

## PLANNING

Date: Monday 7 September 2020

Time: 5.30 pm

Venue: Legislation has been passed that allows Council's to conduct Committee meetings remotely

Members are invited to attend the above meeting to consider the items of business.

If you have an enquiry regarding any items on this agenda, please contact Howard Bassett, Democratic Services Officer (Committees) on 01392 265107.

### *Membership -*

Councillors Williams (Deputy Chair), Bialyk, Branston, Foale, Ghusain, Hannaford, Harvey, Mrs Henson, Mitchell, M, Morse, Sparkes, Sutton and Wright

## Agenda

### Part I: Items suggested for discussion with the press and public present

#### 13 Update Sheet

(Pages 3 -  
6)

#### Date of Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting of the Planning Committee will be held on **Monday 12 October 2020** at 5.30 pm.

Find out more about Exeter City Council services by looking at our web site <http://www.exeter.gov.uk>. This will give you the dates of all future Committee meetings and tell you how you can ask a question at a Scrutiny Committee meeting. Alternatively, contact the Democratic Services Officer (Committees) on (01392) 265107 for further information.

#### Follow us:

[www.twitter.com/ExeterCouncil](http://www.twitter.com/ExeterCouncil)

[www.facebook.com/ExeterCityCouncil](http://www.facebook.com/ExeterCityCouncil)

**Individual reports on this agenda can be produced in large print on request to Democratic Services (Committees) on 01392 265107.**

This page is intentionally left blank

## PLANNING COMMITTEE – 7<sup>th</sup> September 2020

### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

#### Correspondence received and matters arising following preparation of the Agenda

Item 6: **Planning Application No. [20/0581/TEL](#) - St Thomas Centre, Cowick Street, Exeter**

The agent has confirmed the reduced height is in accordance with ICNIRP guidelines. No supporting information has been provided.

At the time of publishing the officer report, 300 objections had been received, and 12 representations of support.

A further 12 objections have been received and 12 people have provided additional comments. Additional issues raised:

- The submitted photomontages are misleading and some images show an inaccurate position. They do not show the correct scale or height in some views, and use a distorted wide angled perspective.
- The reduced height of the mast is still visually intrusive and dominant feature that would be detrimental to the character of the area, the conservation area and views of the cathedral from the historic Cowick Street approach
- The lowering of the height to 15 metres would also put the mast in direct line of sight from the many residential properties in the area
- The reduced height would put the antennas in closer proximity to the trees and residents
- The Council could use an article four restriction to stop any further masts being installed

The Council's Heritage Officer has provided comments on the reduced height.

The photomontage images are sufficient and helpful to enable the likely true visual impact of the proposal to be assessed.

The principal issues from a historic environment viewpoint are the impact of the proposal on the settings of the grade I listed Cathedral, of the grade II listed buildings nearby, principally Nos 35 - 41 Cowick Street, and on the character and appearance of the Cowick St Conservation Area.

The proposed column is thicker and higher than the neighbouring street lamp and CCTV columns and trees, with a slightly bulbous top section. As such in the photomontage views it appears more visually obtrusive the closer one is, but less so with distance.

1. I note Historic England's most recent comments with regard to the impact on the setting of the Cathedral, as a prominent grade I listed building on the city's skyline, and as such with a very wide setting. From the more distant views from further up Cowick St the proposed column appears less visually obtrusive with regard to the Cathedral towers, and has a similar impact to that of the existing street lamp columns, including those on either side of the street, which already distract the viewer from the towers beyond. From closer to, it is more obtrusive, although the existing lamp columns already detract from and compete with the views of the Cathedral towers in the background; the proposed column will add to the existing clutter, but it will still be possible to obtain views of the Cathedral towers.

2. With regard to the grade II listed buildings at Nos 35 – 41, the proposed column does not lie within their immediate setting, as it is sited across and down the street from these buildings, and not within any principal views of the buildings – which are from the Buller Road junction, from directly across Cowick St and from the opposite side of Cowick Street to the west. Therefore it does not cause any appreciable harm to the settings of these buildings in my view.
3. With regard to the Conservation Area, this column is sited on the boundary of the area, and on a narrow section of it that just includes the highway – presumably as a way of being able to include the Brunel period railway bridge and station within the conservation area – and that does not include any area or buildings to either side. It is not located next to, or within the settings of positive buildings within the conservation area, for example. The character and appearance of this particular section of the conservation area is thus one of a highway with lamp columns and other clutter. It does however have an impact on views up the street into the main part of the conservation area, particularly from closer to, although from some angles will probably be partly obscured by the trees for example.

Clearly it will have a visual impact, particularly from closer to, and clearly also it would be preferable for it to be thinner, with a less prominent bulbous section at the top, and as such more akin to a tall lamp column. However, it is difficult in my view to raise an objection to the current proposal from a purely historic environment viewpoint, given that Historic England have not objected with regard to the impact on the wider setting of the grade I Cathedral, that I do not feel that – due to its location – it harms the setting of the listed buildings further up the street, and that it is located in a part of the conservation area that is principally highway and street clutter, and a way of linking the outlier of the railway bridge and station with the main part of the conservation area to the west.

**Item 7: Planning Application No. [20/0809/TEL](#) - Land at Sidmouth Road, Exeter**

**ITEM WITHDRAWN FROM AGENDA**

It has been established that there is a gas main under the site of the proposed mast in Sidmouth Road. It is not possible to implement the scheme as currently submitted. The applicant is looking at whether it can be moved slightly (in which case revised plans will be submitted) or an entirely new site will be required (in which case the prior approval notification will be withdrawn and a new notification submitted). The applicant has agreed in writing to an extension of time to 16 October 2020, to allow this issue to be explored.

**Item 8: Planning Application No. [19/0699/FUL](#) - Land at Hill Barton, Adjacent to the Boundary of the Met Office, Exeter**

One additional letter of comment summarised as follows:

- i) Concern that the railway halt which was part of the original Monkerton masterplan seems unlikely to ever be implemented. Instead there is one arterial road (Pinhoe road) connecting the fast-growing area of Hill Barton with the city centre. This contravenes the city's carbon neutral ambitions to place such heavy reliance on the use of the car. Investment is needed to make the

halt a reality. Spaces such as railway stations can be a focal point for community and placemaking, bringing economic advantage and vitality to an area

ii) The Hill Barton Local Centre was also part of the masterplan, and there seems to be no reason the identified site (located to the south of the application site) should not be suitably developed to accommodate a local shop and other community facilities such as a library or community centre and a small park area for children. Concern that an application will ultimately be made in this area for more housing.

iii) Green space within the area was to be provided for within a green corridor to link the Hill Barton development area with the 'Picturesque ridge', in the Monkerton master plan. The latest planning application seems to encroach into this land and this should be provided healthy outdoor space for the growing community to use

**Item 9: Planning Application No. [20/0293/FUL](#) - 89 Mount Pleasant Road, Exeter**

No update

**Item 10: Planning Application No. [20/0437/FUL](#) - Land to the North East of Newcourt Road**

One further representation has been received from a local resident who had already objected to the proposal expressing disappointment that no new traffic survey had been undertaken, and commenting on the impact on pedestrian and cyclist safety, hedgerow/wildlife impacts, and infrastructure demands relating to school and healthcare facilities. This raises no new issues that haven't already been considered in the main report and in the formulation of the officer recommendation.

Following further discussions with the applicant's agent regarding the proposed conditions it is necessary to amend condition 16 as set out in the main report as follows:-

16) The dwellings hereby approved on plots 11, 21, 22 and 27 shall be designed and built to meet M4 2 of the Building Regulations Access to and Use of Building Approved Document M, 2015 edition.

Reason: To increase choice, independence and longevity of tenure in accordance with Policy CP5 point three of the Exeter Core Strategy.

This page is intentionally left blank