

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

Monday 22 July 2019

### Present:-

Councillor Lyons (Chair)

Councillors Williams, Bialyk, Branston, Foale, Ghusain, Harvey, Mrs Henson, Mitchell, M, Morse, Pierce, Sheldon and Sutton

### Also Present

Director (BA), Service Lead City Development, Assistant Service Lead (Planning) City Development, Principal Project Manager (Development) and Democratic Services Officer (HB)

### In Attendance

Councillor Holland - Speaking Under Standing Order 44.

39

### DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made by Members.

40

### RETAIL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

The Chair explained the process for considering the three applications for retail developments as set out in Min. Nos. 42, 43 and 44 below, explaining that a fourth application as set out in Min No. 41 below had been withdrawn. The Principal Project Manager (Development) (MD) would present the detail of the three applications in turn to be followed by questions of clarification from Committee Members. The Councillor attending under Standing Order No 44 would then speak followed by the four public speakers, one of whom, was speaking in respect of two of the applications, to combine both his presentations into one.

The Chair further advised that the applications would be taken in the following order which differed from that set out in the agenda:-

- 18/1330/OUT - Land North of Honiton Road and West of Fitzroy Road);
- 18/0368/OUT - WPD Depot, Moor Lane; and
- 18/0983/OUT - B&Q, Avocet Road, Sowton Industrial Estate

that of 18/1007/FUL - Police Headquarters, Devon And Cornwall Constabulary Police Training College, Alderson Drive having been withdrawn.

In respect of Application No 18/0983/OUT, the Chair reported that the applicant had requested that the application be deferred to carry out revisions. The Service Lead City Development advised that the request had been received after publication of the agenda and that because it was substantially different from the submitted proposal, requiring a number of new documents, the applicant had been advised instead to withdraw the application or the application should be determined.

The Chair put the request for a deferral to the vote.

**RESOLVED** that the request from the applicant for Application No 18/0983/OUT to be deferred be refused.

Following presentations by the public speakers, debates and votes followed in respect of Min. Nos. 42, 43 and 44 below.

41 **PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 18/1007/FUL - POLICE HEADQUARTERS,  
DEVON AND CORNWALL CONSTABULARY POLICE TRAINING COLLEGE,  
ALDERSON DRIVE, EXETER**

The application had been withdrawn.

42 **PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 18/1330/OUT - LAND NORTH OF HONITON  
ROAD AND WEST OF FITZROY ROAD, HONITON ROAD, EXETER**

The Principal Project Manager (Development) (MD) presented the outline application for a mixed use development to provide town centre facilities comprising uses within Classes A1 (Retail), Class A2 (Financial and Professional Services), Class A3 (Cafes and Restaurants) with associated Drive-Throughs, Class A5 (Hot Food Takeaways), Class D2 (Assembly and Leisure) with associated means of access, access roads, service yards, car parking, infrastructure, public realm and landscaping (all matters reserved except access).

The application was a revision of the application that had been submitted in 2018 and was subsequently withdrawn (ref. 18/0076/OUT). Approval was sought for a maximum floorspace of 11,527 sq m (GEA)/11,004 sq m (GIA) comprising 8,659 sq m A1, 465 sq m A2, 1,021 sq m A3, 116 sq m A5 and 743 sq m D2. The amount of floorspace had been reduced by about 13% compared to the previous application and the applicants proposed that between 1,000 sq m and 2,789 sq m of the A1 floorspace be used for the sale of convenience goods, alongside a chemist and related goods (with or without a pharmacy) and provision made for Post Office facilities.

The report also detailed the key issues of the principles of the proposed development, access and impact on local highways, parking, impact on air quality, contaminated land and impact on amenity of surroundings, impact on trees and biodiversity, flood risk and surface water management and sustainable construction and energy conservation.

Approval was also sought for a Parameters Plan and suggested controls for the proposed floorspace had also been submitted. The access proposals showed the redesign of the existing access road to the site off Fitzroy Road. It also proposed widening the carriageway to the north in order to incorporate an island and right turn lane into the Persimmon residential development site to the north.

The Principal Project Manager (Development) (MD) referred to a letter of support to this application from SW Communications and a representation from the Crown Estate, requesting conditions on the basis of the other applications being refused. In addition, an objection had been received from East Devon District Council to this and the other applications because of the impact on the Cranbrook Town Centre and insufficient information on the impact on this Centre from the retail sequential test. It was noted that East Devon were yet to formally adopt a development plan document for Cranbrook.

The Principal Project Manager (Development) (MD) referred to the results of the assessment of the impacts in terms of both comparative goods floor space and convenience of each of the three applications and also an assessment of the cumulative impact issues of the three applications except the Police Headquarters site prepared by the Council's external retail consultant, Avison Young. The

cumulative assessment had concluded that only one of the proposed schemes should be permitted to avoid significant adverse impacts on Exeter City Centre and St Thomas District Centre. A judgement was therefore necessary on which application should be approved.

The recommendation for the Moor Exchange application was for approval, subject to the conditions set out in the report, as it was considered that the salient factors in making this determination should be the accessibility of the sites to the local community by sustainable modes of travel and how well the proposals serve the local community's day-to-day needs. Due to its close proximity to housing in Hill Barton Vale and its wider mix of uses, the current Moor Exchange application was considered to be the most sustainable out of the three. It also possessed the best access to the City Centre by public transport.

Councillor Holland, having given notice under Standing Order No. 44, spoke on the three retail proposals in general. He raised the following points:-

- open minded about the applications but am not in favour of one or against any of the applications;
- initially believed that there would be six retail applications but two on the Tesco site were not forthcoming with the Police HQ site withdrawn. The 7,000 residents of St Loyes, a ward which was going through unprecedented growth, through 4,000 delivery points had been notified of all these proposals;
- widely recognised that 'out of town' retail parks may give shoppers greater convenience but they impact on retail trade in the City Centre;
- 30,000 vehicles enter the city daily along the Honiton Road Corridor Pinch points with a particularly adverse impact on the Honiton Road Junction with Wilton Way. Had Hammersons progressed their application for Middlemoor they were set to pay for the reconfiguration of the roundabout/road layout which would have helped alleviate these pinch points. Such investment is not forthcoming from the other applicants;
- concerned about the impact a Retail Park may have on the City Centre. At an InExeter independent showcase many City Centre independent operators expressed their concern in respect of out of town centres and sought reduced car parking charges in the Centres car parks; and
- expect any developer/contractor to be considerate of neighbours and seek to reduce noise and pollution with robust conditions to prevent deliveries taking place throughout the night and to ensure construction hours are limited to 8am to 6pm, Mondays to Fridays, 1pm on Saturdays and none on Sundays.

Councillor Holland advised that he had received 43 responses to consultation with residents

Nick Freer spoke against the application. His comments are also covered Min. No 43 below.

- significant impact on Exeter City Centre and other centres and Cranbrook should also be considered. The Cranbrook development plan document describes the Cranbrook town centre as a sequentially preferable and more sustainable option. Cranbrook was planned to deal with Exeter growth pressures and is part of a comprehensive solution for Greater Exeter. Cranbrook Town centre is clearly available and suitable for town centre development;
- a similar proposal was decisively refused in August 2018 and nothing of

- significance has changed;
- officers still accept that the proposals conflict with CP19 yet consider that material circumstances dictate that consent could be granted;
- many of the occupiers that the scheme is intended to attract have no basis to be in a local centre;
- only a modest reduction in the amount of floorspace yet it remains fundamentally larger than a local or neighbourhood centre;
- since a year ago, the vulnerability of existing retail centres has become more not less apparent;
- nothing of significance has changed since August 2018 to warrant a different conclusion being drawn. Such change as has happened heightens the importance of Cranbrook and the policy status of the town centre. It also heightens concerns regarding the vulnerability of existing centres;
- the report makes one new argument - that the scheme is the most sustainable of the four applications which is a different matter to it being a sustainable or acceptable scheme given its failings and impacts across Exeter and beyond;
- Exeter Civic Society and the developers of the strategic site to the north unite in opposing the latest application not least because of the impacts on residents and the City's policies;
- the Hill Barton Consortium have set out their reasons why the gross oversizing of the retail element has real impacts on residents adjoining the boundary of the site, for example, servicing yards, recycling facilities, air conditioning are within 15-20 metres of buildings to the north;
- the applicant has the ability to deliver the Oberon Road access into Hill Barton yet fails to do so. That link should be an imperative and critical infrastructure item for the Monkerton Masterplan. Permission should be refused without it or a Grampian condition imposed to require it if permission is granted. No development should commence until the Oberon Road Link has been completed;
- comments consistent with those of East Devon District Council who also oppose the schemes; and
- in summary, the Committee report offers no significant change in circumstance since the decision taken last year. If anything, the passage of time has reinforced the reasons to refuse.

He responded as follows to Members' queries:-

- Cranbrook has existing planning permission for retail and other elements and community and employment use and a consultation on the development plan document took place between February and April 2019 with sustainability a key issue. Planning permission includes a Section 106 Agreement to bring forward 500 square metres retail units;
- although all authorities have not signed up to the Greater Exeter Strategic Partnership the vision for Cranbrook in the original Structure Plan Strategy was for a sustainable community for the wider Exeter area and to help meet Exeter's housing needs; and
- Cranbrook's current population is 2,000 with permission for a further 3,500, with the intention to ultimately grow to 7,800.

Martin Ridgway spoke in support of the application. He raised the following points:-

- report provides a balanced consideration of the development with previous issues of concern addressed. Moor Exchange enjoys the most accessible and sustainable location with local residents and employees able to walk to the site or use public transport;

- sustainability credentials have been improved, including more green space, a reduction in parking spaces and more electric car charging points, pedestrian links to the south, a crossing at Honiton Road, plus a new bus connection to the north;
- Moor Exchange has reduced in scale and a broader range of uses introduced such as a gym, bank, newsagents, chemist and a larger food element to ensure a good balance on the site to serve the community;
- many retailers such as Morrisons, Lidl, Next and Boots remain committed to physical stores and to expanding their presence in Exeter. The scheme's impact on Exeter are minimal as confirmed by the Council's retail advisor. Moor Exchange will complement Exeter City Centre. There is a clear need for a modern retail and services hub to serve the growth in East Exeter;
- Moor Exchange continues to enjoy significant local business support from Exeter Science Park, Chamber of Trade and South West Communications;
- most of the key building blocks for Moor Exchange are already in place;
- CPG are one of the largest developers in the retail and mixed use sector with an impressive track record;
- Moor Exchange continues to have the backing of retailers and occupiers;
- the scheme will provide significant social benefits due to the improved mix of uses to serve the local community including widened bus lanes to Honiton Road, provision of a new bus link into the adjacent residential development, further reduction in parking numbers on site, with increased capacity for 40 electric charging points and infrastructure for more in the future together with increased cycling provision;
- Co-Cars and Co-Bikes believe Moor Exchange could be central to their East Exeter vision and sustainable network;
- there will be a new pedestrian crossing at Honiton Road and enhanced landscaping to Honiton Road frontage, a key gateway to Exeter;
- the much needed facilities will help to make East Exeter a more attractive place to live, locate, work and invest. 520 new jobs will be created with 160 spin off jobs in the wider economy and 260 construction jobs. There will be a substantial Community Infrastructure Levy payment of £1.82 million and £1.1 million annually in business rates; and
- the report concludes that Moor Exchange is the most sustainable scheme.

He responded as follows to Members' queries:-

- Metrobank have expressed an interest in occupying a bank unit and a potential post office facility would be earmarked for another unit but which would benefit from parcel pick-ups etc. from neighbouring stores;
- the reduction in floor space will have a positive impact on the nearby Air Quality Management Area; and
- the applicant works with a large number of retailers across the country who are committed to on-going schemes and these close relationships should ensure early occupation of the Moor Exchange units. This is not a speculative scheme and is the most advanced of the other proposals.

Members expressed concerns that the overall scale of the proposal was not suitable for the area and considered that a purely Local Centre was preferable for the neighbouring residential development and the wider area that local residents would require access to smaller convenience stores for small items and not an out of town Shopping Centre. It was noted that Avison Young had calculated the impact of the revised proposal on the City Centre as 2-3% reduction for both convenience and comparison goods, representing £40/50 million spend compared with the total city centre spend of £720 million. The retail consultant also advised that, of the total floor space of 120,000 sq ft, it had been estimated in November

2018 that 9,700 sq ft had been vacant. It remained a concern therefore that there would be an adverse impact on the vitality and viability of the City Centre.

Members referred to the objection from Environmental Health on air quality grounds, one Member referring to the particular problems that increased traffic flow would have on the Heavitree Road Corridor and in particular East Wonford Hill, suggesting that smaller units such as a gym would lead to repeated journeys. The increased traffic would also impact adversely on the Wilton Way roundabout, another Member asking why the County Council had not sought Section 106 contributions to improve the roundabout from this applicant or the other two before the Committee.

Responding to Members' queries, the retail consultant advised that St Thomas had been used as a comparator centre as there was some overlap in the nature of trade such as at Exe Bridges and that other centres in the city were of low level impact. He also stated that a centre on Moor Exchange was likely to both rotate spend away from some other centres as well as increasing overall retail spend in the city.

The Service Lead City Development advised that the retail impact assessment had shown minimal impact on the city centre also advising that there was little likelihood that a developer would bring forward a local centre in the Pinhoe/Monkerton area. He also referred to the changes to the scheme with units now identified for potential occupation by a bank, gym, pharmacy and post office and to the potential for differing floor space utilisation by identified traders such as Next rather than direct transfer/duplication of existing assets of theirs in the city.

In respect of the representations made suggesting that the Cranbrook Town Centre should be included in a sequential assessment for the proposed scheme. The Council had not required this for the 2014 application and it had not been questioned by the Inspector or Secretary of State. In addition, the National Planning Policy Framework defined a town centre as an area defined on the local authority's policies map, including the primary shopping area and areas predominantly occupied by main town centre uses within or adjacent to the primary shopping area. This was not the case with the Cranbrook Town Centre at the current time.

**RESOLVED** that planning permission for outline application for a mixed use development to provide town centre facilities comprising uses within Classes A1 (Retail), Class A2 (Financial and Professional Services), Class A3 (Cafes and Restaurants) with associated Drive-Thru's, Class A5 (Hot Food Takeaways), Class D2 (Assembly and Leisure) with associated means of access, access roads, service yards, car parking, infrastructure, public realm and landscaping (all matters reserved except access) be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:-

1. the proposal does not accord with Core Strategy Policies CP19 and CP8, as it is not a local centre due to its scale, particularly the quantum of Class A1 and A3 uses, taking into account the definition of local centres in the Glossary in the Core Strategy; and
2. the proposed would have an adverse impact on air quality within the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) of East Wonford Hill, where pollution levels are exceeding the objective level at residential properties and the proposed mitigation is unquantified and insufficient, The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy EN3 of the Exeter Local Plan First Review and paragraph 181 of the NPPF.

**PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 18/0368/OUT - WPD DEPOT, MOOR LANE, EXETER**

The Principal Project Manager (Development) (MD) presented the outline application for the demolition of existing structures, site remediation and redevelopment to provide Classes A1 (retail), A3 (Cafes and Restaurants), associated access, internal circulation, service yards, parking, landscaping, public realm works, infrastructure and dedication of land for improvements to Honiton Road (all matters reserved except access).

The Principal Project Manager (Development) (MD) detailed the consultations undertaken, the representations received and supporting information supplied by the applicant for the proposal to re-develop the site to provide a total of 7,962 sq m (gross) retail floorspace comprising 6,900 sq metres (gross) for Class A1 (shops) and 1,062 sq m for Class A3 (cafes and restaurants) including associated service yards, parking and landscaping, following demolition of the existing buildings and remediation of the site. The existing Moor Lane access would be modified to left in only. The report also detailed the key issues of the principles of the proposed development, access and impact on local highways, parking, impact on air quality, contaminated land and impact on amenity of surroundings, impact on trees and biodiversity, flood risk and surface water management and sustainable construction and energy conservation.

The Principal Project Manager (Development) (MD) advised that an updated response had not been received from the Local Highway Authority and he also referred to a late objection from the Crown Estate which supported the recommendation to refuse the application.

Councillor Holland, having given notice under Standing Order No. 44, spoke on the three retail proposals in general. His comments are set out in Min No. 42 above.

Nick Freer spoke against the application, his presentation is covered in Min No. 42 above

Mark Scoot spoke in support of the application. He raised the following points:-

- Members will be aware of our concerns in the way in which these applications have been dealt with. The benefits of the WPD proposal have been completely ignored. The WPD site is a gateway site on the entrance to Exeter from the east and is able to make an important contribution to this part of Exeter if re-developed. It has been an un-sightly lorry/storage yard for the last 40 years. The application offers an attractive scheme fronting Honiton Road with associated benefits and there will not be another opportunity in the foreseeable future;
- the approach by officers has been inappropriate and none of the reasons for refusal are defensible. The retail advisor's report was received by the Council in November 2018 but not provided for review and response. Council legal advise was that the reports should be immediately released;
- a key consideration in determining the application is the loss of employment land, even though it was agreed at the pre-application stage that there was no policy conflict. The specialist advise was only made available two weeks ago which is ten months after it was received. Officers did not provide the consultant with all of the viability information provided so no weight can be given to the comments raised in the response;
- the response of the Environmental Health officer was provided only a week ago, more than six months after the air quality assessment was submitted

- and it has not been possible to respond. By contrast, the consultation response on the Moor Exchange scheme appears to have been made publicly available within two weeks of that application being submitted;
- the report states that the scheme should also be refused on ecological grounds even though there is no objection from any relevant consultee and the applicant was not advised until the committee report was issued; and
  - the application has not been dealt with fairly or competently and request that all applications are deferred.

Responding to a Member, he confirmed his concerns at the late release of pertinent information.

Both the Planning Consultant - Legal and the Service Lead City Development refuted Mr Scoot's claim that the application had been dealt with unfairly. The latter stated that there was no obligation to release information produced from consultants but these had been released to the applicants before the Committee reports had been published.

The recommendation was for refusal for the reasons as set out in the report.

**RESOLVED** that planning permission for outline application for the demolition of existing structures, site remediation and redevelopment to provide Classes A1 (retail), A3 (Cafes and Restaurants), associated access, internal circulation, service yards, parking, landscaping, public realm works, infrastructure and dedication of land for improvements to Honiton Road (all matters reserved except access) be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:-

1. The site is located within the established employment area of Sowton and is in existing employment use. Therefore, redevelopment of the site to provide retail uses would contravene Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy and saved Policy E3 of the Exeter Local Plan First Review. There are no material considerations to indicate the application should be approved contrary to these policies. Furthermore, the Viability Reports submitted with the application to demonstrate that redevelopment of the site to B1 (office), B2 (general industrial) and/or B8 (storage or distribution) uses are not considered robust, and no evidence has been provided to test the market for the current lawful use of the site.
2. Insufficient information has been provided to confirm that safe and suitable access can be achieved to the site for all users, taking into account the transport hierarchy in Policy T1 of the Exeter Local Plan First Review, or that the residual cumulative impacts of the scheme on the road network would not be severe. In the absence of this information and confirmation from the Local Highway Authority that these issues are acceptable it cannot be ensured that safe and suitable access to the site will be provided or that the development would not have severe cumulative impacts on the local road network, including securing the provision of any necessary infrastructure in accordance with Policy CP18 of the Core Strategy. The application therefore contravenes paragraph 108 of the NPPF.
3. The proposed development would have a moderate adverse impact on air quality within the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). The proposed air quality mitigation in the submitted Air Quality Assessment include measures already in the submitted Transport Assessment and therefore would not be new mitigation. In the absence of the information referred to in Reason 2, it cannot be established whether satisfactory air quality mitigation would be provided.

4. Therefore the application contravenes Policy CP11 of the Core Strategy, saved Policy EN3 of the Exeter Local Plan First Review and paragraph 181 of the NPPF.
5. The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal identified the site has potential to support bats and reptiles, which are protected species. Natural England's Standing Advice states that protected species surveys should be up-to-date and ideally from the most recent survey season. A bat survey was carried out of buildings on the site in June and July 2016, and a further preliminary roost assessment of the buildings in February 2018, outside the bats' active season, and internal inspections of the buildings could not be undertaken at this time. A reptile survey has not been submitted. Therefore, inadequate survey information has been provided to confirm the presence or otherwise of bats and reptiles, together with detailed mitigation and/or compensation schemes should these protected species be present on the site. Natural England's Standing Advice states planning permission can be refused where species surveys are not suitable, carried out at the wrong time of year or if not enough information has been provided to assess the effect on a protected species.

44

**PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 18/0983/OUT - B&Q, AVOCET ROAD, SOWTON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, EXETER**

The Planning Consultant - Legal, in response to a Member, advised that the Committee had already voted to resolve to refuse the request from the applicant to defer the application.

The Principal Project Manager (Development) (MD) presented the application for outline planning permission for a retail park (Class A1) along with complementary cafe/restaurants (Class A3) including means of access (all other matters reserved).

The proposal was to demolish the existing retail warehouse and develop a retail park comprising Class A1 (shops) and A3 (cafes and restaurants) uses. The application was a re-submission of an application submitted in 2015 and withdrawn in 2016. The developers are seeking approval for a maximum floorspace of 17,000 sq m (GEA) / 14,865 sq m (GIA) comprising 8,175 sq m A1 ground floor, 5,899 sq m A1 mezzanine and 790 sq m A3. The mezzanine floorspace would be used for trading or non-trading purposes. Approval was also sought for a Parameters Plan, showing the above floorspace provided in a Core Development Area arranged in an L shape on the site and, beyond this, an Outer Development Area used for ancillary buildings, pedestrian circulation, car parking, service yard areas and vehicle circulation. The Plan also showed 0.64ha landscaping around the edge of the site and two public footpaths to Honiton Road to the north. The Principal Project Manager (Development) (MD) advised that the Parameters Plan encroached into the TPO area.

The report also detailed the key issues of the principles of the proposed development, access and impact on local highways, parking, impact on air quality, contaminated land and impact on amenity of surroundings, impact on trees and biodiversity, flood risk and surface water management and sustainable construction and energy conservation.

The Principal Project Manager (Development) (MD) advised that an updated response had been received from Environmental Health maintaining their objection due to the adverse impact on air quality and insufficient mitigation of air quality

impacts.

This was in response to a Technical Note by Create Consulting Engineers Ltd. submitted on 19 July.

No new information had been submitted in regard to the highways issues.

The Principal Project Manager (Development) (MD) referred to a late representation from the Crown Estate supporting the recommendation to refuse the application.

Councillor Holland, having given notice under Standing Order No. 44, spoke on the retail proposals in general. His comments are set out in Min. No. 42 above.

Adrian Fox spoke in support of the application. He raised the following points:-

- an important decision is required to decide on where Exeter is going to accommodate future, out of town retail growth. The retail sector was contracting and facing unprecedented structural change with less demand for new floorspace making the re-use of existing underutilised retail floor space desirable in planning terms;
- disappointing that the Honiton Road scheme is recommended for approval because of the planning history of this site, previously refused and dismissed by the Secretary of State with a modest reduction in floor area failing to address the latter's concerns;
- a principal reason for recommending the Honiton Road site was that it was perceived to be sequentially preferable due to its accessibility. National policy is clear that preference should only be given to out of centre locations that are well connected to a centre rather than potentially being better connected;
- both sites are clearly out-of-centre but are both accessible by a variety of modes of transport, including by bus and cycle. The two sites are sequentially equal;
- as the only site with an established retail use, the B&Q site is the right choice for retail growth in Exeter. It is logical to redevelop an established retail destination rather than build a new out-of-centre retail development, adding to traffic, congestion and pollution;
- it is unsustainable to permit new floorspace when the sector is contracting, and underutilised and when redundant retail space already exists;
- the existing consent allows sub-division and the sale of any non-food goods. This acknowledged fallback position is unlike any other retail proposal under consideration. There are examples across the country where similar large format retail units are being sub-divided to accommodate a range of retailers. This represents a genuine fallback that is deliverable;
- the outstanding matters of highways and air quality do not represent reasons why the scheme cannot be supported; and
- open to further discussions in relation to appropriate planning conditions for an even better scheme to be presented. This includes agreement to a reduced quantum of floorspace. For this reason, request that the application be deferred.

He responded as follows to Members' queries:-

- the site is accessible by bus with a bus stop some 400 metres on the nearby Honiton Road which is the recommended distance;
- the County Council accept that the site is readily accessible by alternative

- modes of transport; and
- fall back position is put forward as, although major stores are committed, other B and Q sites across the country are underutilised resulting in subdivision and provision for food and drink, convenience etc.

The recommendation was for refusal for the reasons as set out in the report.

**RESOLVED** that planning permission for outline application outline planning permission for a retail park (Class A1) along with complementary cafe/restaurants (Class A3) including means of access (all other matters reserved) be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:-

1. Insufficient information has been provided to confirm that safe and suitable access can be achieved to the site for all users, taking into account the transport hierarchy in Policy T1 of the Exeter Local Plan First Review, or that the residual cumulative impacts of the scheme on the road network would not be severe. In the absence of this information and confirmation from the Local Highway Authority that these issues are acceptable it cannot be ensured that safe and suitable access to the site will be provided or that the development would not have severe cumulative impacts on the local road network, including securing the provision of any necessary infrastructure in accordance with Policy CP18 of the Core Strategy. The application therefore contravenes paragraph 108 of the NPPF.
2. Insufficient information has been provided to confirm that the proposed development will not have an adverse impact on air quality at East Wonford Hill within the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), where pollution levels are exceeding the objective level at residential properties, and no air quality mitigation is proposed should the development have an adverse impact at this location. In the absence of this information, it cannot be ensured that the development would not harm air quality within the AQMA and the application is considered to be contrary to Policy CP11 of the Core Strategy, saved Policy EN3 of the Exeter Local Plan First Review and paragraph 181 of the NPPF.
3. Paragraph 87 of the NPPF states that when considering out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites which are well connected to the town centre. Taking into account the requirement for flexibility on issues such as format and scale, the site subject to planning application number 18/1330/OUT ('Moor Exchange') and recommended for approval by officers is considered sequentially preferable to the application site, as it is nearer to bus stops with regular services to the City Centre. The application is also considered to contravene Policy CP8 of the Core Strategy, as it is considered to have poor access by public transport and other sustainable travel modes.

(The meeting commenced at 5.30 pm and closed at 7.25 pm)

Chair