

Planning Committee – Tuesday 27 May 2025

Late representations/updates

Item No.	Description
6a	<p>23/00305/MAJ - Site Of Shell Cove House 19 Old Teignmouth Road Construction of 13 townhouses with associated landscaping, access, and infrastructure (Revised scheme)</p> <p>No further third-party comments or consultee responses received.</p> <p>Typo correction</p> <p>The second sentence in the summary of DCC Education comments should read as follow (emphasis added) :</p> <p><i>“...contributions are no longer sought as there is <u>sufficient</u> capacity within Dawlish’s primary and secondary schools.”</i></p>

Item No.	Description
6b	<p data-bbox="320 40 927 73">23/00911/MAJ - Bakers Yard Forder Lane</p> <p data-bbox="320 73 1422 185">Outline planning application for a mixed use development to include provision for three commercial units, nine dwellings and six live-work units (approval sought for access and layout)</p> <p data-bbox="320 226 1385 293">Third party representation dated 20 May 2025 received from Mr Matt Neale since publication of the Committee report.</p> <p data-bbox="320 333 1449 736"><i>I can see there are a number of draft planning conditions, notably 16 and 29, which requires a reptile translocation plan. My concern is that the site owner has already cleared most of the reptile and dormouse habitat from the site so won't be able to fulfil this mitigation requirement for legally protected species because they have already been moved on or killed. I'd like to understand how this will be addressed please. Also, what mitigation and compensation will there be for a the loss of habitat, on site and the species rich grassland habitat around Newton Road, and how will no net loss be demonstrated and secured in line with planning policy. All of the survey data is well out of date, or doesn't exist. I think all this needs to be addressed before planning permission can be granted.</i></p> <p data-bbox="320 777 1445 889">Comments have been requested from the Council's Biodiversity Officer and the applicant/applicant's ecologist which will be reported verbally at the Committee meeting.</p> <p data-bbox="320 960 1442 1140">During the Committee site visit, a question was raised about the amenity value of the ash tree and conifer tree adjoining the existing site entrance. Officers have sought advice from an independent tree consultant regarding the amenity value of the trees and whether service of a TPO is warranted. Advice from the tree consultant is as follows:</p> <p data-bbox="320 1180 1452 1655"><i>The three trees are growing as a group with a shared canopy, consisting of Leyland cypress (dominant), field maple, and elm. The Leyland cypress is suppressing the growth of the other two species, and overall, this is considered a low-quality group offering limited visual or environmental value within both the immediate and wider landscape. The amenity assessment score is low, and while there is no objection to retention if shown on the submitted plans, the group is not considered suitable for a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). Protection would not be in the public interest given the limited amenity contribution. However, should removal be proposed, it is recommended that this be accompanied by new planting of a long-lived, broadleaved deciduous species to establish a high-quality long-term feature more in keeping with the local landscape character. This would help ensure the site continues to contribute positively to local green infrastructure and amenity in the future.</i></p> <p data-bbox="320 1695 1445 1841"><i>Felling the Leyland cypress would likely provide the greatest immediate benefit to the field maple, as the cypress is the dominant species suppressing both the maple and the elm, particularly in terms of light and space. Removing it would remove significant competition and allow the field maple to begin recovering.</i></p> <p data-bbox="320 1881 1449 2060"><i>The field maple, while currently suppressed, has the potential to develop a new canopy in line with what is typical for species (although it's difficult to tell as the conifer has quite a dense canopy). Although it may take time to put on additional growth and restructure, it is a native species and is well-suited to the local landscape character.</i></p> <p data-bbox="320 2101 1425 2201"><i>The elm is unlikely to survive in the long term due to its susceptibility to Dutch Elm Disease. Its retention would offer only short-term value, and over time, it may/will decline or fail entirely.</i></p>

6b cont	<p><i>If only one tree is to be retained for the future benefit of the site, the field maple would be the most desirable species to retain, provided that surrounding competition—particularly from the Leyland cypress—is removed to give it the space and light it requires to recover and establish.</i></p> <p>Mindful of such comments, it is recommended that conditions 20 and 31 are reworded as follows:</p> <p>20. Except for the Leyland Cypress and elm tree currently growing immediately to the north east of the existing site entrance, all existing native trees, hedges and hedgerow shall be retained, except where removal is necessary to create access and/or to benefit visual amenity. No materials shall be brought onto the site, or any development commenced, until protective fencing has been erected around all trees and hedges. The fencing shall be in accordance with Figure 2 of BS 5837 2012. The fences shall be maintained until all development has been completed. The level of the land within the fenced areas shall not be altered without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority. No materials shall be stored within the fenced area, nor shall trenches for service runs or any other excavations take place within the fenced area except by written permission of the Local Planning Authority. Cotoneaster and other invasive, non- native plant species shall be removed. Where these occur in boundary hedges, they shall be replaced with a mix of locally appropriate native tree and shrub species. REASON: To protect vegetation in the interests of biodiversity and visual amenity and to provide biodiversity enhancements.</p> <p>31. The existing field maple tree located immediately to the north east of the existing vehicular entrance into the site shall be retained and maintained, and shall not be lopped, felled or otherwise interfered with, without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. REASON: To safeguard visual amenity and biodiversity interests.</p>
---------	---