

PLANNING COMMITTEE

19 OCTOBER 2021

Present:

Councillors Haines (Chair), Bradford, Clarence, Colclough, H Cox, Hayes, J Hook, Kerswell, MacGregor, Nuttall, Nutley, Patch, Parker and Peart

Members in Attendance:

Councillors Keeling and J Petherick

Apologies:

Councillors Goodman-Bradbury, Eden and Jeffery

Officers in Attendance:

Rosalyn Eastman, Business Manager, Strategic Place
Trish Corns, Democratic Services Officer
Christopher Morgan, Trainee Democratic Services Officer

58. MINUTES

It was proposed by Councillor Nutley and seconded by Councillor Nuttall that the minutes of the previous meeting be agreed as a correct record.

A vote was taken – see attached.

Resolved

That the minutes of the previous meeting be agreed as a correct record.

a) **20/02181/FUL The Retreat, 49 Old Exeter Street, Chudleigh (Pages 9 - 10)**

The Business Manager presented the application to the Committee.

Public Speaker, Supporter – Spoke on:

- Dwelling will be on separate land, away from the walled structure.
- Self-sustaining home.
- Follows conservation guidelines
- No plans to make changes to driveway
- Minimal light pollution
- Support from Town Council

Comments from Councillors included

Planning Committee (19.10.2021)

- Application is in line with town council's policies
- Application is in line with local plan
- Similar large dwelling nearby
- Archaeological works could be done on site
- No visual impact or overlooking reasons for refusal however it could be refused on heritage grounds
- Impact on heritage does not appear substantial
- Shared driveway is positive but concerns about future construction on site
- CIL charges are public interest
- Concerns about splitting site
- Condition for air source heat pumps
- Condition for bat and bird boxes

In response to comments from Councillors, the Business Manager informed the Committee of the following

- Even if the harm is not substantial, the NPPF says there must be a clear public benefit, which 1 dwelling would not be
- Concerns about splitting up the site
- Members need to confirm the decision they want to make and the reasons for going against advice

It was proposed by Councillor Nutley and seconded by Councillor MacGregor that permission be granted subject to the conditions listed below that were agreed by members of the committee. Members accepted that there was harm but disagreed with the officer recommendation to refuse planning permission.

A vote was taken – see attached.

Resolved

Permission be granted for the following reasons:

1. Development to commence within 3 years.
2. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
3. Archaeological works to be undertaken pre-commencement
4. Compliance with policies EN3 and S7
5. Swift and bat boxes to be placed on site

Note

The granting of planning permission was against officer recommendation. The committee considered the application agreeable due to the limited visual impact as well as the perceived low level of harm to heritage assets.

b) **21/01397/HOU 1 Barn Park, Ilington (Pages 11 - 12)**

The Business Manager presented the application to the Committee.

It was proposed by Councillor Patch and seconded by Councillor MacGregor that permission be granted.

A vote was taken – see attached.

Resolved

Permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. Development to commence within 3 years.
2. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings.

c) **21/01472/FUL 59 Cockhaven Road, Bishopsteignton (Pages 13 - 14)**

The Business Manager presented the application to the Committee.

Public Speaker, Objector – Spoke on:

- Proposals do not highlight full extent of development
- Loss at appeal previously
- Loss of privacy
- Unsafe access
- Lack of drainage solution

Public Speaker, Supporter – Spoke on:

- Well proportioned and well designed dwelling
- Contributes to village
- Family history in village
- Modern house

Comments from Councillors include:

- Multiple near misses on road
- Narrow pavement
- Poor water drainage
- Concerns about light pollution
- Height increase
- No planning reasons for refusal
- Swoop/swift boxes could be included
- Local plan would grant more ecological powers
- Nearby road has different rulings in regards to highways

In response to comments from Councillors, the Business Manager responded that:

- Access to site is acceptable
- Ecology report support application and includes swoop/swift boxes
- Height increase is spread out over the dwelling.
- Foul drainage is not a reason for concern

Councillor MacGregor proposed refusal. This was not seconded.

It was proposed by Councillor Haines and seconded by Councillor Colcough that permission be granted as set out in the report with an additional condition relating to habitats and a new S106 agreement.

A vote was taken – see attached.

Resolved

Permission be granted subject to the following conditions.

1. Standard 3 year time limit for commencement
2. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans
3. Access and parking to be provided in accordance with the approved plans prior to first occupation
4. Prior to works going beyond the DPC samples of all external materials and finishes shall be submitted for approval
5. Recommendations set out in the Ecological Report to be incorporated
6. Restricted Permitted Development Rights
7. Provision of EV charging point
8. Works to be carried out in accordance with the protection measures set out in the Arboricultural Report

d) **21/01788/HOU 3 Southdowns Road, Dawlish (Pages 15 - 16)**

The Business Manager presented the application to the Committee.

Public Speaker, Objector – Spoke on:

- Loss of light
- Loss of privacy/overlooking
- Dwelling is too large/overbearing

Public Speaker, Supporter – Spoke on:

- Loss of light and heat is unfounded
- Hedges used to provide privacy
- Upper floor would look onto neighbouring roofs not windows

Comments from Councillors include

- Town Council objects on overlooking concerns, against policy WE-8
- Site inspection would be beneficial to investigate overlooking

It was proposed by Patch and seconded by MacGregor that decision be deferred pending a members' site inspection.

A vote was taken – see attached.

Resolved

That decision be deferred pending a members' site inspection.

e) **20/02390/LBC Pedestrian Crossing. Newton Abbot (Pages 17 - 18)**

The Business Manager presented the application to the Committee.

The chair read out a statement received from the objector. It raised the following

points:

- Heritage asset
- Overdevelopment on site
- Could be possible to avoid removing heritage asset
- Nearby development has closed through route.

Comments from Councillors include:

- 20MPH provides increased pedestrian safety
- There may be a way around removing the heritage asset
- Permission should be approved in order to prevent further accidents and protect pedestrians.
- Only 3 objections received
- Complaints received about existing layout and safety concerns

It was proposed by Councillor Nutley and seconded by Councillor J Hook that permission be granted subject to conditions in the report.

A vote was taken – see attached.

Resolved

Permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit.
2. Works shall proceed in accordance with approved plans.
3. Prior to the removal of the gate pier, details of the future use of the gate pier and the details of any new retaining structures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

59. APPEAL DECISIONS - TO NOTE APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BY THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE.

The Committee noted the appeals made by the Planning Inspectorate.

The meeting started at 10.00 am and finished at 12.00 pm.

Chair
Cllr Mike Haines

This page is intentionally left blank

Voters	14	For	11	Against	0	Abstain	3
Cllr Bradford-College							
Cllr Clarence-Shaldon & S-t-head							
Cllr Colclough-Ambrook							
Cllr H Cox-Ashburton Buckfast							
Cllr Haines-Kerswell-w-Combe							
Cllr Hayes-NA Bushell							
Cllr J Hook-NA Bushell							
Cllr Kerswell-Bovey							
Cllr MacGregor-Bishopsteignton							
Cllr Nutley-Ashburton Buck'leigh							
Cllr Nuttall-Kenn Valley							
Cllr Parker-NA Buckland & Milber							
Cllr Patch-Haytor							
Cllr Peart-Kingsteignton East							

This page is intentionally left blank

1

Voters	14	For	12	Against	1	Abstain	1
ClIr Bradford-College							
ClIr Clarence-Shaldon & S-t-head							
ClIr Colclough-Ambrook							
ClIr H Cox-Ashburton Buckfast							
ClIr Haines-Kerswell-w-Combe							
ClIr Hayes-NA Bushell							
ClIr J Hook-NA Bushell							
ClIr Kerswell-Bovey							
ClIr MacGregor-Bishopsteignton							
ClIr Nutley-Ashburton Buck'leigh							
ClIr Nuttall-Kenn Valley							
ClIr Parker-NA Buckland & Milber							
ClIr Patch-Haytor							
ClIr Peart-Kingsteignton East							

This page is intentionally left blank

1

Voters	14	For	14	Against	0	Abstain	0
Cllr Bradford-College							
Cllr Clarence-Shaldon & S-t-head							
Cllr Colclough-Ambrook							
Cllr H Cox-Ashburton Buckfast							
Cllr Haines-Kerswell-w-Combe							
Cllr Hayes-NA Bushell							
Cllr J Hook-NA Bushell							
Cllr Kerswell-Bovey							
Cllr MacGregor-Bishopsteignton							
Cllr Nutley-Ashburton Buck'leigh							
Cllr Nuttall-Kenn Valley							
Cllr Parker-NA Buckland & Milber							
Cllr Patch-Haytor							
Cllr Peart-Kingsteignton East							

This page is intentionally left blank

1

Voters	14	For	10	Against	3	Abstain	1
ClIr Bradford-College		10					
ClIr Clarence-Shaldon & S-t-head				3			
ClIr Colclough-Ambrook		10					
ClIr H Cox-Ashburton Buckfast		10					
ClIr Haines-Kerswell-w-Combe		10					
ClIr Hayes-NA Bushell				3			
ClIr J Hook-NA Bushell		10					
ClIr Kerswell-Bovey		10					
ClIr MacGregor-Bishopsteignton				3			
ClIr Nutley-Ashburton Buck'leigh							1
ClIr Nuttall-Kenn Valley		10					
ClIr Parker-NA Buckland & Milber		10					
ClIr Patch-Haytor		10					
ClIr Peart-Kingsteignton East		10					

This page is intentionally left blank

1

Voters	13	For	11	Against	2	Abstain	0
ClIr Bradford-College		11					
ClIr Clarence-Shaldon & S-t-head		11					
ClIr H Cox-Ashburton Buckfast				2			
ClIr Haines-Kerswell-w-Combe		11					
ClIr Hayes-NA Bushell				2			
ClIr J Hook-NA Bushell		11					
ClIr Kerswell-Bovey		11					
ClIr MacGregor-Bishopsteignton		11					
ClIr Nutley-Ashburton Buck'leigh		11					
ClIr Nuttall-Kenn Valley		11					
ClIr Parker-NA Buckland & Milber		11					
ClIr Patch-Haytor		11					
ClIr Peart-Kingsteignton East		11					

This page is intentionally left blank

1

Voters	13	For	12	Against	0	Abstain	1
Clr Bradford-College							
Clr Clarence-Shaldon & S-t-head							
Clr Colclough-Ambrook							
Clr H Cox-Ashburton Buckfast							
Clr Haines-Kerswell-w-Combe							
Clr Hayes-NA Bushell							
Clr J Hook-NA Bushell							
Clr Kerswell-Bovey							
Clr Nutley-Ashburton Buck'leigh							
Clr Nuttall-Kenn Valley							
Clr Parker-NA Buckland & Milber							
Clr Patch-Haytor							
Clr Peart-Kingsteignton East							

This page is intentionally left blank