

EXMOUTH TOWN COUNCIL

**Matters considered by Exmouth Town Council's Planning Committee
Original Planning Committee Date 27 April 2020**

Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, the Planning Committee were unable to meet in a formal meeting. The matters were considered, and the responses recorded below represents the opinion of members of the Planning Committee agreed via co-ordinated telephone and email consultation process. This procedure and observations to be formally ratified at the next appropriate meeting of the council.

Councillors Consulted:

L Elson (Chair)
B Bailey
F Caygill (FCa)
A Colman
F Cullis (FCu)
J Humphreys
C Nicholas
T Dumper
M Rosser
B Toye
J Whibley

P20/059. Declarations Of Pecuniary Interest And Dispensations

Cllr J Whibley declared a personal interest in planning application 19/1753/MFUL, Sam's Funhouse, St Andrews Road/Imperial Road, EX8 1AP

P20/060. To Determine Applications Under Delegated Powers.

		APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION
WARD	Brixington	
PLAN No:	20/0539/TRE	<p>Land Rear Of 29 Durham Close (Gorse Lane) EX8 5QU Mrs Tilley T1, Oak: remove lowest limb rubbing on garage roof</p> <p>COMMENTS STATUTORY CONSULTTEES: Tree Officer's Report The proposed works were discussed on site during a pre-application site visit. The works are minimal to remove one low limb which is in contact with the garage roof. The proposed works are minimal and would not be detrimental to either the health or amenity of the tree. Recommendation - Approval</p> <p>VIEWES OF REPRESENTATIONS:</p> <p>DECISION: Proposed: CN Seconded: FCa Approval in accordance with the Tree Officer's report</p>
LIMIT	04.05.20	

		APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION
WARD	Town	
PLAN No:	20/0336/ADV	<p>Exmouth Docks Shelly Road Eagle One 2 no. non-illuminated fascia signs; 2 no. non-illuminated pole mounted signs</p> <p>COMMENTS STATUTORY CONSULTEES: DCC Highways – after carrying out a site visit it could be seen that the pole mounted signs were positioned far enough back from the carriageway Shelly Road, L2604, that the visibility splay of an X distance (2.4m) from the back of footway was undisturbed, allowing the Y distance of the inter-visibility of vehicles passing the access and exiting or entering the access is unaffected. Therefore, DCC Highway Authority had no objection to this planning application. Cllr O Davey – Objection to signs C1 & C2 not to the signs on the buildings. The proposed signs would be an unjustified visual intrusion, and out of proportion to the information carried on them. Cllr E Wragg – Objection on the grounds inappropriately positioned. Scale and mass would visually impact adversely on adjacent residential properties. Raised concern over highway safety. For these reasons contrary to policy D4 of the Local Plan.</p> <p>VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIONS: 8 x Rep – Signage was overlarge, unattractive and serves no purpose detracting from the environment. Concerns raised over highway safety. 15 Letters of support Exmouth Quay Management Co. – Statement of support of their application.</p> <p>DECISION: Proposed: JW Seconded: TD Approval</p>
LIMIT	15.04.20	

		APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION
WARD	Withycombe Raleigh	
PLAN No:	20/0391/ADV	<p>Former Carpetright Premises, Liverton Business Park, EX8 2NR Jane Mitchell 5 no. internally illuminated fascia signs; 1 no. internally illuminated totem sign.</p> <p>COMMENTS STATUTORY CONSULTEES: DCC Highway - Fri 24 Apr 2020 Observations: The illuminated sign upon the rear of the former carpet right building would be primarily obscured by the hedge line that runs along Salterton Road, B3178 in accordance with the installation height , this building plot sits slightly lower than the nearby McDonalds and Pets at home where the light would indeed illuminate out further. Therefore the DCC Highway Authority was satisfied that the dazzle effect will be minimal on passing traffic and the sign would not present a unsatisfactory visual disturbance.</p> <p>VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIONS:</p> <p>DECISION: Proposed: FCu Seconded: LE</p> <p>SPLIT DECISION APPROVAL of flex face sign 1, URL face sign 4, Pricing roundel 5, window graphics 6, manifestations 7, D/S Business Park totem 8, D/Sided totem sign 9 – subject to this being no larger than the Pets at Home board opposite.</p> <p>REFUSAL of flex face signs 2 and flex face sign 3 on the grounds that they are contrary to EDDC local policy D4.1, 4.3. & 4.4</p>
LIMIT	05.05.20	

P20/061. To Consider The Planning Applications For Consultation Set Out Below.

		APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION
WARD	Brixington	
PLAN No:	20/0702/FUL	<p>9 Oakwood Rise, EX8 4PU Mr Luke Norton Construction of boundary fence</p> <p>COMMENTS STATUTORY CONSULTEES: EDDC Trees have been consulted but not yet commented DCC Highways have been consulted but not yet commented</p> <p>VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIONS: 1 x Rep – Objection on the grounds that it was an open plan cul de sac, with trees and grass verge to benefit all residents. The rear of the property concerned, was surrounded by all front facing properties and so would have considerable impact on them. The proposal would further narrow the already tight space, causing difficulties to other elderly residents wishing to reverse in and out of their own driveways and parking problems. There was no pavement in this area so pedestrians would have to walk out in the road, around the fence. There were 3 trees in this area, which could be damaged. Cllr Chapman had recommended a tree officer should look at this. Concerned that the emergency services would completely block the road if they had to attend. Other non-material planning reasons were also given.</p> <p>DECISION: Proposed: CN Seconded: FCa Objection, concerned about the neighbouring properties line of sight onto the highway which would be blocked by the proposed new fence. The proposal would alter the open aspect of the area and be harmful to the amenity of the occupiers of the adjacent residential properties. It was therefore considered contrary to policy EB2 of the Exmouth Neighbourhood Plan and EDDC Local Plan policy D1</p>
LIMIT	06.05.20	

APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION		
PLAN No:	20/0475/VAR	<p>Land South Of Elgin, Bassetts Gardens Mr Richard Dye Variation of Condition 2 of planning permission 19/1478/VAR (construction of a dwelling) to allow enlarged porch, re-positioning of roadside retaining walls and cladding of gable ends</p> <p>COMMENTS STATUTORY CONSULTEES:</p> <p>VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIONS:</p> <p>DECISION: Proposed: FCa Seconded: CN No objection</p>
LIMIT	12.05.20	
WARD	Halsdon	
PLAN No:	20/0382/FUL	<p>18 Featherbed Lane, EX8 3NE Mr S Wilson Construction of single storey extension and provision of cladding.</p> <p>COMMENTS STATUTORY CONSULTEES:</p> <p>VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIONS:</p> <p>DECISION: Proposed: BT Seconded: LE No objection</p>
LIMIT	07.05.20	

APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION		
PLAN No:	20/0768/FUL	<p>34 Hulham Road, EX8 3HS Mr & Mrs Liam and Emma Ellis Addition of first floor accommodation by raising roof; replacement rear extension; addition of porch</p> <p>COMMENTS STATUTORY CONSULTEES:</p> <p>VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIONS:</p> <p>DECISION: Proposed: LE Seconded: BT Objection, concerned that the increase in height from single storey to 2 storey would overlook the property in front which was less than 10 metres away.</p>
LIMIT	06.05.20	
PLAN No:	20/0764/FUL	<p>1 Orchard Close, EX8 3JD David Rice Construction of side/rear extension</p> <p>COMMENTS STATUTORY CONSULTEES:</p> <p>VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIONS:</p> <p>DECISION: Proposed: BT Seconded: LE No objection</p>
LIMIT	05.05.20	

		APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION
PLAN No:	20/0745/FUL	<p>50 Mount Pleasant Avenue, EX8 4QW Mr and Mrs Martin Trelawny Construction of flat roof side dormer window, provision of cladding, wheelchair accessible ramp to front and decking to rear</p> <p>COMMENTS STATUTORY CONSULTEES: Cllr M Armstrong - This would be overdevelopment of the site, from a small single storey two bed bungalow to a two storey three bedroomed house. It would be totally out of character with the rest of that road which consisted of the same type of small bungalows. These proposals, including the large dormer and other new windows would be overbearing and cause overlooking of the property and garden of the next-door neighbours, no. 52, thereby seriously affecting their privacy and long-established amenity. As the application site was currently approximately one metre higher than its neighbour (no. 52) due to the road's incline, the proposed works would have an increased dramatic and detrimental effect on this neighbour and other nearby residents. This difference in height would also exacerbate the overlooking caused by the proposed new decking at the rear of the property. The proposed extensions to the roof and side of the property would cause loss of light and overshadowing of no. 52's living rooms. As had been suggested by one of the neighbours, if there had to be an enlargement of this property, it may be more acceptable if it was limited to the ground floor both to reduce the amount of harm and overlooking, etc. to neighbouring properties and to be more in keeping with the street scene. Cllr Paul Millar – Objection on the grounds of Out of character - Plans were overbearing out of character with, and detrimental to the visual landscape, of Mount Pleasant Avenue - the rest of the road consists of small bungalows. Therefore, these plans which seek to extend a small single storey two-bed bungalow to a two-storey three-bedroomed house would represent overdevelopment. Overlooking and a loss of privacy to neighbours - These proposals, including the large dormer and other new windows would be overbearing and cause overlooking of the property and garden of the next door neighbours, no. 52, thereby seriously affecting their privacy. As the application site was approximately one metre higher than its neighbour (no. 52) due to the road's incline, the proposed works would have an increased dramatic and detrimental effect on this neighbour and other nearby residents, exacerbating the overlooking caused by the proposed new decking. Significant loss of light -The proposed extensions to the roof and side of the property would cause significant loss of light and overshadowing of no. 52's living rooms. An enlargement of this property would be more acceptable if it was limited to the ground floor both to reduce the amount of harm and overlooking, etc. to neighbouring properties and to be more in keeping with the street scene.</p> <p>VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIONS: 3 x Rep (1 letter pending scanning) – Objection, the size and quantity of additional windows would overlook neighbouring gardens and result in the loss of privacy. Concern raised that the proposed extension to the roof and side of the property, would overlook and restrict the amount of light into neighbouring property. The neighbouring property was about 3ft lower and they were concerned that the decking to the rear would overlook resulting in loss of privacy. The proposal would turn a two bedroomed bungalow into a three bedroomed house which would be out of keeping with the design and appearance of the rest of the street scene. Concerned about the noise and disturbance that the proposed works would cause.</p> <p>DECISION: Proposed: LE Seconded: TD Objection on the grounds of the property was over 1 metre higher than the bungalow situated at no 52 and would therefore overlook and significantly affect the light in no 52.</p>
LIMIT	06.05.20	

		APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION
WARD	Littleham	
PLAN No:	20/0783/FUL	<p>4A Portland Avenue, EX8 2BS Mr R Galler Construction of replacement garage</p> <p>COMMENTS STATUTORY CONSULTTEES:</p> <p>VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIONS: 1 x Rep – Objection on the grounds of the loss of the tree screening which screened the main house from the highway and no 7 Portland Ave. Proposed building materials of timber cladding was out of keeping within the Conservation area and the number of garages was excessive.</p> <p>DECISION: Proposed: BB Seconded: JH No objection subject to the Conservation Officer’s report.</p>
LIMIT	05.05.20	
PLAN No:	20/0726/FUL	<p>The Old Orchard 8 Foxholes Hill, EX8 2DF Mr Richard Jones Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of two semi-detached dwellings</p> <p>COMMENTS STATUTORY CONSULTTEES: Natural England – Gave standing advice</p> <p>VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIONS:</p> <p>DECISION: Proposed: BB Seconded: MR No objection</p>
LIMIT	06.05.20	

		APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION
PLAN No:	20/0311/MFUL	<p>Chestnuts, 65 Salterton Road, EX8 2EJ Mr D Crocker Demolition of existing 10-unit house in multiple occupation and erection of a 9-unit apartment block and 1 no. detached dwelling with associated parking, cycle and bin stores together with two new accesses onto Salterton Road</p> <p>COMMENTS STATUTORY CONSULTTEES: DCC Strategic Planning Children’s Service – Identified nearest secondary school did not currently have capacity for the additional pupils likely to be generated by the proposed development. DCC would seek a contribution toward education infrastructure provided through CIL. EDDC Trees – Concerned that the detached house in the rear garden would lead to severe problems in the future due to shading and pressure on having the horse Chestnut tree to be pruned. There was no arboricultural survey/TPP/AMS submitted which was imperative for this proposal. Cllr B de Saram – Rec’d a verbal representation objecting to the size of the proposed building at 3 storeys high. It would therefore be out of keeping. Cllr B de Saram would be recommending it was deferred to the DMC.</p> <p>VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIONS:</p> <p>DECISION: Proposed: BB Seconded: MR No objection subject to the additional information requested by EDDC Tree being satisfactory.</p>
LIMIT	07.05.20	

		APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION
PLAN No:	20/0152/FUL	<p>58A Salterton Road, EX8 2NF Mr & Mrs Prangley Construction of first floor front extension and subdivision of dwelling to 2 no. semi-detached dwellings; provision of cladding; erection of 2 no garages and garden store; creation of new vehicular access and parking</p> <p><u>Amended Plans</u> Reduce size of extension and re-position garage to address tree constraints identified in the new Arboricultural report.</p> <p>COMMENTS STATUTORY CONSULTEES: Town Council – 17.02.20 - No objection DCC Highways – 24.02.20 – Recommend provision of cycle storage facility, no objection EDDC Trees – 24.02.20 – Concern raised that there is no arboricultural report, streetscene trees being removed without justification, no Tree Protection Plan or Arboricultural Method Statement for retained trees, no landscaping scheme.</p> <p>No comments received to date from the Tree Officer in respect of the amended plans</p> <p>VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIONS:</p> <p>DECISION: Proposed: JH Seconded: BB No objection subject to the concerns raised by the EDDC Tree Officer were addressed.</p>
LIMIT	04.05.20	

		APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION
PLAN No:	20/0420/VAR	<p><u>ADDITIONAL APPLICATION</u> Garages 1 - 7 Raddenstile Lane Mr A Newton Variation of Condition 2 (approved plans) of planning permission 19/1638/FUL (dwelling) to facilitate design changes to include changes to windows and doors and pitched roof over extension</p> <p><u>Amended plans for consultation.</u> Amended position of roof lights on west elevation.</p> <p>COMMENTS STATUTORY CONSULTEES: Town Council – 16.03.20 – No objection</p> <p>VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIONS: No comments received in respect of the amended plans. 1 x Rep in respect of the original application 1 letter of support in respect of the original application</p> <p>DECISION: Proposed: MR Seconded: JH No objection subject to the alterations did not cause any loss of privacy to the neighbours.</p>
LIMIT	07.05.20	

		APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION
WARD	Town	
PLAN No:	<u>19/1753/MFUL</u>	<p>Sams Funhouse, St Andrews Road/Imperial Road, EX8 1AP</p> <p>Stag Inns (Exmouth) Ltd</p> <p>Demolition of existing buildings and construction of 35 apartments on the upper floor; cafe/bar, restaurant and youth centre on the ground floor with associated parking, cycle and bin store provision</p> <p>Amended Plans</p> <p>Revised proposal increasing affordable apartments within the development to 12 on the 1st and second floor with a dedicated stair access as discussed. Updated supporting documents include sequential test, heritage and conservation statement, design and access statement and heads of terms</p> <p>COMMENTS STATUTORY CONSULTEES:</p> <p>Environmental Health 12.03.2020- request additional information</p> <p>EDDC Trees on 30.01.20 has no objection, subject to conditions.</p> <p>Town Council on 19.08.19, 30.09.19 & 03.02.20 objection on the grounds that the proposal was overdevelopment of the site in terms of its mass and scale. As the site was in Conservation Area, members felt the design had not been mindful of the surrounding building styles and therefore contrary to policy EB2 of the Exmouth Neighbourhood Plan. The parking provision was inadequate for the number of proposed dwellings. Although members had no objection in principle to the development of the site.</p> <p>SWW – no objection, proposed surface water drainage strategy was acceptable in respect of attenuated discharge to public sewer meeting their requirements.</p> <p>Environment Agency on 27.02.20 – Conditional approval</p> <p>DCC Flood Risk Management Team on 30.01.20 conditional approval</p> <p>Police Architectural Liaison Officer on 28.08.19 raised a number of concerns regarding the design, access and movement, lighting, security, bin and cycle storage and surveillance. No further comments received.</p> <p>Housing Strategy Officer on 24.04.20 – Applicant has increased affordable provision from 8 units to 12 (35%) which was above policy requirement and had made changes to group units together with a core staircase and separate lift. EDDC had not adopted a space standard, however flat 15 at 26 sq m was considered small even for 1 person. Without a registered provider on board these units would not be able to be delivered on-site. Normally in these circumstances we would agree to a commuted sum payment (once all supporting evidence had been submitted), however there were other factors aside from affordable housing with this site and development, namely the location in a flood zone which was not supported. A commuted sum did not equate to the same amount of units as on-site therefore it was not a like for like benefit in terms of numbers provided.</p> <p>Highways – 12.02.20 No objection subject to conditional approval.</p> <p>Conservation on 07.02.20 – Amended plans an improvement, though frontage to the restaurant could be improved by more sub-division and better detailing.</p> <p>VIEWES OF REPRESENTATIONS:</p> <p>No comments received in respect of the amended plans.</p> <p>9 x Rep – in respect of the original application</p> <p>4 letters of support – in respect of the original application.</p> <p>Exmouth Community Association – No objection in principle however the plan was not clear on provision for the storage of waste and recycling bins off street. Ample provision should be made so that they did not spill out on to the pavement.</p> <p>DECISION: Proposed: TD Seconded: LE</p> <p>No objection to the amended plans subject to outstanding noise concerns from EH were met, outstanding concerns from Conservation Officer considered and if possible, a further reduction on number of apartments to mitigate overdevelopment concerns.</p>
LIMIT	04.05.20	

		APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION
WARD	Withycombe Raleigh	
PLAN No:	20/0720/FUL	<p>23 Bradham Lane, EX8 4BB Mr D Skinner Construction of single storey rear extension, dormer window to front and rear to allow loft conversion.</p> <p>COMMENTS STATUTORY CONSULTTEES:</p> <p>VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIONS:</p> <p>DECISION: Proposed: FCu Seconded: LE Objection on the grounds of overdevelopment. The proposal would leave very little amenity space and the footprint of the original house would have doubled.</p>
LIMIT	07.05.20	

P20/062. Items for Consideration

(i) CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS (EXISTING) APPLICATION

20/0723/CPE, 8 Douglas Avenue

Certificate of lawfulness to establish lawfulness of 4 no. air source heat pumps.

A copy letter from EDDC was circulated to members.

Date Limit for comment: 2 May 2020

Members did not have any information that either supported or contradicted the evidence submitted.

ADDITIONAL ITEM

(ii) Premises And Club Premises Licence Applications, Variations And Minor Variations Received Under The Licensing Act 2003

Ref No. 050770

Premises: Co-op, Exmouth (Exeter Rd) 190B Exeter Road, EX8 3EA

Ward: Halsdon

Name of applicant: Southern Co-operative Ltd (The)

Premises Licence Minor Variation Application to include

PROPOSED VARIATION

To alter the layout plan by making changes:

To the till/self-service tills and queuing system; the central fixtures on which goods are displayed; and to the back of store stockroom/office space.

To delineate the licensed part of the premises with a red outline to make clear only the public part of the premises is licensed for the sale of alcohol.

Last Date for receipt of representations by the Licensing Authority 7 May 2020

Cllr B Toye had no objection subject to self-service tills were monitored for underage drinking.

P20/063. East Devon District Council – Planning Decisions

APPLICATION	EXMOUTH TOWN COUNCIL VIEW	EDDC DECISION
20/0511/FUL 77 Douglas Avenue	No objection	Approval
20/0527/FUL 41 Holland Road	No objection	Conditional Approval
20/0492/FUL 4 Little Meadow	No objection	Approval
20/0448/FUL 12 Walls Close	No objection	Approval
20/0398/FUL 4 Springfield Road	No objection	Approval
19/2818/FUL 10 Fairfield Close	Objection	Refusal
20/0429/FUL Ideal Laundry & Cleaning, Pound Lane	No objection	Approval
20/0514/FUL Exmouth Marina Car Park, Shelly Road	No objection	Conditional Approval
20/0606/FUL 46 Elmfield Crescent	No objection	Approval
<u>19/2815/FUL</u> & <u>19/2816/LBC</u> 20 The Beacon	Objection	Conditional Approval
<u>20/0133/COU</u> Warehouse, Danby Lane	Objection	Conditional Approval

20/0427/FUL Store Rear of 39 Exeter Road	No objection	Approval
20/0599/FUL 123 The Marles	No objection	Approval
20/0256/FUL 6 Marston Garages, Camperdown Terrace	No objection	Conditional Approval
20/0144/FUL 26 Montpellier Road	No objection	Conditional Approval
20/0064/FUL 140 Exeter Road	Objection	Refusal
20/0342/FUL 21 Parade	No objection	Approval

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