

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**23 JUNE 2020**

Present:

Councillors Haines (Chairman), Goodman-Bradbury (Vice-Chairman), Bradford, Bullivant, Clarence, Colclough, H Cox, Hayes, J Hook, Jeffery, Keeling, Jenks, Kerswell, MacGregor, Nuttall, Nutley, Patch, Parker, J Petherick and Wrigley

Apologies:

Councillors Phipps

Officers in Attendance:

Rosalyn Eastman, Business Manager, Strategic Place  
Anna Holloway, Senior Planning Officer  
Christopher Morgan, Trainee Democratic Services Officer  
Trish Corns, Democratic Services Officer  
Paul Woodhead, Solicitor & Deputy Monitoring Officer

### **7. MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 9 June were confirmed and signed as a correct record by the Chairman.

### **8. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.**

Councillors J Hook and Wrigley declared an interest in application 19/1854/FUL due to being close associates with the applicant. They did not vote on this application.

Councillor Patch declared an interest for application 19/00122/MAJ due to predetermination. He did not vote on this application but spoke as the ward member.

### **9. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION - TO CONSIDER APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION AS SET OUT BELOW.**

The Committee considered the agenda report and additional information reported by the Business Manager- Strategic Place.

- a) **IPPLEPEN - 19/01854/FUL - Dornafeld Farm, Dornafeld Lane - Storage building and new trackway and access**

The Committee considered the agenda report and additional information reported by the Business Manager- Strategic Place.

Councillors Hook and Wrigley declared an interest in the application due to being close associates with the applicant.

Public Speaker – Supporter: Spoke on the direct road access, recyclable materials, sight of the building from the road is obstructed by on site foliage, there have been no objections from consultants, and compliance with policies including S12.

Comments from Councillors included: The building is hidden well from public view, the ground being built on is unpleasant anyway, other unattractive buildings already exist on site, there would be a positive impact on business and tourism in a time when it is needed, the site was in need of more storage space, the building is restricted to the corner of the site, helps remove waste from the courtyard area, there are other buildings in the area that negatively impact the scenery too, the site is very reputable, Devon County Council support the application, there would be a positive impact on the surrounding area's waste management, is it normal for the DCC and Teignbridge Officers to disagree on an application and what is the recommended colour for the building.

The Business Manager responded by explaining that it was not unusual for officers to disagree on an application because they were focused on different parts of the application, and that the recommended colour for the building was grey as it allows the building to blend into the environment better than green. They also warned that the local area was sensitive to change.

Further comments from Councillors included: The site is shielded on 3 sides, the application should include a replanting scheme, the design is inappropriate, the building will be visible once the trees shed their leaves, 2 and a half thousand square feet makes the building prominent, and had there been any wildlife tests taken as part of the application.

The Legal Advisor reminded the Committee that they needed clear reasons if they were to go against officer recommendation.

The Business Manager explained that no biodiversity or wildlife tests were taken as they weren't considered necessary for this application.

The Business Manager suggested a list of conditions for the application,

It was proposed by Councillor MacGregor and seconded by Councillor Nutley that the application be approved subject to conditions proposed by the Business Manager.

A Roll Call was taken as follows:

FOR:

## Planning Committee (23.6.2020)

Cllrs Haines, Goodman-Bradbury, Clarence, Colclough, Cox, Hayes, Keeling, Kerswell, Jenks, MacGregor, Nutley, Patch, Parker, and Petherick.

Total: 14

### AGAINST

Cllrs Bullivant, Bradford, and Jeffery

Total: 3

### ABSTAINED

Cllr Nuttall

Total: 1

### RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. Time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Landscaped conditions as per page 17 of the officers report
4. Compliance with the WSI
5. Confirmation of mixed storage use associated with the holiday park (ancillary thereto and not B8 or agriculture by itself).

Note: The approval of this application was contrary to the advice of the Business Manager as set out in the agenda report. The Committee considered that the proposed application was acceptable for the reasons detailed above, and below.

### Statement of reasons

The decision to approve the application was against officer recommendation. The Committee considered the application acceptable for the following reasons; the landscape impact was acceptable, as well as the economic benefits for Teignbridge.

(14 for, 3 against and 1 abstained)

- b) **KINGSTEIGNTON - 20/00466/FUL - 1 Three Corners, Kingsteignton - Change of use of part of private car park to domestic curtilage**

The Committee considered the agenda report and additional information reported by the Business Manager- Strategic Place.

It was proposed by Councillor Petherick and seconded by Councillor Parker that planning permission be granted as set out in the agenda report.

A roll call was taken.

For:

Cllrs Haines, Goodman-Bradbury, Bullivant, Bradford, Clarence, Colcough, Cox, Hayes, Hook, Jeffery, Keeling, Jenks, Kerswell, MacGregor, Nuttall, Nutley, Patch, Parker, Petherick, and Wrigley

Total: 20

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions

1. Standard three year timescale
2. Works in accordance with approved details  
(20 for and 0 against)

c) **BISHOPSTEIGNTON - 19/01984/FUL - 2 Great Furlong, Bishopsteignton - Single storey side extensions, detached garage and provision of new steps to relocated front door (revised scheme)**

The Committee considered the agenda report and additional information reported by the Business Manager- Strategic Place.

The Chairman asked the Business Manager to explain the second condition mentioned in the report. The Business Manager replied by explaining that the tiles should match those of other houses in the area, and suggested a condition for this.

Public Speaker – Objector: Spoke on lack of support in the neighbourhood, the low roof pitching, the previous application had been rejected, the site isn't well shielded, concerned about setting a precedents, the house is out of character, and a lack of fit with other houses in the neighbourhood.

Public Speaker – Supporter: Spoke on there being no objections from consultants, the two renovations are small and acceptable, the garage is smaller than several others in Great Furlong, the roof tiles are weathered and need replacing, the roof tiles are match with others in Great Furlong, and that the proposed extensions were also similar to others in the area.

The Business Manager clarified that the current roof tiles were required to be replaced if they did not match others in the neighbourhood.

It was proposed by Councillor Wrigley and seconded by Councillor H Cox that a site visit be taken in order to check whether the roof tiles were correct. This was lost by 9 for and 10 against.

A roll call was taken.

FOR:

Cllrs Goodman-Bradbury, Hayes, Cox, Keeling, MacGregor, Nuttall, Nutley, Patch, and Wrigley.

Total: 9

Against

Cllrs Haines, Bullivant, Clarence, Colclough, Hayes, Hook, Jeffery, Jenks, Parker and Petherick.

Total :10

It was proposed by Councillor J Hook and seconded by Councillor Haines that planning permission be approved as set out in the agenda report.

A roll call was taken

For

Cllrs Haines, Bullivant, Clarence, Colclough, Hayes, Hook, Jeffery, Keeling, Jenks, Parker and Petherick.

Total: 11

Against

Cllrs MacGregor, Patch, and Wrigley

Total: 3

Abstain

Cllrs Goodman-Bradbury, Bradford, Cox, Nuttall, and Nutley

Total: 5

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions.

1. Accord with approved plans;
2. Within 1 month of the date of permission, the applicant shall provide samples, details and in situ photographs of the roofing material used for the garage and extension hereby approved as well as photographs and details of the material used on the host dwelling. If these are not found to be reasonably matching materials (colour, size and texture) to the host dwelling then the existing roofing materials for the as built extension and garage shall be removed and replaced with matching materials (including size) within 6 months of the date of this permission.
3. The recommendations and safeguarding measures given in the Bat and Bird Assessment shall be followed, including precautions to prevent threat of harm during construction works.

Note: Councillor Kerswell did not vote on the application as she was not able to

hear the whole discussion.

(11 for, 3 against, and 5 abstentions)

- d) **TEIGNMOUTH - 20/00675/FUL - Dryads Garth , Inverteign Drive - Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of replacement dwelling with garage, associated landscaping works and alterations vehicle access**

The Committee considered the agenda report and additional information reported by the Business Manager- Strategic Place.

Public Speaker – Supporter: Spoke on there being no letters of objection to the application, the architecture doesn't stand out, it provides a positive impact on the gateway to Teignmouth from Shaldon and Newton Abbot, support from Teign Heritage, the applicant is a local, and the application would be a show of Teignmouth's progression.

Comments from Councillors include: The building would have a lower profile than the original, the development adds to the gateway to Teignmouth, the building is sensible and attractive, the ward members approve of the application, and the building would offer benefits to both Teignmouth and Shaldon.

In response to questions from Councillors, the committee were informed that the application had been brought to committee by request of the town council.

It was proposed by Councillor MacGregor and seconded by Councillor Petherick that the application be approved as set out in the agenda report.

A roll call was taken:

For:

Cllrs Bradford, Bullivant, Clarence, Colclough, Cox, Hayes, Hook, Jeffery, Jenks, Keeling, Kerswell, MacGregor, Nuttall, Nutley, Patch, Parker, Petherick, Wrigley, Haines and Goodman-Bradbury.

Total: 20

**RESOLVED**

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. 3 year time limit for commencement;
2. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans including climate emissions reduction measures set out in design and access statement;
3. The timber boarding to be installed on the property shall be the hereby approved iroko timber boarding which shall be left to naturally weather and shall

not be painted or stained.;

4. Ecological report including safeguarding measures and installation of ecological enhancement measures shall be followed and on completion a bat consultant shall confirm that the ecological enhancement measures have been installed in accordance with the recommendations in the report;

5. On site parking and turning provision shall be provided prior to first occupation of the hereby approved dwelling and retained thereafter.

(20 for and 0 against)

e) **ILSINGTON - 19/00122/MAJ - Land Adjacent To Little Liverton Business Park, Liverton - Outline - Business units (Use Classes B1, B2 and B8) (approval sought for access and landscaping)**

The Committee considered the agenda report and additional information reported by the Business Manager- Strategic Place.

Cllr Patch declared an interest in this application due to predetermination. He did not vote but spoke on the application as the ward member.

Public Speaker – Objector: Spoke on the negative impact on the environment, the village being designated rural, air and light pollution caused by the site, the increase in traffic and problems with road quality, health issues stemming from the construction, the proximity to the nearby school, enhanced risk to members of public including dog walkers, risk of flooding on site, this isn't included in local plan, and the economic benefits aren't enough to justify this application.

Public Speaker – Objector: Spoke on the lack of need, lack of demand from companies, the former BCT site, detrimental effect on Heathfield industrial estate and other stores in the area, the slip road to Ilsington is in need of repair, the application is contrary to policy S1, and the location is inappropriate.

Public Speaker – Supporter: Spoke on the applicant being an employer, the economic benefits, the employment gap, business closures, new homes but no new jobs, the need for more successful allocated employment floor space, job loss in recent years, no objections from any consultees, and no wildlife issues with the application.

Comments from Councillors include: Doesn't fit with the Local Plan, evidence used is out of date, not as much demand as is claimed, employment space will open up as businesses shut down, the recent car crash shows how important traffic safety is in the area, increased pollution, sequential tests haven't been taken, recent floodings in the area, loss of the carbon sink, better locations in the area, contrary to several policies, housing wouldn't be allowed here, it would cause a 23 percent increase in village size, no carbon reduction plan, cautioning against building on greenfield land, the site would redistribute jobs rather than create them, concerns about school safety, heavy industry is damaging to small businesses, damaging to the rural setting, the proximity to the school isn't as close as other Councillors believe, and there has been past criticism about failure to provide employment sites.

The Planning Officer stated that the application was not contrary to any policies in their opinion, there isn't a major flooding risk, there are good transport options, there haven't been any objections from consultees, and there is no need to demonstrate

need,

Further comments from councillors included: There are only 3 buses to the site, there isn't a realistic cycle route to the site, and the site should be refused to not following policy S22.

The Business Manager stated that several conditions for planning permission included transport, the A382 may be receiving renovations which would help with transport issues, there is a need for employment space in Teignbridge, and reiterated that there was no need to provide proof of need.

Further comments from councillors included: Lack of support from residents, employment land is often unfinished, no positives from combatting climate change with this application, need for landscape protection and enhancement, and the proposed site is too large,

It was proposed by Councillor J Hook and seconded by Councillor MacGregor that permission be refused for the reason set out below.

A roll call was taken.

For

Cllrs Haines, Goodman-Bradbury, Bradford, Clarence, Colclough, Cox, Hayes, Hook, Jeffrey, Keeling, Jenks, Kerswell, MacGregor, Nuttall, Nutley, Parker, Petherick, Wrigley.

Against

None.

Total: 18

Abstain

Cllr Bullivant

Total: 1

**RESOLVED**

That planning permission be refused for the following reason.

1. Contrary to policy S22, S9, and EC3 due to the scale of the application as well as lack of ease of transport options other than private car.

Note: The refusal of this application was contrary to the advice of the Business Manager as set out in the agenda report. The Committee considered that the application was unacceptable for the reasons detailed above, and below.

**Statement of reasons**

The decision to refuse the application was against officer recommendation.

The Committee considered the application unacceptable due to being contrary to



S22 & S9 with regard to overall travel patterns and minimising dependence on private cars, and this is not small scale and therefore conflicts with EC3.

**10. APPEAL DECISIONS - TO NOTE APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BY THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE.**

The Committee noted appeal decisions made by the Planning Inspectorate.

The meeting started at 10.00 am and finished at 12.50 pm.

This page is intentionally left blank