

PLANNING – UPDATE SHEET

Date: Monday 27 April 2026
Time: 5.30 pm
Venue: Guildhall, High 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 Mark Devin, Democratic Services Officer - democratic.services@exeter.gov.uk.

Membership -

Councillors Knott (Chair), Rolstone (Deputy Chair), Asvachin, Atkinson, Banyard, Hughes, Hussain, Ketchin, Mitchell, M, Pole and Williams, M

UPDATE SHEET

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

9 Update Sheet

(Pages 3 -
14)

Date of Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting of the Planning Committee will be held on **Monday 1 June 2026** 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.

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

27 April 2026

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Correspondence received and matters arising following preparation of the Agenda

Item 7: Planning Application No. 25/1042/FUL – School Playing Field, Homefield Road, Heavitree, Exeter

Representations

An additional representation has been received on behalf of Bramdean Field C.I.C. to advise that an application to register the site as an Asset of Community Value has been submitted to the City Council.

Consultations

The following additional response has been received in addition to the responses received and reported in Section 10 of the Agenda Report.

Principal Heritage Officer (ECC) written response is circulated with this update sheet.

Item 8: Planning Application No. 25/0781/FUL - Mary Arches Street Car Park, Exeter.

Consultations

The following additional response has been received in addition to the responses received and reported in Section 10 of the Agenda Report.

Urban Design and Landscape Officer (ECC): are circulated with this update sheet. Landscape details (15), external materials (14) and LEMP (16) and tree protection (5) conditions are appended to the officers committee agenda report. The additional and amended conditions recommended are included below; construction details (13), gate details (27), S278 highway works (36), tree pit details (37).

Conditions

The following wording should be substituted for the respective conditions listed set out in Section 18 of the Agenda Report.

Condition 2. Approved Plans

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in strict accordance with the submitted details received by the Local Planning Authority on 23 April 2026 (including drawings numbers listed below) as modified by other conditions of this consent.

PL03000 rev P6	Proposed Site Plan
PL03100 rev P7	Proposed Ground Floor Plan
PL03101 rev P7	Proposed First Floor Plan
PL03102 rev P7	Proposed Second Plan
PL03103 rev P7	Proposed Third Floor Plan
PL03104 rev P7	Proposed Fourth Floor Plan
PL03105 rev P8	Proposed Fifth Floor Plan
PL03106 rev P7	Proposed Roof Plan
PLA03100 rev P7	Proposed Ground Floor Plan - Building A
PLA03101 rev P7	Proposed First Floor Plan - Building A
PLA03102 rev P6	Proposed Second Plan - Building A
PLA03103 rev P6	Proposed Third Floor Plan - Building A
PLA03104 rev P6	Proposed Fourth Floor Plan - Building A
PLA03105 rev P6	Proposed Fifth Floor Plan - Building A
PLA03106 rev P6	Proposed Roof Plan - Building A
PLB03101 rev P7	Proposed First Floor Plan - Building B
PLB03102 rev P7	Proposed Second Plan - Building B
PLB03103 rev P7	Proposed Third Floor Plan - Building B
PLB03104 rev P7	Proposed Fourth Floor Plan - Building B
PLB03106 rev P7	Proposed Roof Plan - Building B
PL03200 rev P7	Proposed West Elevation - Building A Front
PL03201 rev P7	Proposed North Elevation - Building A Front
PL03202 rev P7	Proposed East Elevation - Building A Rear
PL03203 rev P7	Proposed South Elevation - Building A Side
PL03204 rev P7	Proposed West Elevation - Building B Side
PL03205 rev P7	Proposed East Elevation - Building B Side
PL03206 rev P7	Proposed South Elevation - Building B Front
PL03207 rev P7	Proposed North Elevation - Building B Rear
PL03210 rev P7	Proposed Site Elevations
PL03301 rev P7	Proposed Site Section A-A
PL03302 rev P7	Proposed Site Section B-B
PL03303 rev P7	Proposed Site Section C-C
PL03304 rev P7	Proposed Site Section D-D
PL03305 rev P7	Proposed Site Section E-E
DR L2001 rev 07	Landscape - Illustrative Roof Plan
8359-PHL-SW-XX-DR-L-2000 rev 11	Illustrative Landscape - Ground Floor Plan
8359-PHL-SW-RF-DR-L-2001 rev 07	Illustrative Landscape - Roof Plan

Reason: In order to ensure compliance with the approved drawings.

Condition 13 (amended text)

No construction works above ground level shall be commenced until large scale details of the building design have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include key aspects of the construction which affect the external appearance of the building design and showing the typical

articulation of parapets, copings, sills, drips, mouldings, the depth of reveals, brickwork bonding, joints between elements/components of dissimilar materials, specialist metalwork, canopies, glazing systems, pergolas and other fabrications.

For the avoidance of doubt these details shall include;

- a) details of the main entrance and steps at the corner of North Street and Bartholomew Street East including detailed design of the soffit, glazed display cases/panels (for street level public display below the full height windows),
- b) accessible entry 'threshold' details to Block A main entrance from North Street,
- c) metal cladding construction details to the attic storey of Block A,
- d) entrance canopy to Block B,
- e) sample elevations and sections at 1:20 scale as 'bay studies' of the different architectural languages
- f) details of the pergola structure to the roof garden on Block A, and
- g) extent, placement and appearance (including any mitigating landscape treatments) of the acoustic fence providing separation to the Mecca Bingo site.

The development hereby approved shall thereafter only be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure good quality design and local distinctiveness, in accordance with Policy CP17 of the Core Strategy, saved Policy DG1 of the Exeter Local Plan First Review and paragraph 135 of the NPPF, and that the setting of the Conservation Area opposite would be preserved.

Condition 27 (amended text)

Details of the gates to be installed at the access points of the pathways linking North Street to Mary Arches Street in the locations shown on Plan ref. 8359-PHL-SW-XX-DR-L-2000 rev 11 Illustrative Landscape - Ground Floor Plan received 23 April 2026 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall have been installed in accordance with those approved details prior to occupation of any part of the development hereby approved.

Reason: To restrict unauthorised access prevent the opportunity for casual intrusion, crime and anti-social behaviour.

Condition 36 (additional)

Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority no part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until the developer has entered into a S278 agreement with the Highway Authority of those works shown on drawing 8359-PHL-SW-XX-DR-L-2000 rev 11 Illustrative Landscape - Ground Floor Plan which are within the public highway.

Reason: To ensure redevelopment is carried out in a co-ordinated manner and is delivered on a comprehensive basis.

Condition 37 (additional)

Prior to commencement of development (excluding works of demolition and site clearance) the design details, cross-sectional construction and layout of the tree pits that will facilitate the new trees to Bartholomew Street East shown on drawing 8359-PHL-SW-XX-DR-L-2000 rev 11 Illustrative Landscape - Ground Floor Plan shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development hereby approved shall thereafter only be carried out in accordance with the approved details and the development shall not be occupied until the approved details have been implemented on site.

Reason: Drawings/specification showing the method for achieving this need to be submitted and agreed prior to commencement

Item 7: Planning Application No. 25/1042/FUL – School Playing Field, Homefield Road, Heavitree, Exeter

Consultation Response from ECC Principal Heritage Officer:

The application site lies within the Heavitree Conservation Area and is identified in the Council's adopted Conservation Area Appraisal as positive, enhancing the character and appearance of the area through its openness, green character and mature tree planting. The proposal seeks planning permission for the redevelopment of the former school playing field to accommodate a three-storey block of retirement apartments, together with associated access works, parking, hard landscaping and infrastructure.

Significance of the Site.

Historically, the site formed part of the agricultural hinterland of Heavitree before later being incorporated into the playing fields of Bramdean School in the early 20th century. A simple map regression indicates that the site has remained undeveloped since at least the earliest OS. Although subsequently enclosed, the surrounding residential development has been laid out in a manner that benefits from the retained open space. It should be noted that the green space was not an intentional element of the designed space which surrounds it, it is an inherited element which is an important distinction when considering levels of harm. This relationship between built form and landscape makes an important contribution to the spatial and historic character of the Conservation Area. As an urban green space with mature planting, the site plays a key role in reinforcing the distinctiveness of the Conservation Area and therefore carries a high level of significance. The site also has potential to include previously undiscovered archaeological deposits.

Impact of the Proposed Development

It is considered that the proposal would result in clear harm to the character and appearance of the Heavitree Conservation Area. In particular:

- The introduction of built development would result in the loss of a valued green open space, eroding its openness and making a fundamental change to its character;
- The extent of built form, hard landscaping and widened access would further urbanise the site and lead to tree loss;
- The scale, bulk and massing of the proposed building are considered overly prominent and would be visually dominant in views along Homefield Road and from Anthony and Alpha Streets, an impact exacerbated by the elevated position of the site in relation to surrounding roads;
- The architectural approach, including layout, materials, proportions and detailing, does not demonstrate a convincing or sympathetic response to the established character or grain of development within the conservation area. While landscaping is proposed, this is not considered sufficient to mitigate the identified harm, particularly given the limitations of new planting in replicating

the contribution of the existing mature landscape and the inherent uncertainty associated with long-term establishment and maintenance.

Policy and Legislative Considerations In the officer's view, the proposal fails to meet the statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. The development is also contrary to relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, including:

- Paragraph 8, which recognises the historic environment as a core component of sustainable development;
- Paragraph 135 (b, c and d), relating to local character, sense of place and design quality;
- Paragraphs 208 and 213, which require harm to heritage assets to be avoided, minimised and convincingly justified;
- Paragraph 219, which expects development to preserve or enhance the significance of conservation areas. Furthermore, the proposal conflicts with the Council's own adopted Conservation Area Appraisal, which identifies the site as making a positive contribution.

Conclusion

It is concluded that the proposal, in its current form, would cause harm to the character and appearance of the Heavitree Conservation Area and does not meet the requirement to preserve or enhance its significance. The level of that harm is considered to be below the threshold of substantial, but is still concerning. While it is acknowledged that alternative, more sensitive forms of development of this site could potentially be explored—such as development with a significantly reduced footprint and massing, or arrangements that retain a greater degree of openness and mature planting—this has not been achieved in the submitted scheme. If members are minded to approve it would be prudent to secure full archaeological investigation at the post determination stage.

Item 8: Planning Application No. 25/0781/FUL - Mary Arches Street Car Park, Exeter.

Consultation Response from ECC Urban Design and Landscape Officer:

Project/Application – Mary Arches Street Car Park

ref: 25/0781/FUL

This application seeks to comprehensively develop the site, demolishing the multi-storey car park and nos. 21 to 24 North Street, replacing with a co-living development alongside public realm improvements, landscaping, cycle and car parking, servicing, refuse and recycling provision, and associated works. The project has now benefitted from two design review meetings, and a final and revised re-submission has now been received.

1. Summary Assessment

- 1.1 We have been grateful for the further amendments and adjustments to the project that the applicants and their agents have been willing to explore and propose during the application process.
- 1.2 In its current form, the existing site, occupied by the multi-storey car park and the adjacent open ground level car park accessed from Mary Arches Street, is one of the least satisfactory parts of the inner city of Exeter and the opportunity of redevelopment / regeneration is welcome and clear. North Street is one of the primary streets that formed the main structure of the Roman town and connected the centre of the settlement with the North Gate, sited as part of the city wall, nearby. Although set further back from the historic location of the North Gate, the current scale and massing of this edge of the city centre (including the Guildhall complex alongside) continues to establish an urban edge and ‘threshold’ condition which overlook the Iron Bridge and the route into the city from St David’s station, as it crosses the Longbrook Valley. Views of any proposed development from the northwest, along St David’s Hill and the Iron Bridge are therefore significant. In the opposite direction then the vista down and along North Street provides a glimpse of open countryside in the far distance and a ‘visual release’ from the tight urban environment. The demolition / removal of the pedestrian bridge connecting the existing multi-storey car park to the Guildhall complex will greatly assist in the future appreciation of this view.
- 1.3 The massing and articulation of Block A creates a more confident corner element to mark the junction between North Street and Bartholemew Street East, although the new accommodation immediately alongside (to both street elevations) is only moderated and diminished in its presence by the technique of including space within the roof form. In conventional elevational drawings the difference created may seem slight, but the visual

experience from street level will be stronger, due to perspective and the stepping back in section. The possibility of achieving a variegated silhouette in the longer views from the northwest has been tempered by the need to maximise the efficient use of the site. The Bartholomew Street East elevation does not resort to artifice and therefore the repetitive programme of accommodation produces a relatively uniform façade. The tree-planting in front of the main part of this elevation will be important in mitigating the expression/appearance here.

- 1.4 The key corner of Block A is occupied at upper levels by open balconies inset within the building form and providing 'break out space' from adjacent kitchen/dining spaces. These re-entrant external spaces provide useful articulation/interest and should allow light and glimpses through this final part of the building as it addresses the corner condition. The corner element of Block A is set out in plan to an orientation that rationally relates it to the rest of the building whereas the façade connecting it with the existing frontage of North Street adopts an alignment that subtly respects the historic line of the street. This creates some richness and interest. Whilst the massing of the development at the corner reaches six storeys, and this is an abrupt change of scale compared to the general 3 to 4 storey heights alongside, North Street has Paternoster House as an approximately similar-sized 'bookend' at the other end of the street. A smaller linking element extends and adapts the general language of the proposed project but then replicates the scale of the existing North Street properties and is clad in a glazed brick. This element bridges over the passageway, which has been enlarged in width. Natural surveillance to the passageway below has been improved.
- 1.5 Block A has therefore been improved through discussion and negotiation and the significant introduction now of a main entrance at the corner of North Street and Bartolomew Street East is warmly welcomed. Other detailed changes to the architectural language of the block (particularly in terms of how it 'meets the sky') have also been achieved.
- 1.6 The contribution that Block B makes to 'healing/mending' Mary Arches Street is improved and the scale of the four-storey building is now more acceptable as a contribution to the street scene. Its plan form in relation to the street edge is also stronger with 'bookend' elements reaching a 'back of pavement' condition and these contain uses that help to re-activate the public realm at ground floor. The central section is recessed slightly providing a narrow 'defensible space' for residential rooms, which also gain modest benefit by being set raised slightly above pavement level. The adjusted character of the architecture now makes a more informal and modest contribution to the street appropriate to its use and status.

- 1.7 A variety of relatively minor concerns are set out in sections below, but the general scale, massing and appearance, together with the approach taken to landscape design are now capable of being supported and form the basis for a satisfactory project in terms of its contribution to the townscape and streetscape.
- 1.8 Therefore, with the remaining design matters satisfactorily covered by appropriate Conditions, we are now content to support the approval of the revised application.

2. HTVIA commentary

- 2.1 Representative View 1: Barley Valley Nature Reserve
 - 2.1.1 No comments to raise.
- 2.2 Representative View 2: St. David's Hill at Junction of Richmond Road
 - 2.2.1 Some of the roofscape interest of Paternoster House (beyond the site) will be lost but the replacement of the current multi-storey car park frontage will be welcome.
- 2.3 Representative View 3: St. David's Hill outside the former Iron Bridge pub
 - 2.3.1 Silhouette increases a little in height, but the vertical sub-division and façade textures of the proposals will generally improve the appearance of the site.
- 2.4 Representative View 4: Iron Bridge (western end width restriction)
 - 2.4.1 A more variegated roofline would have been desirable but good to see sub-characters in the elevational treatment across the width of the proposals.
- 2.5 Representative View 5: Iron Bridge outside the City Gate public house
 - 2.5.1 Entrance on corner now a much more confident proposition (but steps are not here modelled to show the arrangement which appears on the submitted conventional drawings - which we assume will be the approved ones).
 - 2.5.2 Soffits to balcony spaces and the stepped entry space below need careful specification / detailing.
- 2.6 Representative View 6: Bartholomew Street East, North Street junction
 - 2.6.1 See both comments under 2.5 above.
 - 2.6.2 Metal clad 'attic storey' to North Street element needs more careful handling in terms of parapet / coping detail.
- 2.7 Representative View 7: North Street

- 2.7.1 See 2.6.2 above.
- 2.8 Representative View 8: Mary Arches Street outside St. Mary Arches Church, St. Olaves Court junction
- 2.8.1 Calmer, more passive 'background' character much more successful than previous scheme and scale now comfortable in the streetscape.
- 2.9 Representative View 9: Bartholomew Street East, Mary Arches Street junction
- 2.9.1 Proposals now provide better definition to the street.
- 2.10 Representative View 10: Fore Street
- 2.10.1 See comment at 2.8.1.
- 2.10.2 Improved sighting of tower to St Michaels and All Angels is welcome.
- 2.11 Representative View 11: Bartholomew Street West
- 2.11.1 No comments to raise.

3. Response to resubmitted drawings (April 2026)

- 3.1 The most recent revisions to the architectural design prompt the following requirements for Conditions to be imposed on any consent requiring further detailed information to be submitted for our written approval prior to commencement:
- 3.1.1 Sample elevations and sections at 1:20 scale as 'bay studies' of the different architectural languages being attempted across the project.
- 3.1.2 Drawings at 1:1 / 1:2 / 1:5 scale of key details within the construction including sectional profiles of the window and door frames, cornices, parapets/copings, sills, string courses and other decorative mouldings.
- These should include (but are not limited to):
- final 'coping' detail to the corner element of Block
 - details of the main entrance steps at the corner of North Street / Bartholomew Street East junction including detailed design of the glazed display cases/panels (for street level public display below the full height windows)
 - accessible entry 'threshold' details to Block A main entrance from North Street
 - metal cladding details to the attic storey of Block A
 - entrance canopy to Block B
 - details of the pergola structure to the roof garden

- extent, placement and appearance (including any mitigating landscape treatments) of the acoustic fence providing separation to the Mecca Bingo site.

3.1.3 Samples / full specification information of all external materials comprising roof cladding, wall facing materials and cladding, window glass, window doors and frames, decorative features, rainwater goods and paving.

3.2 Further detailed issues relating to the landscape/public realm design can also be dealt with by Condition(s):

3.2.1 A Condition will be required to submit all landscape details, schedules and specifications to coordinate with the revised general arrangements - the cross-sectional construction and layout of the tree pits that will facilitate the successful planting of the substantial new trees to Bartholomew Street East should be specifically included. Drawings/specification showing the method for achieving this need to be submitted and agreed prior to commencement.

3.2.2 A Condition will be required to ensure that the existing trees that are to be retained in Mitre Lane are suitably protected during the construction period – details/specification showing the method for this need to be submitted and agreed prior to commencement.

3.2.3 A Condition will also be needed to require the submission of a LEMP (Landscape and Ecology Management Plan).

3.2.4 Hard landscape proposals are only currently specified within the red line of the application site, however, significant works to the adopted public realm adjacent to the site will be necessary and should be anticipated. These need to be secured through Condition and / or the S106 agreement as part of any approval.

This page is intentionally left blank