

**PLANNING COMMITTEE  
19 MARCH 2018**

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**Correspondence received and matters arising following preparation of the Agenda**

**Agenda item 5 - application ref: 17/1871/FUL  
Land at Tesco Stores  
Russell Way**

No further information.

**Agenda item 6 - application ref: 17/1640/FUL  
Exeter Royal Academy for Deaf Education  
50 Topsham Road**

Affordable housing

Following further negotiations relating to the provision of affordable housing an increased level of provision is now proposed equating to 28%, and increase of 4% on the original proposals. This equates to an additional 6 affordable dwellings. The provision of affordable housing now proposed therefore comprises a total of 41 dwellings, of which 23 would be social rented units comprising a mix of 1, 2 and 3 bed apartments and 3 and 4 bed houses, together with 18 shared ownership units.

Taking into consideration the substantial abnormal developments costs associated with this development (relating to demolition, asbestos removal, site remediation and significant cut and fill requirements across the site), and the genuine fall-back position with regard to Vacant Building Credit (VBC) (which applied in full would result in significantly less affordable housing provision on the site amounting to 16%), the level of provision now proposed following the further discussions with the applicant is considered acceptable and recommended to Members by officers.

An updated consultation response has been received from DCC (Lead Local Flood Authority). This now comprises a response of no objection subject to the following conditions which replace condition 13 as listed in the main report (other conditions will need to be renumbered accordingly) –

An updated Acoustic Assessment relating to the Nursery has been submitted which confirms the building will incorporate appropriate glazing to ensure a satisfactory environment will be created to allow the building to function as a pre-school nursery.

Since the main report was prepared 3 further representations have been received, one in support and two objections. The points raised in these representations are similar to those already summarised in the main report. One of the objections refers to the fact the formal consultation response of the Highway Authority was not available until after the deadline for representations had passed. Whilst this objection disputes conclusions reached by the Highway Authority in respect of the transportation/highway impacts of the scheme the concerns it raises have already been expressed in other representations and are considered to be covered by the summary of representations set out in the main report. This objection also refers to the public speaking arrangements for Committee being unfair where there are distinctly separate issues raised by different groups of people adjoining different parts of the

development. It contends that only allowing one speaker doesn't facilitate equal opportunity for the varying interests to be raised through a single public speaker slot.

**Agenda item 7 - application ref: 17/1658/VOC**

**Honiton Inn**

**Paris Street**

For the purposes of clarification the figure referred to on Page 50 as the total number of students at the university includes both the Exeter campuses and the Penryn campus. The "Exeter only" figure for 2015/16 is 17,399. For 2016/17 it is 18,246.

**Agenda item 8 - application ref: 17/1617/VOC**

**St James Park**

**Stadium Way**

**Representations**

St James Neighbourhood Forum objected on the following grounds:-

1. The proposal to increase the No of students by 24 is unacceptable and contrary to the ESJF Neighbourhood Plan.
2. The loss of the amenity space that will be caused by moving the cycle lockers into that space is unacceptable and will leave little or no amenity space in this crowded development
3. It is unclear what the new proposals are with respect to the boundary walls with Old Tiverton Road, and will apparently leave a gap between the existing boundary wall and a new part timber wall - it is not clear who will be responsible for cleaning that gap. The original plan was for a planting scheme along the existing boundary walls and it is wholly unclear as to why it is necessary to change the plan as originally granted.
4. There is a lack of clarity as to why the road arrangement needs to be altered to permit fire tender and vehicle turning as shown on the plan on Page 23 D & A Statement.
5. It is not clear why the angle of the parking bays for disabled users has been altered (plan on Page 23) it appears from the drawing that these reconfigured spaces will be less convenient for disabled users.
6. There is insufficient consideration given to the access and egress via the main entrance on Stadium Way, particularly in the event of emergencies at either the flats or the football stadium on match days requiring an evacuation of both
7. It is unclear as to what is meant on Page 23 (Point 5) where it states that the retaining wall will be relocated to the boundary with the Big Bank Stand
8. A significant factor in the original scheme being approved was the benefit to the Football Club and this scheme will provide no further financial benefit from the new development - this is no more than a naked attempt to maximise profit at a loss of amenity to the students and further increasing the community imbalance that is already endemic with the scheme as approved.
9. If the Developer is stating that the football club will gain benefit from this then that should be properly set out so that it can be properly considered by the full Planning Committee.
10. It is accepted that student housing does not require the same level of consideration as to room size, amenity space etc as residential housing, but that is not a reason for failing to consider the impact upon the 24 students who will be looking out onto cycle lockers and into what will be, as a result, a somewhat dark space, being bordered by the flats on 3 sides and the Big Bank Stand on the 4th. Have the Student Guild been consulted at all as to what the students feel about these developments?
11. The Council is already aware that having approved so much student accommodation within the St James Ward in spite of the overriding objective of the Neighbourhood Plan this unnecessary increase in numbers will further increase that imbalance and the Planning Committee and Council should on this occasion at least recognise the importance of the Plan

as a Planning Document of the Council

12. From recollection the original scheme was for about this number of students. The then Developer made great play of the fact that the numbers had been reduced and the height of the buildings had been marginally reduced as a "concession" to the ESJF. Whilst the height of the building is not been proposed to be reversed students are now being expected to live at lower floor level in order to increase numbers again. If the number of flats as approved was right in the eyes of the Planning Committee then that it the number that should be retained.

13. There are no particular comments as to whether the rooms should be individual or arranged as cluster flats, provided that the overall number of students does not increase.

18 Letters/emails of objections including Prospect Park Residents Association and Exeter Civic Society regarding:-

1. Height, scale, bulk and massing of building out of keeping/ unsympathetic/inappropriate/overbearing to the surrounding residential area;
2. Contrary/disregards the principles of the St James Neighbourhood Plan (Policy SD1, C2 and C3) particularly in regard to the need for a balanced community;
3. Undermines overall aims of the St James Neighbourhood Plan;
4. Site should be used for alternative residential uses eg affordable housing/ a more varied housing stock/properties to buy rent for families/first time buyers
5. Already too many students already living in the city;
6. Increased traffic and pedestrian movement in the area;
7. Insufficient parking available leading to pressure on already existing congested St James streets;
8. Increased late night noise/litter/unsociable behaviour from students;
9. Concern about management of emergency services serving the football club or the student accommodation
10. Little consideration given to student wellbeing;
11. Student accommodation looking out onto cycle locker representing a poor level of amenity for students;
12. Loss of amenity space with the introduction of the cycle lockers into an area previously identified as amenity space;
13. Increased size of electricity sub-station.

For the purposes of clarification the figure referred to on Page 65 as the total number of students at the university includes both the Exeter campuses and the Penryn campus. The "Exeter only" figure for 2015/16 is 17,399. For 2016/17 it is 18,246.

**Agenda item 9 - application ref: 17/1824/FUL**

**Pinhoe Lodge  
Gipsy Hill Lane**

No further information