated with student developments in any part of the City and, in respect of this application, would not be overwhelming to merit refusal. However, considerable concern was raised regard the scale and massing of the proposal in terms of both its impact on the immediate area and with regard to views from other parts of the City. Although there was support for certain aspects of the design, such as the internal courtyard, it was not thought that the current proposal was acceptable given the overbearing nature of the height and size of the blocks.'*

The Committee resolved to defer the application for the applicant to have an opportunity to provide a revised proposal with differing and reduced scale and massing.

The same scale and massing of building had previously featured in a developer presentation to Planning Member Working Group in December 2015.

#### **Revised design proposal**

The applicant has responded to Member concerns about the height and size of the blocks by revising the design of the roof and upper storeys to: make the inner courtyard elements the same height as the outer street facing elements and to reduce overall roof ridge and eaves heights. To achieve this there has been redesign of the internal layouts to reposition lift cores and a reduction of student bedspaces from 577 to 558.

The amended plans reduce the overall height of the roof by about 4.8m. The overall maximum heights of the building are about 71.3m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) on the Bampfylde and Cheeke Street wings, and 70.3m AOD on the Belgrave Road wing. These

give a maximum ridge height over Finished Floor Level (FFL) of 26.3m on the Bampfylde and Cheeke Street wings, and 29.3m on the Belgrave Road wing. The lowest points of the roof valleys eaves heights on Belgrave Road vary between about 25m and 22m above FFL across that façade, with lower eaves at each end. The lowest points of the roof valleys eaves heights on Bampfylde Street vary between 21m and 18.5m above FFL across that façade, again with lower eaves at each end. Eaves on Cheeke Street façade are 16.2m above FFL at the Bampfylde Street end and 22.8m above FFL at the Belgrave Road end, ground levels dropping around 4.5 metres across that façade towards Belgrave Road.

These compare with the guidance that buildings should be 21m to 25m in height, 6-7 storeys with plant/pitched roof, in the Grecian Quarter Height Constraints Analysis. This analysis did not recommend an absolute height limit for the area of this site and made recommendations on the basis of impact on views only, acknowledging other considerations (such as urban design) in determining the appropriate height of buildings.

The amendments to the roof ridge heights of 4.8m proposed represent a significant reduction in the impact of the block in longer views to and through the site, and improve the amenity of the internal courtyard. While the eaves level, and hence impact in street level views in Bampfylde Street and Belgrave Road will remain similar there is a more substantial reduction in eaves level on Cheeke Street.

The changes to the floor plans involve deletion of the top floor and significant resulting changes to the layout of floors below. A series of amended elevations, cross sections and photomontages of distant views have been provided. There are minor changes to other floor plans due to the need to reposition the lifts. The net result will be a reduction of about 19 in the total number of bedspaces from 577 to 558.

No further public consultation has been undertaken on the revised design since the building is essentially the same design with lowered roof and eaves lines in parts. Further consultation is not essential when the impact of a proposal are less than those upon which the public was originally consulted.

### **Noise issues**

Following representation to committee on behalf of Unit 1 Nightclub and the discussion at committee the following additional information regards noise complaints is offered. Six complaints have been received by the Council regarding noise at UNIT 1 Nightclub. Four from the Printworks regarding music noise and two from flats above the Post Office block regarding noise from customers queuing and using outdoor areas.

The applicant indicates that there has been a further dialogue with representatives of Unit 1.

Officers remain of the view that the living conditions of occupiers of the building can be protected by a scheme of noise insulation ventilation that does not rely on opening windows and that these details can be secured by suggested condition 11.

### **Previous update**

The update sheet circulated for the previous Planning Committee identified that the reasons for proposed planning conditions 7 and 8 should read 'To protect controlled waters and human health.'

The Principal Project Manager (Development) who presented the application noted that proposed Condition 9 should be amended to allow for Construction Environment

Management Plan to be a living document updated to reflect work stages on site rather than one which was required to be in a final form before any work commenced.

### **Revised CIL and NHB**

The CIL contribution and New Homes Bonus will change as a result of the amended scheme and will be updated at committee.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Assistant Director City Development be granted delegated authority to **APPROVE** the application on the basis of the amended plans being secured by an amended condition 2, subject to the Section 106 agreement and the recommended planning conditions (which may be varied or supplemented as appropriate).