

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)**

**26/00236/FUL - Land at Hoe Road (public bench between Maritimo and Pier One Cafes)**

Temporary External Artwork, Beryl Cook's 'Hips and Chips' figures.

Consultation with various bodies in Plymouth has been undertaken, including Plymouth City Council, the planning committee, and Plymouth Waterfront Partnership, to gain better input through a collaborative approach to the overall proposal. Discussions have covered the overall design, location, access, future events on or near the proposals, existing planting and use, planning process, build and on-site proposals and management, timescales, maintenance, and overall legalities—all of which have been considered, discussed, and agreed.

**Proposed Timeline:**

24 January 2026 – Exhibition at The Box opened to the public

23 March 2026 – Installation of figure at proposed location

31 May 2026 – Exhibition closes

22 July 2026 – Installed figures are removed and restoration of site complete



**Comments by 24<sup>th</sup> Mar**  
~~~~~

PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Ongoing)

26/00190/LBC - 33 Grand Parade

As a result of flooding, the partial replacement of ceilings due to damage and partial collapse in two rooms.

Comments by 10th Mar

~~~~~

**25/01516/LBC + 25/01515/FUL - Duke of Cornwall Hotel, 13 Millbay Road**

Removal and replacement of existing enclosed fire escape staircase and associated structures, various alterations and repairs to the roof, render, rainwater goods and windows, internal alterations and associated works.

Full drawings and images now submitted for further assessment regarding works to:

Fire Escape Staircase, Ensuite Façade, Rainwater and Drainage Goods, Roof Water Tank Removal, Flat Roof Formation and Incidental Repairs, Window Repairs, Slate Repairs– Rear Elevation Pitched Roof

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

~~~~~

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 HNF meeting.

Comments by 3rd 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."

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

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.

**PCC Historic Environment Officer**

The building is a modern block of flats designed to reflect the appearance of the surrounding historic buildings. The applicant proposes to remove and replace all the existing windows.

In principle, there is no objection to removing the existing windows but the proposed replacements are not acceptable because they are all of a top hung design whilst the existing windows on the main elevations are all of a vertical sliding sash design.

From a heritage view replacing these vertical sliding sashes with top hung design windows does not maintain the contribution of this modern building to the heritage assets, so my recommendation would be not to support this proposal.

However, if the applicant were to amend the proposal so that existing vertical sliding sash windows were replaced with vertical sliding sash windows of the same appearance with a change of colour and material, then the proposal may be supportable, depending on submitted details.

There is also a reference to "associated works" but it is not clear what these are, so clarification is needed from the applicant on that point so that they can be defined for any consent.

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

~~~~~

PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Ongoing)

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.

PCC Historic Environment Officer

The agent wrongly states that the Listing does not include the interior of the Listed Building. He also says that the only alterations are two windows - the proposed plans show that internal alterations are proposed. The applicant needs to submit full details of all proposals and sufficient information to understand the potential impact on the significance of any heritage asset affected by the proposal.

There is insufficient information on this application, so recommendation is not to support.

Comments by 3rd Mar

~~~~~

**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**

~~~~~

PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Closed)

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

Installation of extractor fan unit and associated works.

PCC Historic Environment Officer

In principle, we have no objection to the proposal as ventilation is essential in buildings of this period, and the intervention will benefit the property as a whole, not solely the room in question. The proposed pipework will be concealed beneath the floorboards and will tie into existing plumbing.

Given the extent of historic alterations already present within the building, we do not consider the introduction of a bath in this area to cause harm to its significance. The majority of the proposed works are also reversible.

On this basis, we consider the proposals to be broadly compliant with the relevant policies and not harmful to the special interest of the listed building.

The only matter I would question is whether any assessment was undertaken regarding the floor joists' ability to support the weight of the bath. Any structural interventions to the flooring would require Listed Building Consent, although it is possible that the landlord or contractor was satisfied that no such works were necessary.

Awaiting decision

~~~~~

## **PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Closed)**

### **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.

### **PCC Historic Environment Officer**

In principle we have no objections to the works outlined. It is clear from the images provided that replacement and repair would be of benefit to the building. The works are seen to be acceptable subject to conditions that more information regarding the materials to be used be issued.

Awaiting **decision**

### **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.

### **Historic England**

We have concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds. We recommend that further information is provided and that the design is amended to address our heritage concerns. Your authority should take these representations into account and seek amendments, safeguards or further information as set out in our advice.

### **PCC Historic Environment Officer**

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. We would welcome the opportunity to review further iterations once the issues highlighted above have been addressed.

### **HNF Response**

The Hoe Neighbourhood Forum, whilst supporting development of the site with a scheme that is broadly congruent with our own site feasibility study, **OBJECTS** to this planning application on the grounds of insufficient detail to meet the requirements of both the JLP and our emerging neighbourhood plan policies. Specifically:

1. We support the Historic England position that there is the potential for harm to the Conservation Area and we support their call for more details on materials to be used as well as further information to support their justification for such a high building within the Conservation Area. We agree there is a lack of critical contextual analysis for how the building sits within its neighbourhood. We share their concerns about the potential harm to the setting of the Grade I and II assets in the immediate vicinity. We share their concerns about some of the proposed materials being used and would like more information to be produced for experts to decide on its suitability for such an iconic location. (We draw your attention to the Hoe Neighbourhood Plan policies H1, H2, H4 in connection with the above.)
2. We support the Historic Environment Officer's comments in connection with the suitability of the GRC cladding. We agree with the comment that there is a lack of detailed and comprehensive views of the building's setting within the landscape and its impact on important views within the Conservation Area. (Hoe Neighbourhood plan policy H3, view 2)
3. We support the Natural Environment Officer's comments about the excessive number of mature trees proposed for felling, the risk of Root Protection Areas not being properly adhered to and thus the risk of harm to trees proposed to remain. Also, the mitigation planting numbers quoted in the report as being 87 should be mandated and should be within the Hoe Forum area. The Biodiversity Net Gain calculations should be validated by an independent body to ensure they are correct, especially in light of the wanton destruction of habitat caused by the applicants during bird nesting season last year, for which an enforcement notice is awaited. (Hoe Neighbourhood draft plan policy BG2)
4. There is a regrettable lack of affordable housing and variety of housing type, as outlined in our draft policy HS1
5. With reference to the applicant's Daylight and Sunlight report we have serious concerns that the effect on some of the existing homes around the new development does not meet the recommendations of the Building Research Establishment Guide."

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS** (Closed)

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

**Councillor Allison Lewis Comments - Planning Committee Councillor Call In**

This application raises fundamental and material planning concerns regarding the deliverability of the proposed development and the justification for departing from adopted policy requirements, particularly in relation to affordable housing provision.

Given the scale of the proposal, the prominence of the site, and the extent of policy departure being sought, the application clearly warrants full scrutiny.

The applicant seeks to provide no affordable housing on viability grounds. However, the submitted Financial Viability Assessment concludes that the scheme remains substantially unviable even after the removal of affordable housing contributions and other planning obligations. This presents a significant and unusual position whereby policy flexibility is being sought, but the applicant's own evidence indicates that removing policy requirements does not enable delivery of the scheme. In these circumstances, it is unclear what planning benefit is secured by granting permission or how the proposal represents a realistically deliverable form of development.

Planning policy allows for flexibility in obligations where doing so would enable development to proceed. However, where the applicant's own viability evidence indicates that the scheme would remain unviable even without affordable housing or S106 contributions, the justification for departing from policy becomes fundamentally unclear. Granting permission in such circumstances risks approving a scheme that delivers no affordable housing and potentially no development at all.

Given the scale of the development, the prominence of the site within a conservation area, the significant departure from adopted affordable housing policy, the applicant's own conclusion that the scheme remains unviable even without policy requirements, and the presence of unresolved consultee concerns, it is appropriate that this application be determined by Planning Committee rather than under delegated powers.

For the application to revert to a delegated decision would require clarity over how the applicant proposes to progress the scheme and any strategy to ensure that the application as proposed can be made viable.

**Other Comments**

There have been supporting and objecting comments submitted by the following people, Community Connections, Plymouth Tree People, and two public comments, which cover similar issues as stated in the responses above.

**Awaiting decision**

~~~~~

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. One public objection on the grounds that there are already a number of HMOs, Hostels, AirBnB and subdivided houses in the area. Concern regarding parking, bins and further impingement on the quality of the neighbourhood.

Awaiting decision

~~~~~

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

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

**PCC Historic Environment Officer**

The applicant has now submitted amended proposed drawings which contain annotations and legends that confirm that the proposed replacement materials maintain the existing external appearance of the building. As the proposal will sustain the contribution of the building as an element within the Conservation Area and the setting of the nearby Listed Building, as well as within the Registered Park and Garden, recommendation is to support this amended proposal.

**Awaiting decision**

~~~~~

PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Closed)

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

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

The applicant proposes to remove and replace the window sashes and timber screen panelling along the front façade of Flat 18 and install replacement double glazed units. Also proposed is the addition of a heat pump to the rear of the building and two replacement windows.

PCC Historic Environment Officer

The proposed air source heat pump would require the addition of a rectangular metal or plastic box type addition onto the rear wall of the building at first floor level. This would add an anomalous feature high on the rear elevation of the Listed Building which would not be sympathetic to the style, traditional materials or appearance of the building and would also be in clear view from the public street to the rear of the building. The purposes of the heat pump is to provide underfloor heating for the solarium but the benefit from such a heating system would be limited in comparison to the harm to the Listed Building.

Also proposed is the removal and replacement of the existing windows along the front elevation of the applicant’s Flat, which is one of the individual properties into which the former Grand Hotel has been subdivided. The applicant describes the windows and screen as not being original to the building, which dates from c1870, but as early additions dating from the early 1900s they are historic features which have formed part of the Listed Building for most of its existence. The two rear windows, the subject of this proposal appear to be original windows of the building, and their retention and repair were described in the 2009 repair post fire renovation schedule.

The existing windows, timber screen of panels and pilasters, and the two rear windows of Flat 18 all appear to be historic features of the Listed Building and are features which contribute positively to its architectural and historic interest as well as to its significance. They are elements of the continuous balustrade across the first floor of the front façade of the building so are also important, highly visible features which contribute to the aesthetic value of the building. For the same reasons these features make a positive contribution to the historic and aesthetic values of the Conservation Area as well as to its character and appearance.

For the above reasons the proposed removal of these features from the Listed Building is considered to be harmful to its character and significance. The condition of the windows and timber screen is not such that they are irreparable so there is no clear and convincing justification for the harm to a heritage asset. The removal of these features is also considered to be harmful to the character, appearance and significance of the Conservation Area.

Recommendation is not to support this proposal.

Applicant

Has agreed to remove the ASHP from the application and to amend the application to repair of the window woodwork rather than replacement but would like consent to fit heritage Ultra Clear slimline double glazing, which would guarantee visual consistency with the rest of the building. This would be in-line with Historic England’s Advice Note 18 section 81 on the use of double glazing in a listed property where the glass is not original. They have added that the PCC Historic Environment Officer was happy with the sample of glass we showed them.

Regards the internal timber cladding and modern gypsum plaster - we would like to replace this where necessary.

The Grand (Plymouth) Management Company

Supports the replacement windows, as long as they are in keeping with and maintain the general character of this Grade 2 listed building.

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.

**Granted**

~~~~~

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>

---