

TEIGNBRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

CHAIRMAN: Cllr M Haines

DATE: 18 February 2020

REPORT OF: Site Inspection Team – Councillors Haines (Chairman), Bullivant, Nuttall, Patch, Petherick, and Jenks

DATE OF SITE INSPECTION: 31 January, 2020

Application 19/01665/FUL **Abbotskerswell – 19/02270/FUL – The Meadows, Maddacombe Road, TQ12 5LF**
Retention of new dwellings

Also present: Councillors Bradford, Daws, and Taylor
Apologies: Cllrs D Cox, MacGregor, and Parker

Purpose of Site Inspection:
To assess the impact of the proposal on the overall site and the landscape.

The Site Inspection Team initially viewed the dwelling from the entrance on Maddacombe Road.

The Planning Officer reported: The application is recommended for refusal because it is contrary to Local Plan policy S22 which only permits new dwellings in the countryside if they provide affordable housing for local need or are required for agriculture, forestry, or other necessary rural workers. The change made from the last refused application is a change from a pitched roof to a curved roof. The Planning Officer informed the team that Class Q consent is not a realistic fall back as the building had been demolished prior to application and so cannot be converted. The Planning Officer also explained that this was the second application from the applicant for the retention of a dwelling on this site with the previous application having been refused under delegated powers as being contrary to policy S22 as it creates a dwelling in the open countryside which does not provide affordable housing for local need or a dwelling for agriculture, forestry or other necessary rural workers. The Planning Officer also advised that there had been a previous withdrawn application between the Class Q consent granted to a previous owner and the previously refused application for the retention of a dwelling. This application sought to replace the barn with a new dwelling, however this was withdrawn by the applicants' agent following advice from Officers that the proposal would not be supported. Between this application and the previous application for a retention of a dwelling the original Class Q barn was demolished and the Planning Department received notification from an interested party that the frame of a building was being constructed which is what Members can see on site.

TEIGNBRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL

In response to questions from the Site Inspection Team, the Planning Officer spoke on: the reason for the new roof design being curved to seek to replicate the shape of the original barn, the energy impact of the new dwelling would likely be better due to the modern construction however this information was not submitted with the application so they were unable to comment this information; suggested that members could condition for other unauthorised structures on the land be removed if they voted for approval, the previous application for retention of the dwelling would have likely been refused irrespective of the roof structure because it is contrary to policy S22 creating a new dwelling in the Countryside. The Planning Officer also advised that Class Q is related to all agricultural buildings that could be converted to residential use which were in agricultural use on 20th March 2013, and so the other barn on the site which Members observed could potentially be converted under Class Q if it could be demonstrated that the permitted development criteria is met, however this had not been tested with an application.

The Site Inspection team then viewed the agricultural buildings from the north of the site.

The Planning Officer reported on the other buildings on site that required planning permission to be there but did not have it, the extent of the applicants land ownership, and the foundations of the class Q building.

In response to questions from the Site Inspection Team, the Planning Officer reported that demolition to a Class Q structure would result in the loss of the Class Q classification, photographic evidence is not suitable to defend approval of the application, and the financial situation of the applicant shouldn't be taken into account when making a decision. The Planning Officer also reported that if the building was not still on site and capable of being lived in it could not be considered as a realistic fall-back position. Members queried whether the base of the building remaining was sufficient and the Planning Officer advised that this would not be sufficient as the building which would be lived in had been removed.

The Site Inspection Team gave their views. All but one considered that the application is acceptable. One Member considered that the application was not acceptable due to the proposal being contrary to policy and raised serious concerns about setting a precedent if the application were to be granted for residential development in the countryside.

Cllr M Haines
Chairman