

**PLANNING COMMITTEE
13 FEBRUARY 2017**

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Correspondence received and matters arising following preparation of the Agenda

**Item 4 : Pages 5-28 : Ref: 16/1232/01
University of Exeter, East Park**

Description should read '*Outline planning application to build student accommodation (up to a maximum of 35,700 sq metres) and ancillary central amenity facilities (up to a maximum of 1,500 sq metres) with associated infrastructure and landscaping (all matters reserved)*' not 37,200 as stated in the Committee report description.

The Site Plan has been amended to show the correct position of the land under the University's ownership (blue line) in respect of a property in Hoopern Avenue.

Revised to Condition 3

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the Land Use Parameters Plan (250001B/P003 Rev B); Building Heights Parameter Plan (250001B/P004 rev B); & Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy Plan (250001B/P006 Rev B) as modified by other conditions of this consent.

Reason: In order to ensure compliance with the approved drawings.

Revised to Condition 14

No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until the 2010 Masterplan framework proposal for a permissive pedestrian/cycle route linking the campus to Higher Hoopern Lane in the vicinity of Higher Hoopern Farm (as indicated on Movement and Access Parameter Plan (dwg no. 250001B/P005 Rev B) has been provided in accordance with details that shall previously have been submitted to, agreed and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To provide adequate facilities to promote the use of sustainable modes, in accordance with paragraphs 29 and 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

For clarification the 79 additional comments referred to in the representation section of the Committee report were from a number of previous objectors, not just one.

29 additional letters received since the report was published (overall total is now 339). Principal issues raised mainly reiterating the previous objections as stated in the Committee report. Additional comments state that:-

- i) insufficient attempts have been made by the University to meet their own Sustainable Transport Plan target of reducing daily student car commuting to 3%, which currently remains at 5%. This target has been extended to 2020; and
- ii) it is unfair that the proposed solution to the parking issue by the creation resident's parking zones in surrounding residential roads would effectively

tax local residents, as a consequence of the university's developments.

Objector's response to Committee report

1. As the scale of the scheme is set at this stage and not at the reserved matters stage, the majority of the matters raised by objectors cannot be dealt with at the reserved matters stage.
2. Report fails to fully acknowledge that the revised plans show an increase in height of building at the highest part of the site and therefore will have the greatest negative impact.
3. No mention is made that some objections received are from University staff.
4. No restrictions have been included to address the Devon Wildlife Trust's concerns about need for buffer zones along the southern and eastern boundaries.
5. Report fails to adequately explain the addition of 10,800 sq metres more development area over the highest figure as stated for development of 26,000sq m in the University masterplan
6. Mention should be made that the University masterplan calls for a 'light touch' for the development of East Park.
7. Development of large scale development and the need to protect the character and setting of the campus are incompatible.
8. Description that the scheme is landscape led is contradictory to the Design Review Panel's comment that there is a need for greater integration of landscape.
9. Conclusion that the scheme does not result in over development is not supported by any evidence.
10. The applicant has no influence over keeping the permissive path open and given the scale of the development the path will have to close to the public in order to protect the nearest listed building from potential problems associated with littering, vandalism, loss of privacy and noise disturbance. This would lead to a significant loss in pedestrian access and amenity value to those who access the University from Pennsylvania Road.
11. Report should highlight that 'there are significant mental health concerns for students living in high rise tower blocks'.
12. It should be noted that most of the objections contain more than one significant concern estimated to be 73% of those responding objecting to the design/scale of development; 65% to traffic/parking issues and 65% to the loss of green space and amenity value.
13. Objections should not be viewed as anti-student but loss of green open space, scale of development and the scheme being at odds with University masterplan.

Applicant's response to Committee report:-

i) Under heading 'Use of site for student accommodation'

It should be noted that the 2010 Masterplan Framework is a Supplementary Planning Document and therefore not part of the Development Plan, although it is a material consideration. It should be made clearer that the balance in this case is not about potentially conflicting development plan policies. There are no conflicts in the development plan, which is very clear that the site is identified for development and Policy E4 clearly states that residential use is part of this. Rather, the balance to be considered is balancing development plan policy (that identifies the site for development and provides for the general principle of development, including residential use) with a material consideration (the SPD that indicates an intention at the time the document was prepared, but not an overriding requirement, for academic development at this location). It is notable also that the SPD (Masterplan Framework), whilst indicating academic development at the site, does not specifically exclude residential use.

The priority in 2010 was to reserve land for academic use, and this was the University's priority, not the Council's. The University's priority now in 2017 is to have this particular site for residential use. The reality is that either is allowed under the development plan (policy E4). It should be stressed that

there is no conflict in the development plan, or between the policies of the development plan and the proposals in the SPD. The proposals in the outline planning application comply fully with the uses set out in the development plan (Policy E4). Residential development at the site is not prohibited by the proposals in the SPD.

ii) Under heading 'Impact on the landscape'

Generally this section could refer more to the material provided in the submitted Design and Access Statement that explains how the proposals integrate with the landscape and campus character. The 25m formal landscape strip is not the only landscape feature that is provided by the development, there is also the hilltop wood pasture landscape and the general landscape around and between buildings that brings trees and biodiversity corridors into and through the site. About 70% of the arable field will be used for landscape, based on the illustrative layout, the other 30% comprising building footprint, access roads and car park areas.

iii) Under heading 'flooding'

Noted that the report states that the applicant is "unwilling" to contribute to further works regarding downstream flooding. Far from being "unwilling" the University is in active discussion with ECC and DCC through other channels to address a strategy for dealing with these issues; and this dialogue will continue to arrive at a solution separate from this planning application.

Increase in floorspace:

The amount of floorspace mentioned in the 2010 Masterplan is indicative, based on assumptions at the time, and would always be expected to be subject to further work on specific proposals coming forward that seek to make the most of the site available. Also the Masterplan referred specifically to the potential for higher buildings at the site. This would inevitably increase the amount of floorspace (as there are more floors). With regard to the relationship between use and height, is notable that a 6 storey residential block at 2.85 m per storey stands lower than a 4 storey academic block at 4.5 per storey.

General comment in regard to masterplan compliance

Spread across the site:

The indicative layout for the site in the Masterplan was based on a very high level sketch study and would be unlikely to be practical in the context of the more detailed survey and design work that has been undertaken for the application. The sketch in the Masterplan imposes a rigid grid on a steeply sloping concave site, placing large and tall buildings (4 storey academic could be 18-20m in height, not including rooftop plant) on the higher parts of the site and immediately adjacent to the western woodland.

It is inevitable that a more sensitive and realistic scheme for development would take account of matters such as topography and views. This has resulted in less development at the top of the site and more towards the bottom. It also provides a looser framework of residential buildings (as opposed to academic buildings with a larger floorplate), allowing better landscape integration around and between buildings. This overall landscape-led approach was supported by the Design Review Panel.

Further additional comments from the applicant.

The University gives a commitment to continued discussions on the issue of parking on public roads with ECC and DCC and to consider whether there

may be another way forward post application. This might include, at the least, exploring how we can reinforce the messages we give to our students regarding the desirability of leaving cars at home and the options available for travel without a car, as well as reminding them of their responsibilities to be good citizens.

Regarding the strategic flood issue in the Taddiforde Valley, the University is happy to continue to discuss how this might be addressed outside of the planning application and have made a commitment to carrying on this dialogue to arrive at a satisfactory solution. The potential for a flood alleviation system in the Taddiforde Valley at the New North Park end on the University estate is being considered and we are interested to see how this might be developed and implemented between the various parties in the future.

Item 5 : Pages 29-38 : Ref: 16/1488/03
Arthur Roberts House, 121 Burnthouse Lane

No further update.

Item 6 : Pages 39-48 : Ref: 16/1543/03
36 Higher Shapter Street, Topsham

No new objections to report. Further comments have been received from an objector further highlighting existing problems with access to properties along Higher Shapter Street in the event of vans or cars blocking the road.

Item 7 : Pages 49-54 : Ref: 16/1390/03
2 Lymeborne Avenue

No further update.

Item 8 : Pages 55-60 : Ref: 16/1391/03
3 Lymeborne Avenue

No further update.