

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**25 OCTOBER 2022**

Present:

Councillors Bradford, Clarence, Colclough, Goodman-Bradbury (Chair), Dewhirst, J Hook, Jeffery, Kerswell, MacGregor, Nutley, Parker and J Petherick (Vice-Chair)

Members in Attendance:

Councillors Orme, Jeffries, D Cox, Wrigley and Taylor

Apologies:

Councillors H Cox, Haines, Hayes, Nuttall and Peart

Officers in Attendance:

Rosalyn Eastman, Business Manager, Strategic Place  
Suzanne Walford, Planning Solicitor  
Jennifer Joule, Senior Planning Officer  
Christopher Morgan, Trainee Democratic Services Officer  
Sarah Selway, Democratic Services Team Leader & Deputy Monitoring Officer

### **15. MINUTES**

It was proposed by Councillor Dewhirst and seconded by Councillor Nutley that the minutes of the previous meeting be agreed as a correct record, with an amendment that Cllr Dewhirst had declared an interest in application 21/00572/FUL, and signed by the Chair.

A vote was taken.

Resolved

That the minutes of the previous meeting be agreed as a correct record with an amendment that Cllr Dewhirst has declared an interest in application 21/00572/FUL and signed by the Chair.

### **16. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.**

Councillor Clarence declared an interest in application 20/00961/MAJ due to his relationship with the applicant. He did not speak or vote on this application and left the meeting.

Councillor Nutley declared an interest in application 20/00961/MAJ due to his role as Executive Member for Sport, Recreation and Culture. He spoke and voted on this application.

a) **20/00961/MAJ - Riverside Boatyard, Teignmouth (Pages 5 - 6)**

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation and highlighted the reasons for refusal.

Public Speaker, Objector – Spoke on:

- Only one building is commercial use
- Lack of affordable housing
- Contrary to local development plan,
- Lack of need in housing plan,
- Harm to heritage assets
- Viability concerns
- Inadequate design
- No overriding public benefits
- Duty to pay regards to protecting listed buildings
- Adverse impacts on heritage from applicant report
- Ringmore is a protected site
- Houses at Ringmore will lose view
- No justification of heritage assets harm
- Impact on landscape
- Buildings will dominate landscape
- Contrary to national policies,

Public Speaker, Supporter – Spoke on:

- Applicants are Teignmouth locals
- 100 employees
- Demand for improved facilities
- Support for businesses and visitors
- Protection from harm using sea wall
- Lack of office facilities in Teignmouth
- Residential element to aid with costs
- Company works in other coastal towns

Public Speaker, Supporter: Spoke on

- Increased tourism
- Sea wall provides flooding protection
- New housing for Teignmouth
- 64 letters of support
- Leisure marine support
- Fishery conservation authority support,
- Boatyard users support
- Crown estate support
- S106 agreement can be reached
- Willing to make contribution to green space and various other fees, 550,000 in CIL and 10,000 per annum in tax
- Some reasons for refusal can be overcome with conditions.

Comments from Councillors included:

- Area is already a mix of residential and industrial use

## Planning Committee (25.10.2022)

- Keeps wealth within Teignmouth
- Definite vision and values behind project
- Applicant has similar successful operations
- No other sites for this application
- Public support for application
- Removing contamination
- Provision of jobs
- Maintaining of infrastructure
- Economic issues give weight to application
- Benefits for local college
- The site was used as accommodation before
- Improved cycle path
- Town regeneration
- Precedent of building on undeveloped coastline
- Is the whole bridge a listed asset?
- Concern about sea wall boundary and size
- Concerns about traffic and highway safety due to collisions and possible fatality
- Possibly not the correct site for an office building
- Design of main building is too tall
- Residential unit design is positive
- Boatyard use would improve
- Site is unattractive and development would improve this
- Concerns about criminal behaviour being monitored
- Applicant is a local
- Bishopsteignton Parish Council views the application as overdevelopment
- Similar employment sites in area
- Other sites have been outside the development limit
- No entitlement to a view
- Building is imposing but would hide view of unattractive buildings behind
- Concerns about access to the site
- Possible loss of coastline and heritage assets
- Affordable workshop space
- Conflict with local plan policy
- Overcoming technical issues wouldn't solve all reasons for refusal
- Concerns about viability
- No affordable housing
- Overdevelopment
- Plans in the 1980s were even larger than this application

In response the Senior Planning Officer clarified that:

- The bridge in question is a listed asset
- The application wont impact delivery of the Teign estuary trail
- The similar employment site was further upriver. It was also smaller in scale and adjacent to other office buildings.
- Listed building each have their own individual considerations
- The building will be bright at night.

It was proposed by Councillor Dewhirst and seconded by Councillor J Hook that permission be refused for the reasons set out in the report.

A vote was taken – see attached

Resolved

That planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. Principle of Development
2. Design and associated landscape impact
3. Design and associated heritage impact
4. HRA payment
5. Ecological harm
6. Amenity of future occupiers
7. Green infrastructure

**17. MAJOR DECISIONS SUMMARY**

The Committee noted the Major Decisions Summary Sheet.

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

The Committee noted the appeal decisions made by the Planning Inspectorate

The meeting started at 10.00 am and finished at 11.48 am.

Chair  
Councillor Goodman-Bradbury

Planning Committee Vote – 25 October 2022 – 20/00961/MAJ

<b>COUNCILLORS</b>	<b>FOR</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>	<b>ABSTAIN</b>
CLLR JANET BRADFORD	<b>X</b>		
CLLR MARY COLCLOUGH		X	
CLLR ALISTAIR DEWHIRST	X		
CLLR JACKIE HOOK	X		
CLLR MIKE JEFFERY	X		
CLLR AVRIL KERSWELL	X		
CLLR ANDREW MACGREGOR		X	
CLLR JOHN NUTLEY	X		
CLLR GOODMAN BRADBURY	X		
CLLR JOHN PETHERICK	X		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>

This page is intentionally left blank