

PLANNING

Date: Monday 19 February 2024

Time: 5.30 pm

Venue: Rennes Room, Civic Centre, Paris Street, Exeter

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 Pierre Doutreligne, Democratic Services Officer (Committees) on 01392 265486.

Entry to the Civic Centre can be gained through the rear entrance, located at the back of the Customer Service Centre, Paris Street.

Membership -

Councillors Knott (Chair), Asvachin (Deputy Chair), Bennett, Jobson, Ketchin, Miller, Mitchell, M, Patrick, Sheridan, Vizard, Wardle, Warwick, Williams, M and Begley

Agenda

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

5 **Planning Application No. 23-1174-RES - Land Off Spruce Close And Celia Crescent, Spruce Close, Exeter**

To consider the report of the Director City Development.

(Pages 3 -
32)

Date of Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting of the Planning Committee will be held on **Monday 25 March 2024** at 5.30 pm in the Civic Centre.

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:

[Twitter](#)

[Facebook](#)

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

Exeter City Council
Planning Committee
19 February 2024




Application 23/1174/RES

Site: Land Off Spruce Close and Celia Crescent, Spruce Close, Exeter

Applicant: Edenstone Homes Ltd

Proposal: Approval of reserved matters of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping pursuant to planning permission ref. 20/0538/OUT for the erection of 93 dwellings with associated access, drainage, open space, play area and landscaping

Case Officer: Catherine Miller-Bassi



SITE LOCATION PLAN

- Reserved matters – **layout, scale, appearance and landscaping**
- Outline consent ref. 20/0538/OUT – erection of 93 dwellings with associated access, drainage, open space, play area and landscaping
 - refused by Planning Committee due to development on greenfield
 - allowed at Appeal 25/08/22 due to housing need

- Outline consent ref. 20/0538/OUT includes **approved plans**:
 - Parameter Plan Land Use (1150 Rev F)
 - Parameter Plan Density (1151 Rev F)
 - Parameter Plan Scale (1152 Rev F)
 - Parameter Plan Access and Movement (1153 Rev F)
 - Parameter Plan Open Space Provision (1154 Rev G)

 - Preliminary Road Design Celia Crescent Access (04268-A-SK110-P4)
 - Spruce Close Access and Parking (04268- A-SK124-P4)
 - Spruce Close Bus Stop Locations (04268-A-SK125-P4)



9.13 ha new Valley Park – addressed by **agreed S106** attached to Outline consent

3.9 ha gross developable area



Northwest part of site: Hilltop Fringe

- Lower density
- More detached dwellings
- Lower building heights – max. 9.5m +/- 1m

Southeast part of site: Urban Core

- Higher density
- More semi-detached / terraced
- Increased building height limits – max. 11m +/- 1m

SITE LAYOUT

Proposed dwellings:

- Pitched roofs covered with grey concrete tiles & solar panels
- Elevation finishes include render, red brick, grey reconstituted stone
- Two-storey appearance
- Terraced, semi-detached, detached – generally houses, some flats or maisonettes above garages
- Single/twin garages to match in appearance



+113.0
+112.0
+111.0
+110.0
+109.0
+108.0
+107.0
+106.0
+105.0
+104.0
+103.0
+102.0
+101.0
UM +100.0



Street Scene A-A

HT - Sa
Plot 1
+102.40

HT - Df
Plot 2
+102.40

HT - Df
Plot 3
+102.50

HT - Mh
Plot 4
+102.05

HT - Mh
Plot 5
+102.05

HT - Df
Plot 6
+102.35

HT - Wy
Plots 85
+102.15

HT - Og
Plots 86
+101.70

HT - Og
Plots 87
+101.55

HT - Mo
Plots 88-89
+101.25

HT - Mo
Plots 90-91
+100.40

HT - Wy
Plots 92
+99.95

HT - Id
Plots 93
+99.50

+117.0
+116.0
+115.0
+114.0
+113.0
+112.0
+111.0
+110.0
+109.0
+108.0
+107.0
+106.0
+105.0
+104.0
+103.0
+102.0
+101.0
UM +100.0

Page 11



Street Scene B-B

HT - Id & Og
Plots 67-68
+107.80

HT - Tm
Plots 69-74
+106.90

HT - Mo
Plots 75-76
+105.70

HT - Wy
Plots 77
+105.70

HT - Am
Plots 79
+105.25

HT - Am
Plots
+105.25

HT - Am
Plots
+105.25

HT - Am
Plots
+105.25

HT - Am
Plots
+105.25

HT - Am
Plots
+105.25

HT - S1
Plot 83
+103.5



STREET SCENES


+128.0
+127.0
+126.0
+125.0
+124.0
+123.0
+122.0
+121.0
+120.0
+119.0
+118.0
+117.0
+116.0
+115.0
+114.0
+113.0
+112.0
+111.0
+110.0
+109.0
+108.0
+107.0
+106.0
+105.0
+104.0
+103.0
+102.0
+101.0
+100.0

Page 12



Street Scene C-C

HT - Mm Plot - 53 +116.6	HT - Wy Plots - 54 +113.95	HT - Wy Plots - 55 +113.52	HT - Mo Plots - 56 & 57 +113.07	HT - Df Plot - 64 +111.60	HT - Sa Plot - 65 +111.6	HT - Df Plot - 66 +110.25
--------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------



C-C - Continued on page 1



C-C Continued

HT - St Plot - 20 +108.85	HT - Af Plot - 21 +106.97	HT - Af Plot - 22 +106.52	HT - Wy Plot - 23 +105.65	HT - Wy Plot - 24 +105.20	HT - Fr Plot - 25 +105.20	HT - Af Plot - 26 +104.30	HT - Af Plot - 27 +103.95	HT - Df Plot - 3 +102.53
---------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------

STREET SCENES



Illustrative Visual - View From Spruce Close Access Looking up Primary Street.

VISUAL AMENITY



Illustrative Visual - Viewed from Ceilia Crescent Access looking up towards New Valley Park

VISUAL AMENITY

- 32no. **objections** from neighbours (up until 08/09/24) **mainly** concerning:
 - Increased **traffic**, parking issues, highways safety
 - Building on **greenfield** – should be on brownfield sites
 - Loss of habitats/**biodiversity** and harm to protected species
 - **Flooding** in wider area
 - Lack of **infrastructure** – GPs, schools etc
 - Loss of **privacy**, overbearing impact, loss of views
 - Overdevelopment/change of semi-rural/edge of town **character**
 - **Valley Park** concerns
 - Impact on wider **landscape setting**, building **heights**
 - **Landscaping details** concerns
 - Lack of detail on **construction** management

- **However**, this scheme has **OUTLINE consent**: 20/0538/OUT
- Following neighbour concerns already assessed and found **acceptable**:
 - **Principle** of development on this greenfield site
 - Impact of up to 93no. new dwellings on:
 - **infrastructure** including schools, surgeries, open space
 - **highways safety** including road network in wider area
 - Details of 2no. site **access points** (Celia Crescent & Spruce Close)

- Following concerns **among others** lie **beyond remit** of this application as ALREADY addressed via Outline conditions and/or S106 legal agreement:
 - **Valley Park & Open Space** including play areas
 - **Landscaping details & Biodiversity Net Gains** (including Devon bank adjacent Spruce Close access)
 - **Developer contributions** via S106 for schools etc
 - **Construction phase** traffic, parking, mud on road, noise etc

- **NO objections** from any statutory consultees **except** for Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)
 - **Drainage details subject to Outline Condition Condition 7**, pending consideration under separate application ref. 23/1175/DIS
 - As such, drainage matters only pertain to current application in terms of proposed site layout
 - Requested soakaway testing information has been submitted to LLFA under 23/1175/DIS and further comments are awaited
 - This application is for **reserved matters** of **layout, scale, appearance** and **landscaping**
 - It is recommended that the Council APPROVE this application subject to the removal of the LLFA holding objection

- Only objection from a non-statutory consultee: Living Options Devon
 - This related to a confusion arising from the misnumbering of the 2no. proposed wheelchair accessible units in the submitted plans/documents
 - As such, this matter is considered **fully resolved** since these units would be fully wheelchair accessible, with direct access to their private gardens, and fully compliant, clearly marked out parking spaces

- Impact on wider area including landscape setting found **acceptable** at Outline subject to building heights parameter plan
 - Northwest part of site – building heights max. 9.5m +/- 1m & 2 storeys
 - All proposed dwellings of 2 storeys & below 9.5m except **Mathern** (plot nos. 43, 44, 46, 47) @ 9.9m & 2.5 storeys
 - This is less than 10.5m so therefore **compliant**
 - 2.5 storeys would have external appearance of 2 storeys – **acceptable**



VISUAL AMENITY



- Southeast part of site: building height max. 11m +/- 1m
 - All proposed dwellings below 11m except **Tamar** (plot nos. 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74) @ 11.95m
 - This is less than 12m so therefore **compliant**
 - Rooms in roof level expressly permitted in this part of site
- Overall, the proposed reserved matters are considered **acceptable** with regard to character of the area and visual amenity


Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (RD SPD):

1. Loss of privacy:

- 7.16 A minimum **back to back** distance of 22 metres is required between habitable room windows.
- 7.18 Where buildings of different storey heights back onto one another, or differences in site levels place buildings of the same storey height higher than those they back onto, privacy distances will need to be increased.

2. Overbearing impact (harm to outlook):

- 7.24 See fig.7.6 The distance between habitable room windows and an elevated blank wall must be minimum **2 times of the height of the wall plus the level difference.**



- **Loss of privacy:**
 - Back to back distance to Celia Crescent would be approx. 32m
 - RD SPD requirement is 22m
 - Therefore, **acceptable**
- **Overbearing impact:**
 - Separation gap to no.48 Celia Crescent would be approx. 20m
 - RD SPD requirement is 17.6m
 - Therefore, **acceptable**
- No closer relationship with Celia Crescent dwellings
- Proposal is **acceptable** re. privacy & overbearing impact along southwest boundary



NEIGHBOURING AMENITY

- Separation gap at southeast boundary min. 21m
- Not back to back due to respective orientation – proposed dwellings would face southeast, while Spruce Close nos. 10-13 have rear elevations on west side
- Intervening landscaping / retained mature trees would also provide some screening
- Proposal is considered **acceptable** re. neighbouring amenity to southeast boundary




NEIGHBOURING AMENITY

- **Future occupiers:**


- All instances of back to back relationships would meet min. separation gap so no overlooking would ensue
- 5no. instances of proposed dwellings facing onto blank wall of neighbouring proposed dwelling
- Gap would measure approx. 11m whereas RD SPD requirement (para 7.24) is 16m
- However, Outline approval exists for up to 93no. dwellings on this site
- While this is less than ideal, the blank wall would not be elevated
- Overall, the short separation gap is **not** considered sufficient grounds for refusal in this case

Page 25



NEIGHBOURING AMENITY

- **Highways safety:**
 - Impact of up to 93no. new dwellings was found acceptable at Outline stage
 - 2no. access points approved at Outline (Celia Crescent & Spruce Close)



- **Highways safety (continued):**
 - 1no. objection re. boundary to front garden of no.67 Pinwood Meadow Drive
 - Developer is currently in discussion with occupier to provide suitable boundary treatment
 - Amended wording to recommended **Condition 7:**

No access to the application site via the southeast site boundary or any route except that existing off Celia Crescent shall take place unless and until:

- A) The new access road leading off Spruce Close has been laid out, kerbed, drained and constructed up to base course level for the first 15 metres back from its junction with the public highway;
- B) The ironwork has been set to base course level and the visibility splays required by this permission laid out;
- C) Details of a boundary treatment adjacent to no.67 Pinwood Meadow Drive have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interest of the safety of all users of the adjoining public highway and to protect the amenities of the adjoining residents

- **Highways safety** (continued):
 - Cycle/car parking and EV charging provision addressed by Outline conditions
 - Most highways-related objections raised concerned with:
 - proposed double-yellow lines set out in the approved drawings – this cannot be re-considered here
 - increased traffic and parking – this cannot be re-considered here
 - Concern also raised re. Devon bank adjacent southeast access through Public Open Space – this is addressed via S106 agreement Developer Contribution
 - Proposal is **acceptable** re. highways impacts

- **Benefits**
 - Outline consent already granted
 - Contribution of 93no. new dwellings to current housing need
 - Includes 35% Affordable Housing (32no. units + financial contribution)
 - Reserved matters application amended in response to **Design Review** & Urban Design Officer comments –
design has been improved to include **more street trees** & **less visible car parking**
 - Scheme complies with Outline approved parameter plans

- **Benefits (continued)**
 - Employment opportunities during construction
 - Financial benefit of increased footfall to local amenities
 - Developer contributions
 - Wider scheme includes **9.13 ha new Valley Park, public open space on site including LEAP & LAP, & orchard**
 - Proposal would result in **over 10% biodiversity net gains & would retain majority of existing mature hedgerows & trees**
- All the above afforded **substantial positive weight cumulatively**

- NPPF para. 11. c) states:
 - *Decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development.*
 - *For decision-taking this means: approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay.*
- No adverse impacts are considered to outweigh the benefits of this reserved matters proposal, when assessed against local and national policies taken as a whole
- Therefore, this proposal is considered to comprise sustainable development and planning permission should be **GRANTED** subject to conditions **(including amended Cond.7)** and removal of the LLFA holding objection

This page is intentionally left blank