

## EXMOUTH TOWN COUNCIL

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE, HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, EXMOUTH ON MONDAY 3<sup>rd</sup> MARCH 2014 AT 6.00P.M.**

**PRESENT:** Councillors: L Elson (Chairman)

I Brownbill	M Chapman
T Dumper	S Gazzard
A Greenhalgh	S MacQueen
C Nicholas	R Turner

**APOLOGIES:** Councillors B Toye & J Taylor

### **P14/031. MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> February 2014 were approved with the following amendment:

#### **P444. Planning Application 14/0213/FUL – 26 Foxholes Hill**

1 x Rep letter - objection on the grounds of insufficient detail in the drawings. The fence would be overpowering & effect sunlight & natural light in their garden.

### **P14/032. DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND DISPENSATIONS**

Councillors M Chapman and S Gazzard declared a personal interest in respect of urgent business, License Minor Variation application, The Point as they sat on the Licensing Sub-Committee at EDDC which would decide on the applications.

### **P14/033. URGENT BUSINESS**

**Allocation of Street Name: Residential development of four houses, land to the rear of Littlemead & Eight Bells, Littlemead lane  
Ward: Halsdon**

A request received from EDDC to consider the name Lowe Gardens or suggest an alternative name.

#### **Target Date: 20.03.14**

Various local names were suggested and discussed including, Stanley Long who donated his land to the National Trust and Parminter after the owners of A La Ronde.

**RESOLVED: The Committee had no objection to the proposed name of Lowe Gardens, however in future would like Parminter to be considered for any future development.**

**Premises : Point (The) Units 14-19-20 Pilots Wharf, Pier Head, EXMOUTH, EX8 1XA**

**Ref No: 036111**

**Ward: Town**

**Name of applicant Mr Nicholas Peter HUNT**

**Premises Licence Minor Variation Application**

**PROPOSED VARIATION**

Extend the existing bar

Install sliding partition wall

Introduce small stud wall to give office space

Install cupboard between servery and kitchen

Last Date for receipt of representations by the Licensing Authority **10 March 2014**

**RESOLVED: No Objection**

**Note:** Councillors M Chapman and S Gazzard left the room whilst discussion took place as they had previously declared a personal interest.

**P14/034. To Determine Applications under Delegated Powers.**

		<b>APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>STATUTORY CONSULTEES VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIONS</b>	<b>DECISION</b>
<b>WARD</b>	<b>Brixington</b>				
<b>PLAN No:</b>	14/0051/TRE	Knappe Cross (rear Of 75 Ivydale) Brixington Lane <b>Mr Arif Pradhan</b> T10, Monterey Pine - Fell		<p><b>3 x letters of support</b> - from neighbouring properties who were concerned about the possibility of falling branches and the fact that there have been recent tree falls in the area.</p> <p><b>Tree Officer's report</b> – the tree was the most southern of a pair of large Monterey Pines &amp; made a significant contribution to the area. It was a mature example of the species with an asymmetric crown with a de-current growth pattern. During recent storms a number of part failed branches had been left hanging. Stated reasons from the applicant for removal of the tree was:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• over mature &amp; in a state of decline</li> <li>• Species know for major branch failure</li> <li>• Poor juxtaposition with adjacent property.</li> </ul> <p>However growth appeared strong and in good physiological condition. Concerns regarding branch failure &amp; adjacent properties could be reasonably managed through crown reduction works. Two recent previous dangerous exemption requests for removal were declined &amp; lesser crown works allowed – to date these works had not been undertaken.</p>	<b>APPROVAL</b>
<b>LIMIT</b>	07.03.14				

		<b>APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>STATUTORY CONSULTEES VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIONS</b>	<b>DECISION</b>
				Continued..... The removal of the tree would compromise the adjacent third party owned tree. <b>Recommendation – for REFUSAL</b> as the tree made a significant contribution to the amenity of the area. Lesser works had already been allowed which addressed the reasons for the removal. Removal would have a detrimental affect to adjacent Monterey Pine.	

**P14/035. To consider the Planning Applications for consultation set out below**

		<b>PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>REPRESENTATIONS</b>	<b>OBJ/NO OBJ</b>
<b>WARD</b>	<b>Halsdon</b>				
<b>PLAN No:</b>	14/0376/FUL	56 Featherbed Lane <b>Mr Alex Dix</b> Demolition of existing garage and construction of side extension to provide garage and accommodation over.		None	<b>NO OBJECTION</b>
<b>LIMIT</b>	10.03.14				

		<b>PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>REPRESENTATIONS</b>	<b>OBJ/NO OBJ</b>
<b>PLAN No:</b>	14/0137/FUL	Land To The Rear Of St Michaels Littlemead Lane <b>Mr D T M Packer</b> Construction of 4 no. detached dwellings with access off adjoining development at Eight Bells approved under reference 13/0428/RES with relocation of 5 no. parking spaces		None	<b>NO OBJECTION</b>
<b>LIMIT</b>	11.03.14				
<b>WARD</b>	<b>Littleham</b>				
<b>PLAN No:</b>	14/0423/FUL	70 Foxholes Hill <b>Mr And Mrs Archer</b> Construction of single storey extension incorporating roof balcony and external steel staircase.	<b>Highways</b> –Did not wish to comment	<b>1 x Rep</b> – Concerned that the balcony on top of the conservatory would be above their residence and over look their rear patio.	<b>NO OBJECTION</b>
<b>LIMIT</b>	13.03.14				

		<b>PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>REPRESENTATIONS</b>	<b>OBJ/NO OBJ</b>
<b>PLAN No:</b>	14/0309/FUL	Ice Cream Hut (Sea Shore Kiosk) Queens Drive <b>Mr Luke Kent</b> Construction of replacement ice cream kiosk.	<b>Cllr. M Williamson</b> – would like the application referred to the Exmouth Regeneration Board as it needed to be assessed against the Masterplan for 'The Splash' area. He supported the application as he understood it didn't compromise the Authority's regeneration strategy. <b>Natural England</b> – commented that it was not likely to have a significant effect on the interest features for which Exe Estuary had been classified		<b>NO OBJECTION</b>
<b>LIMIT</b>	06.03.14				

		<b>PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>REPRESENTATIONS</b>	<b>OBJ/NO OBJ</b>
<b>WARD</b>	<b>Town</b>				
<b>PLAN No:</b>	13/2695/FUL	The Open Door Centre St Saviours House, Church Street <b>Miss Helen Burgess</b> Installation of retractable canopy and awning.		None	<b>NO OBJECTION</b>
<b>LIMIT</b>	17.03.14				
<b>PLAN No:</b>	14/0367//FUL	Workshop To Rear Of 9 Morton Crescent <b>Ms Jane Kingdon</b> Construction of new roof over existing private garage/hobby workshop	<b>Environment Agency</b> had no objection  <b>Highways</b> – did not wish to comment	None	<b>NO OBJECTION</b>
<b>LIMIT</b>	14.03.14				

		<b>PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>REPRESENTATIONS</b>	<b>OBJ/NO OBJ</b>
<b>PLAN No:</b>	13/2446/FUL	<p>Land At South Street  <b>Diadin Ltd</b>  Demolition of existing structures and construction of 5 dwellings.  <u><b>Amended Plans</b></u>  Amendments relate to Omission of apartment block containing 3no flats from rear of site and reduction in size of dormers to front elevation of terrace of 5no dwellings.</p>	<p><b>Town Council</b> objected to original plans on the 02.12.13 on the grounds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Overdevelopment too many units for the site.</b></li> <li>• <b>Lack of parking in a high density area.</b></li> <li>• <b>Lack of amenity for occupants.</b></li> <li>• <b>Habitat review required in connection with bats as a derelict property.</b></li> <li>• <b>Lack of amenity storage such as shed &amp; bin storage.</b></li> <li>• <b>Flood Risk Assessment required as in flood risk zone 2.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>In principle the Committee would welcome re-development of the site if it was considered appropriate.</b></p>	<p><b>1 x Rep - in respect of amended plans.</b>  Concerned that there was no attempt at the provision of some, if not all, off street parking. At the expense of the larger gardens, parking should be provided for as many units as practical.</p>	<p><b>OBJECTION to the amended plans on the same grounds as before:-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Overdevelopment too many units for the site.</b></li> <li>• <b>Lack of parking in a high density area.</b></li> <li>• <b>Lack of amenity for occupants.</b></li> <li>• <b>Habitat review required in connection with bats as a derelict property.</b></li> <li>• <b>Lack of amenity storage such as shed &amp; bin storage.</b></li> <li>• <b>Flood Risk Assessment required as in flood risk zone 2.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>In principle the Committee would welcome re-development of the site if it was considered appropriate.</b></p>
<b>LIMIT</b>	03.03.14				



		<b>PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>REPRESENTATIONS</b>	<b>OBJ/NO OBJ</b>
<b>PLAN No:</b>	14/0393/COU	106 St Andrews Road <b>Mr Steven Grant</b> Change of use from guest house (C1) to residential dwelling (C3)	<b>Highways</b> – did not wish to comment	None	<b>NO OBJECTION</b>
<b>LIMIT</b>	11.03.14				
<b>PLAN No:</b>	14/0343/FUL	Beach Hotel Victoria Road <b>Heavitree Brewery Plc</b> Installation of replacement door and infilling of glazed screen.	<b>Highways</b> – did not wish to comment	None	<b>NO OBJECTION</b>
<b>LIMIT</b>	07.03.14				

		<b>PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>REPRESENTATIONS</b>	<b>OBJ/NO OBJ</b>
<b>PLAN No:</b>	13/2507/FUL	<p><b><u>ADDENDUM</u></b> 74 Victoria Road <b>Mr A Quin</b> Conversion of bed and breakfast to 6 flats <b><u>Amended Plans</u></b> Amended site plan to show drying areas and proposed cycle store.</p>	<p><b>Town Council</b> objected to original plans on 03.02.14 on the grounds of:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Lack of amenity</b></li> <li>• <b>Gross Overdevelopment of the site.</b></li> <li>• <b>Inadequate parking provision.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Endorsed Environmental Health comment re: ventilation.</b></p> <p><b>Endorsed Highways comment re:- cycle storage</b></p>	None in respect of amended plans	<p><b>OBJECTION to the <u>amended plans</u> on the same grounds as before:-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Lack of amenity</b></li> <li>• <b>Gross Overdevelopment of the site.</b></li> <li>• <b>Inadequate parking provision.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Endorsed Environmental Health comment re: ventilation.</b></p> <p><b>In addition the added pressure to the drains and sewage.</b></p>
<b>LIMIT</b>	10.03.14				

		<b>PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>REPRESENTATIONS</b>	<b>OBJ/NO OBJ</b>
<b>WARD</b>	<b>Woodbury and Lympstone</b>	<b>“ADJOINING PARISH”</b>			
<b>PLAN No:</b>	14/0330/MOUT	Land at Goodmores Farm, Dinan Way Upper Lovering <b>Eagle Investments Ltd</b> Outline application for residential development (up to 350 dwellings) with associated roads and open space. The provision of land for mixed-use employment; land for commercial and community uses and land for the provision of a primary school. All matters reserved with the exception of the proposed vehicular access points onto Dinan Way.	<b>South West Water</b> – foul sewer network was unlikely to have sufficient capacity without causing surcharge with resulting flooding. Improvements identified would not be funded by SWW and would need to be at applicants cost. S106 planning obligations would need to be imposed. <b>Environment Agency</b> – Was acceptable on condition of the construction and maintenance of a sustainable drainage system to control surface water. Site was located in Flood Zone 1 “Low Probability” & there was no objection from the flood risk aspect.	<b>5 x Reps who objected</b> to the development of “Greenfield” land. Concerned about the impact of commuter traffic along A376, B3179 & 3180 – currently there was no budget available for road improvements. Lack of parking provision for the dwellings and school. Extra pressure on the drainage system. Impact on the wildlife due to habitats and trees being destroyed. Overlooked existing residential area. Objected to a Commercial/ Employment Zone in a densely populated area. <b>ERATA</b> – did not oppose the proposal in principle. Essential for final linkage between Dinan way & A376 be completed with an improved junction at Hulham Road (Roundabout was a possible option). If there was to be a new major supermarket they believe it should be on this development or adjacent to it. Provision made for a park & ride scheme for Exmouth & Exeter. Proposal mentioned need for link with local cycle & footpaths but no details were provided in the proposal. Unable to assess whether a school was required.	<b>OBJECTION – Please refer to P465 for comments</b>
<b>LIMIT</b>	10.03.14				

**P14/036. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

**1. Town & Country Planning Act 1990  
Planning Appeal**

**Appeal by Mr A Vigor Appeal Reference APP/U1105/A/14/2213539**

**Proposal: Construction of two flats and detached garage.**

**Location: 15 Burch Close (Land at) Exmouth, EX8 4BR**

**Planning Application Number: 13/1603/FUL**

Letter from EDDC dated 19<sup>th</sup> February 2014, which confirms an appeal is lodged in connection with the above matter. Any representations on the Appeal should be received by the Planning Inspectorate no later than the 26<sup>th</sup> March 2014. The original application was not objected to by the Town Council on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2013.

**Noted by the Committee.**

**P14/037. EAST DEVON DISTRICT COUNCIL – PLANNING DECISIONS**

<b>APPLICATION</b>	<b>EXMOUTH TOWN COUNCIL VIEW</b>	<b>EDDC DECISION</b>	<b>DATE OF EDDC DECISION</b>
9 Betjeman Drive 13/2773/FUL	No Objection	Conditional Approval	08.02.14
16 Morton Road 14/0059/FUL	No Objection	Approval	08.02.14
Orcombe Lodge 12 Foxholes Hill 13/1939/FUL	Objection	Withdrawn	11.02.14
RNLI Queens Drive 13/2642/FUL	No Objection	Approval	12.02.14
Rocklands Rolle Road 14/0041/FUL	No Objection	Approval	13.02.14
<b>16 Dunsford Close (Land rear of 13 Colvin Close) 13/2765/FUL</b>	<b>Objection</b>	<b>Approval</b>	<b>15.02.14</b>
Straight Point Rifle Range Sandy Bay 13/2796/FUL	No Objection	Approval	15.02.14
1 Church Mews Little Bickton Place 13/1915/FUL	No Objection	Approval	21.02.14

The Town Clerk explained to the Committee members that the delegated officer at EDDC acknowledged the comments made the Town Council regarding planning application 13/2765/FUL 16 Dunsford Close when making their decision; however there wasn't a planning mechanism in place on which to insist for a retaining wall or retain the existing trees.

**P14/038. EAST DEVON DISTRICT COUNCIL – LICENSING DECISIONS**

<b>APPLICATION</b>	<b>EXMOUTH TOWN COUNCIL VIEW</b>	<b>EDDC DECISION</b>	<b>DATE OF EDDC DECISION</b>
<b>The Strand Fish Bar 40 The Strand</b>	<b>Objection</b>	<b>Approval to extend permitted hours for late night refreshment to 3.30am on Friday &amp; Saturday</b>	<b>11.02.14</b>

The Chairman explained to Committee members that the Police and the Town Council where now in agreement that alcohol would not be served after 3am and late night refreshment after 3.30am on Friday and Saturday only.

*Please note that all Decisions received from East Devon District Council are available on request for inspection in the office.*

*NOTE: It was formally noted that the participation of those Councillors who are also members of the East Devon District Council in both the debate and subsequent vote (in respect of any of the above matters) was on the basis that the views expressed were preliminary, taking account of the information presently made available to the Town Council. The District Councillors reserved their final views on the applications until they were in full possession of all the relevant arguments for and against.*

**The meeting closed at 19.08**

SIGNED:.....DATED:.....

## **14/0330/MOUT**

Goodmores Farm Development

### **OBJECTION**

The Council did not object in principal to a development on this site with infrastructure. However, it did object to 14/0330/MOUT in its current form.

#### **Specifically:**

**Vagueness:** The application represented little more than coloured sectors on a map, with insufficient detail of the buildings that were to be built or the layout. The area scheduled for a school was blank, as was the area for the community use. Commercial/community was a strange mixed classification which gave no clue to the reader as to what might actually be proposed.

**Highways:** The only specific detail in this application was the three proposed access routes off of the Dinan Way. The Town Council was dismayed that a development which is considered the key to the construction of the Dinan Way extension relied upon ordinary left/right turns off of what will intentionally become the busiest road in Exmouth. How were vehicles to turn right across oncoming traffic? Where was the speed control? The junctions should each be mini roundabouts – the Hulham Road junction should be a full-sized roundabout with the Dinan Way extension spur included. The Town Council believed that any traffic forecasts should be based on what the Dinan Way will be like when it is finished and the design of junction built to meet that forecast.

**Flooding and land Drainage:** SUDS should apply to the whole development – the use of permeable surfaces for roads and driveways, use of open space and hedgerow ditching.

**Failure to listen to public concerns:** The inclusion of a primary school within the design despite the very real concerns that such an allocation was unnecessary and negatively impinged on the amenity of the development through reserving ground which could be used for important community purposes such a new community hospital. The community engagement exercise clearly identified reservations from the public questioning the need for a school. The oral hearing on the local plan will hear that the rationale for a school on this site is based on vague school population figures for all of East Devon, not specific Exmouth figures. The Exmouth Area Community Learning Alliance (of headteachers and governors) had written objecting to the inclusion of a school within this development.

The Council regrets that the developers had been seen fit to bring this outline application forward to coincide with the Oral Hearing. It was therefore vital that this application be decided by DMC after the oral hearing had reported and not before, as to do otherwise would subvert the democratic process of approval of the Local Plan. The Council therefore asked for a DEFERMENT of any decision until after the Inspector had reported.

#### **Prevision of Affordable Housing**

The recommendation of 40% affordable housing had been ignored and a provision of only 25% had been made.

#### **Pylons**

The Committee were concerned on the grounds of amenity and health that dwelling are being proposed so closed to pylons and would like to see power lines underground.

**Sustainability of Employment**

Exmouth is in need of 'affordable' small business units to help new 'start up' businesses with the ability to progress to larger units if the business is sound and has an increasing customer base. Exmouth has a need for people to be employed locally and reduce the need to commute to Exeter, Cranbrook or further afield as it will reduce the traffic on the A376 and 'Sandy Gate' roundabout. People of working age are increasing within the Exmouth area with development taking place and the proposed expansion in the emerging Local Plan, the raising of the retirement age and the need for older people to continue to work after retirement.

**Pedestrian Access across Dinan Way**

No provision made pedestrians and disabled access across what will intentionally become the busiest road in Exmouth.

**South West Water**

The Committee noted the comments made by SWW regarding the foul sewer network and that it was unlikely to have sufficient capacity without causing surcharge with resulting flooding. Any improvements identified would not be funded by SWW and would need to be at applicants cost. S106 planning obligations would need to be imposed.