

PLANNING COMMITTEE

22 MARCH 2022

Present:

Councillors Haines, Goodman-Bradbury (Chair), Bradford, Clarence, Colclough, H Cox, Hayes, J Hook, Jeffery, MacGregor, Nuttall, Nutley, Parker, Peart and J Petherick

Apologies:

Councillors Kerswell

Officers in Attendance:

Rosalyn Eastman, Business Manager, Strategic Place
Trish Corns, Democratic Services Officer
Kelly Grunnill, Senior Planning Officer
Jennifer Joule, Planning Officer
Suzanne Walford, Planning Officer
Christopher Morgan, Trainee Democratic Services Officer

73. MINUTES

It was proposed by Councillor Parker and seconded by Councillor Nuttall that the minutes of the previous meeting be signed as a correct record subject to a minor amendment regarding members in attendance.

Resolved

That the minutes of the previous meeting be signed as a correct record subject to a minor amendment regarding members in attendance.

74. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

Councillor Nutley declared a personal interest in application 20/00981/FUL. He did not vote on the application but did comment on it at the start of the item.

75. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIR

It was proposed by Councillor Parker and seconded by Councillor Hayes that Councillor J Petherick be elected Vice-Chair.

It was proposed by Councillor Jeffery and seconded by Councillor MacGregor that Councillor Clarence be elected Vice-Chair.

A vote was held. Councillor J Petherick was successful with 9 votes.

Resolved.

That Councillor J Petherick be elected Vice-Chair of Planning Committee

a) **21/02547/HOU - 34 St Marys Road, Teignmouth (Pages 7 - 8)**

The application was presented to the committee by the Planning Officer.

Public Speaker, Objector – Spoke on:

- Overbearing
- Too close to boundary
- Loss of light
- Loss of privacy
- No other extended balconies

Comments from Councillors included:

- Solar panels are acceptable
- Balcony is oversized
- Retrospective application
- Town council wants refusal
- Other balconies in area

It was proposed by Councillor Parker and seconded by Councillor MacGregor that the application be refused due to it being overbearing.

A vote was taken – see attached.

Resolved

That permission be refused due to the application being overbearing.

Note

The decision to refuse this application went against the officer's recommendation. The reason for this was disagreement with the officers' judgement that the balcony was acceptable.

b) **21/02624/ 18 Fluder Hill (Pages 9 - 10)**

The application was presented to the committee by the Planning Officer.

Public Speaker, Supporter – Spoke On:

- Game room design has changed
- More in line with policy WE-8
- Sloped road means less impact
- Visible from street scene but the current room is more visible
- Similar to nearby single storey garage

Comments from Councillors included:

- Not out of keep with surrounding buildings

Planning Committee (22.3.2022)

- Next to highway but hidden by hedge
- Carbon reduction measures should be in place

The Planning Officer informed the committee that policy WE-8 requires development to be complimentary to the existing dwelling. The Business Manager also informed the committee that this was not considered quality design.

It was proposed by Councillor Haines and seconded by Councillor MacGregor that permission be granted subject to conditions.

A vote was taken – see attached.

Resolved

That permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. Time limit of 3 years
2. Materials used to match the host dwelling
3. Biodiversity enhancement measures to be put in place
4. Development proceeds according to ecology report
5. Carbon reduction methods to be ensured prior to commencement

Note

The decision to approve this application was against officer recommendation. The reasons given were that other buildings in the area were of similar design.

c) **7.c 21.02720 Ranworth (Pages 11 - 12)**

The application was presented to the Committee by the Planning Officer

Public Speaker, Objector – Spoke on:

- Proposed height of new roof is too high
- Photo does not present height of new roof

Comments from Councillors included

- CIL should be paid for this application
- Site visit would help understand roof
- Concerns about the new roof height
- Overbearing
- Will not enhance street scene
- Loss of privacy
- Not overbearing or impactful for neighbours
- 8 foot hedge surrounding bungalow
- Cannot make decision based on applicant intent
- Property is levelled off
- New attic is too large
- New change is too significant from original application

It was proposed by Councillor J Petherick and seconded by Councillor Nuttall

that decision be deferred pending a members' site visit.

A vote was held – see attached.

Resolved

That decision be deferred pending a members' site visit.

d) **7.d 20.00981 - Riseley Nurseries (Pages 13 - 14)**

The application was presented to the Committee by the Senior Planning Officer

Public Speaker, Supporter – Spoke on

- Policy compliant
- Lack of affordable housing
- Carbon reduced homes

Comments from Councillors include

- Site of previous development
- Similar development in Bishopsteignton
- Nearby bus stop is already in use
- Encourage affordable housing
- No accidents on nearby road
- Similar designs to nearby barn
- Improve visual quality of area
- Reduced carbon
- Expand hamlet
- Outside any settlement
- Not allocated on plans
- Would have to be an exception if approved
- Non compliant as highlighted in reasons for refusal
- Climate officer does not support application
- Ensure compliance with local plan
- Drainage concerns

The Senior Planning Officer clarified to the committee that no evidence was suggested to show it was exceptional, and that it was not sustainable.

It was proposed by Councillor Colclough and seconded by Councillor Haines that permission be refused due to the reasons set out in the report.

A vote was taken – see attached.

Resolved

Permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed affordable housing exception site does not accord with requirements of Policy WE5 of the Teignbridge Local Plan 2013-2033

(6th May 2014) as the site does not adjoin a settlement, appropriate planning obligations have not been secured to ensure the delivery the affordable housing and there is no evidence that public grant to fund the affordable dwellings is not available.

2. The site is in open countryside and situated some distance from essential facilities. There are no recognised cycle routes connecting the Site to local town centres, the nearest bus stops are via routes that have no footpath or street lighting and the distance between the Site and local amenities is prohibitive to walking. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the objectives of Policies S1A (Sustainable Development Criteria), S1 (Sustainable Development Criteria) and S9 (Sustainable Transport) of the Teignbridge Local Plan 2013-2033 (6th May 2014) and the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure that new development complies with various sustainability criteria, one of which is accessibility, by public transport, walking or cycling, for main travel purposes.
3. The proposed surface water drainage proposals have failed to demonstrate that the proposed drainage strategy will operate effectively and will not cause an increase in flood risk either on the site, on adjacent land or downstream. The proposed development has not demonstrated that surface water will be appropriately managed in accordance with the principles of sustainable drainage. Given the importance of this matter this detail should not be left to condition. Therefore the development is contrary to policies S1A (Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development) and EN4 (Flood Risk) of Teignbridge Local Plan 2013- 2033 (6th May 2014) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

76. S73 MAJOR DECISIONS SUMMARY

The Major Decisions Summary sheet was noted by the Committee

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

The Committee noted decisions made by the Planning Inspectorate.

The meeting started at 10.00 am and finished at 12.15 pm.

Chair
Cllr Linda Goodman-Bradbury

This page is intentionally left blank

1

Voters	15	For	13	Against	2	Abstain	0
--------	----	-----	----	---------	---	---------	---

This page is intentionally left blank

1

Voters	15	For	12	Against	3	Abstain	0
--------	----	-----	----	---------	---	---------	---

This page is intentionally left blank

1

Voters	15	For	11	Against	4	Abstain	0
--------	----	-----	----	---------	---	---------	---

This page is intentionally left blank

1

Voters	14	For	11	Against	3	Abstain	0
--------	----	-----	----	---------	---	---------	---

This page is intentionally left blank