

**ITEM NO.****COMMITTEE DATE:** 30/10/2017**APPLICATION NO:**

17/0848/FUL

**APPLICANT:**

Mrs Carleton

**PROPOSAL:**

Extension to hotel accommodation block to form 9 self-catering holiday apartments and 4 new hotel bedrooms (net gain 2), following partial demolition of building and demolition of bungalow.

**LOCATION:**

Gipsy Hill Hotel, Gipsy Hill Lane, Exeter, EX1

**REGISTRATION DATE:**

30/05/2017

**EXPIRY DATE:****HISTORY OF SITE**

89/0259/03 -	Change of use of dwelling to hotel	PER	12/05/1989
EN/97/00168 -	Formation of car park without consent	PND	08/08/1997
01/0889/21 -	Installation of telecommunication tower (15 m high) and equipment cabin	WDN	10/07/2001
03/1960/03 -	Ground floor extension on north east elevation	PER	19/01/2004
10/1143/03 -	Replacement store adjacent to north elevation of Hotel.	PER	15/09/2010

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE/PROPOSAL**

The site comprises the western part of the Gipsy Hill Hotel site adjacent to Gipsy Hill Lane. The site area is 800 sq m. The site includes an accommodation block with 14 bedrooms (one staff) and a bungalow with 3 bedrooms. To the east is the main hotel building. The main site entrance is to the south with access from Gipsy Hill Lane. Gipsy Hill Lane connects to Pinn Lane to the west and the Redhayes (pedestrian/cycle) Bridge across the M5 to the east. The site is bounded by Gipsy Lane to the west, which becomes an informal footpath connecting to the Tithebarn Link Road to the north. The land to the west of Gipsy Lane/north of Gipsy Hill Lane is currently subject to a live planning application (ref. 17/1320/FUL) for 61 dwellings. To the north is a dwelling with a large garden that has outline planning permission (all matters reserved except access) for 16 additional dwellings (ref. 14/2155/01); this includes conditions prohibiting development until a vehicular access has been provided from the adjoining development site to the north and prohibiting vehicular access from Gipsy Hill Lane. Apart from the hotel, Gipsy Hill Lane provides access to 9 existing dwellings.

The site is within the Monkerton/Hill Barton Strategic Allocation (Policy CP19) in the Core Strategy (adopted February 2012). This supersedes the Landscape Setting designation (Policy LS1) in the Local Plan First Review (adopted March 2005). Gipsy Hill Lane is shown as a Green Infrastructure Route in the Core Strategy and has subsequently been adopted as a 'green street' in the Sustainable Transport SPD (March 2013) (taken from the approved Monkerton Masterplan (November 2010)). It is also a 'primary' cycle route as part of the adopted (in principle) Strategic Cycle Network for Exeter (Devon County Council Cabinet Meeting 8 June 2016). For information, it is also shown as part of the Proposed Primary (Cycle) Network in the Local Transport Plan (April 2011) and a Greenway in the Green Infrastructure Strategy – Phase II (Dec 2009). The site is in Flood Zone 1 and there are no above ground heritage assets within the vicinity.

The proposed development is to extend the existing hotel accommodation block to the west and north, following partial demolition of the building and demolition of the bungalow, in order to provide 4 new hotel bedrooms and 9 no. 2-bed self-catering, serviced holiday apartments. 3 bedrooms will be lost in the bungalow and 3 in the existing block (one staff), resulting in a net loss of 2 hotel bedrooms. Overall there will be a net gain of 16 bedrooms. The extension to the west will be 2 storeys and contain the 4 new hotel bedrooms; these will be accessed from the existing block. The extension to the north will be 3 storeys and contain the 9 self-catering apartments; these will have independent accesses. The extension to the north will include a basement with a gym, store and plant room.

Members should note that the applicant has submitted an appeal for non-determination within the statutory time period.

### **SUPPORTING INFORMATION SUPPLIED BY THE APPLICANT**

- Design and Access Statement (TFQ Architects, May 2017)
- Draft Transport Impact Assessment (13 November 2016)

### **Additional Information Submitted During Application**

- Noise Emission Limit Report (Clarke Saunders – Acoustics, 24 July 2017)
- Drainage statement for extension to hotel accommodation (Teignconsult, 25.08.17)
- Copy of Exeter Cycle Strategy Cabinet Report of the Head of Planning, Transportation and Environment, Devon County Council (8 June 2016)
- Conference Sales Gipsy Hill Hotel data 31.08.07 – 31.08.17
- Summary Gipsy Hill Conference Sales May 17 and May 08
- Gipsy Hill Hotel vehicle arrivals (12.09.17) / departures (13.09.17) data

### **REPRESENTATIONS**

One letter of support has been received from the occupiers of Pinhoe Lodge, Gipsy Hill Lane welcoming investment in the hotel. No other representations have been received, but Members should note the objections received for application ref. 17/1320/FUL ('Sandrock') regarding increased traffic using Pinn Lane.

### **CONSULTATIONS**

**Devon County Council (Local Highway Authority): Object** – the applicant was advised to submit a professionally written Transport Statement, but this advice has not been followed. Using TRICS the proposed development is expected to generate approximately 7 two way peak hour trips and 70 vehicle trips per day. Consistent with the previous advice provided for the adjoining site, increasing the number of trips using Gipsy Hill Lane is still a major concern. Gipsy Hill Lane now forms part of the primary cycle route between the East of Exeter and Exeter. This route is set out as a Primary route in the Exeter Cycle Map within the Local Transport Plan 3 and Exeter Cycle Strategy. It is also identified as a Green Infrastructure Route in the Exeter Core Strategy. As such, this route is vital in widening transport choice and achieving the low trip rates that are central to the Monkerton allocation. Increasing the number of vehicular trips on a cycle route is contrary to NPPF Para 41. In addition, by not providing facilities for pedestrians and cyclists, but intensifying the use of Gipsy Hill Lane raises concerns on public safety, contrary to NPPF Para 32. Upon site inspection, pedestrians and cyclists were observed giving

way to vehicles (one time a cyclist needed to lean into the hedge), therefore in its current status the access into the site is unsafe for all users. However, following pre-application discussions with the developers of the adjacent site (Sandrock) there may be a scheme in the pipeline that will overcome the above concerns, i.e. provision of a segregated pedestrian/cycle route through the adjacent site. DCC is currently investigating this, but there is uncertainty when it will be provided. Therefore, at the current time the application is recommended for refusal based on NPPF Paras 32 and 41. When there is clear evidence that this segregated route will be provided, DCC will be content to recommend approval with a Grampian condition. Should the Local Planning Authority approve the application, DCC requests reconsideration on suitable conditions and contributions.

**Natural England:** Stated that insufficient information has been provided, as no assessment has been provided of the potential impacts that the proposed development and its net increase in tourist accommodation will have on the Exe Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA), the East Devon Pebblebed Heaths Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the East Devon Heaths Special Protection Area. There is therefore currently insufficient information to undertake a Habitats Regulation Assessment of the proposed development. Under the Joint Approach (Exeter City, Teignbridge and East Devon) to secure mitigation for recreational impacts, tourist accommodation was included alongside housing and other types of accommodation. Natural England would expect to see a Habitat Mitigation Contribution for this development in order to avoid a Likely Significant Effect. Likewise, no assessment has been provided of the potential impacts on the Exe Estuary SSSI and East Devon Pebblebed Heaths SSSI, however provided appropriate mitigation is secured as above, there should be no additional impacts upon the SSSI interest features.

**Devon County Council (Lead Local Flood Authority):** Objected originally, due to a lack of information, however this was withdrawn following the submission of a suitable outline surface water management scheme comprising a rainwater harvesting system with an overflow soakaway, subject to appropriate infiltration testing. Pre-commencement conditions recommended accordingly.

**Devon & Somerset Fire & Rescue Service:** No comments on layout of buildings other than the height of the self-catering apartment block may require provision of a dry riser fire main to facilitate firefighter access to the upper level. Despite the narrowness of the access lane to the site, believe vehicular access with pump appliances should be achievable and there is adequate turning within the site. If the development were to proceed, the above matters would be given further consideration under the Building Regulations. At this stage more detailed information would be expected to confirm that access requirements can be met.

**Environmental Health (ECC):** Required additional information on plant noise. Following the submission of a noise report, recommended a pre-commencement condition requiring details of all building services plant, including predicted noise levels, and restricting the noise level of the plant.

**Exeter Cycling Campaign: Object** – the E4 strategic cycle route between Black Horse Lane in East Devon and Cumberland Way in Exeter is the only traffic free route in and out of Exeter to the east. It is therefore critically important to sustain the growth of Exeter and its hinterland, providing the only active alternative to the private car. The importance is reflected in the strong policy protections that ECC and DCC have afforded it. The proposed development would directly increase vehicle traffic on this route and would not constitute sustainable development.

It would also have serious safety implications on both Pinn Lane and Gypsy Hill Lane, contributing to a dangerous environment on a supposedly safe route to school and work.

**Living Options Devon:** Pleased the proposal includes more accessible accommodation for disabled people and agree with the statement there is a shortage within the Exeter area. Asked if access to the gym can be created for people who cannot use stairs.

## **PLANNING POLICIES/POLICY GUIDANCE**

### **Government Guidance**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)  
Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

### **Core Strategy (Adopted February 2012)**

Core Strategy Objectives

- CP1 – Spatial Strategy
- CP9 – Transport
- CP12 – Flood Risk
- CP13 – Decentralised Energy Networks
- CP15 – Sustainable Construction
- CP16 – Green Infrastructure, Landscape and Biodiversity
- CP17 – Design and Local Distinctiveness
- CP18 – Infrastructure
- CP19 – Strategic Allocations

### **Exeter Local Plan First Review 1995-2011 (Adopted 31 March 2005)**

- AP1 – Design and Location of Development
- AP2 – Sequential Approach
- TM2 – Tourist Accommodation in Residential Areas
- T1 – Hierarchy of Modes
- T2 – Accessibility Criteria
- T3 – Encouraging Use of Sustainable Modes
- T9 – Access to Buildings by People with Disabilities
- LS2 – Ramsar/Special Protection Area
- LS3 – Sites of Special Scientific Interest
- EN5 – Noise
- DG1 – Objectives of Urban Design
- DG2 – Energy Conservation
- DG7 – Crime Prevention and Safety

### **Development Delivery Development Plan Document (Publication Version, July 2015)**

- DD1 – Sustainable Development
- DD5 – Access to Jobs
- DD13 – Residential Amenity
- DD16 – Protection and Enhancement of Tourist and Cultural Facilities
- DD17 – Hotels
- DD20 – Accessibility and Sustainable Movement

DD21 – Parking  
DD25 – Design Principles  
DD26 – Designing out Crime  
DD30 – Green Infrastructure  
DD31 – Biodiversity  
DD32 – Local Energy Networks  
DD34 – Pollution and Contaminated Land

## **Exeter City Council Supplementary Planning Documents**

Sustainable Transport SPD (March 2013)  
Planning Obligations SPD (April 2014)

### **OBSERVATIONS**

The key issues are:

1. Sequential Test and Economic Growth
2. Access and Impact on Local Highways
3. Parking
4. Design
5. Impact on Amenity of Neighbouring Properties / Noise Impact
6. Biodiversity
7. Flood Risk and Surface Water Management
8. Energy Conservation / Sustainable Construction

#### **1. Sequential Test and Economic Growth**

Tourism development, including hotels, is defined as a main town centre use in the NPPF. The NPPF promotes a 'town centres' first approach to main town centre uses and states local planning authorities should apply a sequential test to planning applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan. The PPG states that it is for the applicant to demonstrate compliance with the sequential test (and failure to undertake a sequential assessment could in itself constitute a reason for refusing permission). The applicant has not submitted a sequential assessment, however this was not raised by officers during pre-application discussions. This is because whilst applicants should demonstrate flexibility when assessing alternative sites, the PPG states that the application of the test should be proportionate and appropriate for the given proposal. It also says that use of the sequential test should recognise that certain main town centre uses have particular market and locational requirements which mean that they may only be accommodated in specific locations. In this case officers understand that the proposed development is intended to form part of the hotel and will support the overall business. Therefore, officers accept that this site is the only appropriate location in terms of the sequential test and the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in land use terms accordingly.

The NPPF states that the Government is committed to ensuring that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth and significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth (Para 19). It states to help achieve economic growth, local planning authorities should plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21<sup>st</sup> century (Para 20). In this case, the economic benefits of the proposed development should be taken into account in the overall planning

balance. The hotel has suffered from a loss of trade since the recession and more recently since the construction of the Tithebarn Link Road and closure of Pinn Lane to through traffic, primarily conference sales. The proposed development is intended to diversify trade and redress the loss of revenue. However, in accordance with the NPPF economic growth must be sustainable and therefore the other paragraphs of the NPPF (18 to 219), which, taken as a whole, constitute the Government's view of sustainable development, must also be given due consideration. This is particularly relevant with regards to access and highways issues discussed below.

## 2. Access and Impact on Local Highways

Access to the site will be the same as existing via Pinn Lane and Gipsy Hill Lane. These are narrow lanes with no pedestrian footways and limited lighting. The junction between Pinn Lane and Gipsy Hill Lane has limited visibility, due to a sharp bend and high hedgebanks. Both lanes are adopted green streets in the Sustainable Transport SPD/approved Monkerton Masterplan. Green streets are defined as footpaths and cycleways with no access for motorised traffic, and should be at least 3 metres wide. Gipsy Hill Lane is also a primary cycle route.

The Local Highway Authority (DCC) has recommended refusal of the application. It calculates that the proposed development will generate approximately 7 two way vehicle trips per peak hour (8am – 9am) and 70 extra vehicle trips per day. Consequently it raises concerns over public safety and is contrary to paragraphs 32 and 41 of the NPPF. The former states that planning decisions should take account of whether safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people, and the latter states that local authorities should identify and protect, where there is robust evidence, sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice. Clearly there is robust evidence to protect Pinn Lane and Gipsy Hill Lane as pedestrian and cycle routes.

The planning history of the adjoining site supports this recommendation. In 2005 the Council refused permission to develop 3 dwellings on the site to the north (The Vines), partly 'because the road giving access to the site is, by reason of its inadequate width, capacity and the poor visibility at the junction with Pinn Lane, unsuitable to accommodate safely the additional traffic which the proposed development would generate.' This decision was upheld by the Inspector at appeal. In February this year, planning permission was granted for 16 additional dwellings on this site, but with conditions prohibiting development until a vehicular access has been provided from the site to the north and prohibiting vehicular access from Gipsy Hill Lane. It should be noted that the applicant for the current application objected to this earlier application, in part because they considered that access to the site was not safe and suitable for all people (contrary to paragraph 32 of the NPPF) and Gipsy Hill Lane is a strategic cycle corridor.

However, the applicant argues that the proposed development will result in increased group bookings, which will decrease the amount of traffic generated by the hotel. They also argue that there is potential to increase traffic generation by intensifying the hotel's current trade, which will not be necessary if the proposed development is carried out. The Local Highway Authority does not accept the applicant's Draft Transport Impact Assessment and is unclear where some of the figures it contains have come from. It has therefore used the TRICS database to estimate traffic generation, which is a common methodology in planning. It's considered that limited weight should be given to the figures in the submitted Draft Transport Impact Assessment accordingly. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that the proposed development will result in a decrease in vehicle trips to the site. The Draft Transport Impact Assessment says that it is an expectation that the number of rooms sold to groups will increase following the completion of the proposed

development, but this may not be the case. The Inspector weighed up a similar argument in 2005 stating, 'While I accept the presence of the Hotel may generate considerable traffic movements, and that the Hotel and its conference accommodation may not necessarily always be used at full capacity, I do not consider that this justifies further residential development and associated traffic movements which would use the hazardous junction alignment and the below standard local road network.' Put simply, the proposed development will result in a net increase of 16 bedrooms, which will generate more vehicle movements along Pinn Lane and Gypsy Hill Lane. Even if the applicant's argument was accepted, it's assumed that the reason increased group bookings may decrease traffic is due to more coach trips and this is clearly unacceptable on pedestrian/cycle routes, where cyclists already need to give way to cars (sometimes leaning into the hedge) and raises significant concerns over safety and suitability.

Therefore, officers agree with the recommendation of the Local Highway Authority that the application should be refused, as it is contrary to paragraphs 32 and 41 of the NPPF. These issues are considered to outweigh the economic benefits of the proposed development and consequently the economic growth is not sustainable. The proposed development is also considered to conflict with the following development plan policies:

- CP17 – Development at Monkerton and Hill Barton will be orientated on the sustainable movement network and designed so as to reduce the dominance of vehicles within the public realm.
- AP1 – Development should be designed and located to... reduce the need for car travel. Proposals should be located where safe and convenient access by public transport, walking and cycling is available or can be provided.
- T3 – Proposals should ensure that all existing and proposed walking and cycle routes are safeguarded or that alternative reasonably convenient routes are provided.
- DG1 – Development should be compatible with the urban structure of the city, connecting effectively with existing routes and spaces and putting people before traffic.

The proposed development also conflicts with the following emerging policies in the Development Delivery Plan, although these have very limited weight at the current time:

- DD20 – Development as appropriate to its location, scale and form should:
  - a) give priority to the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and users of public transport over private motorised vehicles;
  - b) avoid prejudicing the delivery of, and where appropriate contribute to development or improvement of, the primary cycle routes and key local cycle/pedestrian links;
  - c) provide safe, sufficient and convenient means of access to existing and proposed transport networks, without conflicting with the existing function or safety of those networks;...
- DD25 – Planning permission will be granted for development that addresses, where relevant, the following factors:
  - ...
  - g) contributes to the delivery of the Exeter Green Infrastructure Strategy;...

In light of Policy T3, officers have been working with the Local Highway Authority in order to provide a segregated pedestrian/cycle route to Gypsy Hill Lane through the Sandrock site. Subject to detailed design, this will overcome many of the above concerns. However, at the current time there is not enough certainty that it will be delivered, therefore it will not be lawful to

permit the proposed development and add a Grampian condition prohibiting development until this infrastructure is provided.

### 3. Parking

Indicative car parking standards for different uses inside and outside the pedestrian priority zone are included in the Sustainable Transport SPD, however there is no standard for hotels. As discussed below, it's considered that the nature of the apartments means that they could be used as independent dwellings, unless their use is restricted. The indicative standard for residential is 1.5 spaces per dwelling, which would equate to 14 spaces for the apartments. Notwithstanding access issues discussed above, it's considered that there would be sufficient space on the hotel site to accommodate this parking.

The Sustainable Transport SPD also contains minimum cycle parking standards. The standard for staff is 1 per FTE for the first 4 FTEs and 1 per 7 FTEs (minimum 4 spaces) for subsequent staff. The standard for visitors is equal to staff parking for overnight guests and 1 per 20 peak period visitors for day visitors. Should the application be approved, a suitably worded condition should be added to secure appropriate cycle parking for the proposed development.

### 4. Design

The design of the proposed development is considered to be acceptable and will improve the outward appearance of the hotel from the public realm. Should the application be approved, suitably worded conditions should be added requiring the approval of external facing materials (including doors and windows) and rainwater goods prior to construction.

The Building Control Officer advises that the design appears acceptable, subject to the detail of a Building Regulations application. No major changes are needed to the design to achieve compliance with the Building Regulations, including fire safety.

### 5. Impact on Amenity of Neighbouring Properties / Noise Impact

It's considered that the proposed development will not harm the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of privacy or overshadowing. The first and second floor windows on the north elevation facing the neighbouring dwelling will have external, angled screens fitted to prevent overlooking. Whilst the proposed development will cause some overshadowing of the neighbouring property, this will only be for part of the day and is not considered significant enough to justify a reason for refusal.

The basement of the apartment block will include a plant room. Environmental Health officers have recommended the following condition, which should be added should the application be approved:

“The rated noise level from the proposed building service plant shall not exceed  $L_{Ar,Tr}$  43 dB between the hours of 07:00 – 23:00 and  $L_{Ar,Tr}$  33 dB between the hours of 23:00 – 07:00 at the nearest noise sensitive receiver. Details of all building services plant, including predicted noise levels, shall be submitted prior to commencement of the development and shall be demonstrated by measurement prior to occupation of the development.”



## 6. Biodiversity

Natural England state that they would expect to see a habitats mitigation contribution for the proposed development to secure mitigation for recreational impacts on the Exe Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA), the East Devon Pebblebed Heaths Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the East Devon Heaths Special Protection Area. This is collected as part of CIL for residential development in the city. The Council does not collect CIL for hotel development in the city. However, following the publication of a report entitled 'Tourist use of the Exe Estuary, Dawlish Warren and East Devon Heaths' for East Devon District Council and Teignbridge District Council in March 2017, officers consider that it is appropriate to apply a habitats mitigation contribution to self-catering holiday apartments in the city. It's considered that visitors using this form of accommodation are more likely to visit the European sites for recreation. The contribution should be the same amount as the amount taken from CIL for residential development in the city. This varies from £343 per dwelling in Zone A to the west to £749 per dwelling in Zone C to the east. The proposed development is in Zone C.

The above applies if the proposed apartments are restricted to holiday use only. However, given the nature of the apartments (i.e. size, independent accesses) it's considered that they could be used as independent dwellings. Therefore, without a restriction on the apartments to ensure that they will not be used as permanent dwellings, it's considered that they fall within Use Class C3 (Dwellings) and are therefore CIL liable.

There are no natural features on the site that would be affected by the proposed development, other than a single tree that will need to be removed. Should the application be approved, a condition should be added securing a suitable replacement tree.

## 7. Flood Risk and Surface Water Management

The site is within Flood Zone 1. Policy CP12 states that all development proposals must mitigate against flood risk utilising SUDS where feasible and practical. Policy EN4 prevents development if it will increase the likelihood of flooding through the discharge of additional surface water or if it will be at risk from flooding. The proposed development is not at risk of flooding and a suitable surface water drainage strategy has been agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority (DCC), subject to appropriate infiltration testing. Should the application be approved, conditions should be added securing the appropriate infiltration testing and approval of the detailed design of the system, in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority.

## 8. Energy Conservation / Sustainable Construction

Policy CP13 requires new development with a floorspace of at least 1,000 sq m to connect to any existing, or proposed, Decentralised Energy Network in the locality to bring forward low and zero carbon energy supply and distribution. The site is located in one of the network areas and the proposed gross internal floor area is 1,049.2 sq m, therefore a condition is required to ensure the building is connected to the network or is constructed to be connected in the future. Policy CP15 promotes sustainable construction. Residential development is currently required to achieve an energy standard of 44% reduction from 2006 Part L Building Regulations. All non-domestic development is required to achieve BREEAM 'Excellent' standards from 2013. The Design and Access Statement describes a number of strategies to ensure that the scheme design will be as sustainable as economically feasible, including use of photovoltaic and solar thermal panels. Should the application be approved, a suitably worded condition should be added securing details of how the requirements of this Policy will be met.

## **CIL/S106**

The nature of the proposed apartments means that they could be used as independent dwellings. Residential use of the site would be acceptable in land use terms. Therefore, without a restriction placed on the apartments to ensure they will not be used as permanent dwellings, it's considered they are CIL liable. The rate for permission granted for residential development in 2017 is £102.14 per sq m. The gross internal area of the apartments (not including the basement) is 838.4 sq m. The gross internal floor area proposed to be demolished is 153.6 sq m. The net gain in gross internal floor area is 684.8 sq m, so the total liability is £69,945.47. As the CIL liability is more than £50,000, it can be paid in the following instalments provided an assumption of liability notice form and commencement form are submitted prior to commencement:

1. £50,000 within 60 days after the date on which development commences
2. £19,945.47 within 1 year after the date on which development commences

If these forms are not submitted prior to commencement of the development, the right to pay in instalments will be lost.

Provided the applicant enters into a s106 legal agreement to restrict the occupancy of the apartments so that they cannot be used as permanent residential dwellings, then the proposed development will not be CIL liable. However, a habitats mitigation contribution of £6,741.00 will be necessary and must be secured in the agreement (£749 per apartment). This is the equivalent amount that is top sliced from CIL for residential development in Zone C to the east of Exeter towards habitats mitigation.

The applicant does not wish to enter into a s106 agreement to restrict the occupancy of the apartments. Therefore, the proposed development will be CIL liable, which includes habitats mitigation.

## **SITE INSPECTION (17 OCTOBER 2017)**

Members walked from Cumberland Way to Redhayes Bridge along Hollow Lane and Gipsy Hill Lane to view the character and width of the strategic cycle route. During the visit, a number of vehicles passed along the route and it was noted that it would be very difficult for a cyclist or pedestrian to pass a motor vehicle safely in certain places. The site inspection panel was very concerned that additional motor vehicle traffic using this route would conflict with pedestrian and cycle safety on this important strategic green route in and out of the city.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**REFUSE** for the following reason(s):

The proposal is contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 32 and 41, Exeter City Council Core Strategy policy CP17, Exeter Local Plan First Review 1995-2011 saved policies AP1, T3 and DG1, and emerging Development Delivery Development Plan Document (Publication Version) policies DD20 and DD25 because:

- i. The road giving access to the site (Gipsy Hill Lane), by reason of its inadequate width, visibility, lack of footways and street lighting does not form a safe and suitable access to the site for all users; and,
- ii. The additional traffic generated by the proposed development will reduce the attractiveness of a key strategic cycle route that is critical in widening transport choice.