

PLANNING COMMITTEE

19 January 2026

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Correspondence received and matters arising following preparation of the Agenda

Item 5: Planning Application No. 25/0781/FUL - Mary Arches Street Car Park, Exeter.

Site Plan

Since the publication of the Committee Report and recommendation it has been found that the report was accompanied by a Floor Plan drawing instead of the Site Location Plan. The Site Location Plan has been published as a supplement.

Representations

An additional representation from Exeter Civic Society has been received which is available on the council website. This raises points regarding Heritage, Housing Needs, rooms sizes and amenity, adaptability for future uses, staffing and management, and public realm improvements.

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.

Design Review Panel.

The scheme was subject of Design Review at pre-application stage, and copy of the pre-application Design Review Panel letter has been made available on the website. There was no further Design Review at planning application stage.

Planning Obligations

There is a typographic error in the list of obligation to be secured by S106, with the decimal point in the Car Club Obligations placed incorrectly. This obligation should read:

- Car Club Contributions £146,434.62 for vehicle provision, and associated £7,269 TROs and £7,269 Road Markings

The sum sought to support Archaeology Public Engagement has now been confirmed as £93,035

- A financial contribution £93,035 to support public engagement of the archaeological investigation and its findings

Planning Balance

The recommendation presented in the report is made with the tilted balance applied. Case law has established that where the proposal will have an impact on the significance of Heritage Assets, first an assessment of the potential harm of the development against the benefits of the scheme applying a 'non-weighted balance' should be carried out. If the benefits of the proposal outweigh any harm caused to heritage assets, then the second part of paragraph 11d) should be carried out, i.e. the 'tilted balance' test.

It is also beneficial to set out the weight that is given to each harm or benefit of the planning balance individually.

For completeness the weight given to each harm or benefit and an assessment of the planning balance applying a 'non-weighted balance' is set out here.

Weight given on each planning matter:

- The provision of 297 Co-living dwelling units of which 60 Affordable Private Rent Units of which 3 are Wheelchair units on a highly sustainable site is given significant weight in decision making.
- The redevelopment of an underdeveloped site and the removal of buildings that make a negative contribution to the setting of Listed Buildings and the Character and Appearance of the Central Conservation Area centre, and the enhanced public engagement with the Archaeological Investigation of the site, is given positive weight in decision making.
- The car free development of the site that will reduce traffic movement in the city centre is given moderate positive weight given the modest reductions in traffic and impact on overall air quality.
- Contributions from the development to offset the impact of the development on services and public spaces are given limited positive weight.
- The harm to the setting of Listed Buildings and the Character and Appearance of the Central Conservation Area at the upper end of less than substantial harm is given significant weight in decision making given the special regard that is required to be had to the assets and that the harm would be long lasting.
- The loss of trees and reduction in on site biodiversity, which will need to be compensated off site, is given significant weight in decision making
- The loss of renewable energy generating capacity is given moderate weight in decision making.

An assessment of the harm to heritage assets is set out in Section 16 part 2 of this report. This concluded that the impact on above ground Heritage Assets (the Central Conservation Area, Grade I, II* and II Listed Buildings, and Locally Listed Buildings is considered to be at the upper end of less than substantial harm. The investigation of the archaeology of the site and the enhanced public engagement that development would secure are considered public benefits.

With regards to that less than substantial harm, the public benefits that the scheme provides, including in public engagement and investigation of the buried Heritage Assets, are considered to outweigh the harms, though not substantially so given the special regard that need to be had to the desirability of preserving such buildings or their setting and the great weight that should be given to their protection as set out in the NPPF. On an unweighted basis a recommendation would be to approve the application but this would be on balance.

The assessment and recommendation with the tilted balance applied is presented in the committee agenda report.

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 9 January 2026 (including drawings numbers listed below) as modified by other conditions of this consent.

Proposed Site Elevations SMA-DAA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-PL03210_P4.
Proposed North Elevation - Building A Front SMA-DAA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-PL03201_P4.
Proposed North Elevation - Building B Rear SMA-DAA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-PL03207_P4.
Proposed East Elevation - Building A Rear SMA-DAA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-PL03202_P4.
Proposed East Elevation - Building B Side SMA-DAA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-PL03205_P4.
Proposed South Elevation - Building A Side SMA-DAA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-PL03203_P4.
Proposed South Elevation - Building B Front SMA-DAA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-PL03206_P4.
Proposed West Elevation - Building A Front SMA-DAA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-PL03200_P4.
Proposed West Elevation - Building B Side SMA-DAA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-PL03204_P4.
Proposed Site Section A-A SMA-DAA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-PL03301_P4.
Proposed Site Section B-B SMA-DAA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-PL03302_P4.
Proposed Site Section C-C SMA-DAA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-PL03303_P4.
Proposed Site Section D-D SMA-DAA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-PL03304_P4.
Proposed Site Section E-E SMA-DAA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-PL03305_P4.
Proposed Ground Floor Plan - Building A SMA-DAA-ZA-00-DR-A-PLA03100_P4.
Proposed Ground Floor Plan (site) SMA-DAA-ZZ-00-DR-A-PL03100_P4.
Proposed First Floor Plan - Building A SMA-DAA-ZA-01-DR-A-PLA03101_P4.
Proposed First Floor Plan - Building B SMA-DAA-ZB-01-DR-A-PLB03101_P4.
Proposed First Floor Plan (site) SMA-DAA-ZZ-01-DR-A-PL03101_P4.
Proposed Second Floor Plan - Building A SMA-DAA-ZA-02-DR-A-PLA03102_P3.
Proposed Second Floor Plan - Building B SMA-DAA-ZB-02-DR-A-PLB03102_P4.
Proposed Second Floor Plan (site) SMA-DAA-ZZ-02-DR-A-PL03102_P4.
Proposed Third Floor Plan - Building A SMA-DAA-ZA-03-DR-A-PLA03103_P3.
Proposed Third Floor Plan - Building B SMA-DAA-ZB-03-DR-A-PLB03103_P4.
Proposed Third Floor Plan (site) SMA-DAA-ZZ-03-DR-A-PL03103_P4.
Proposed Fourth Floor Plan - Building A SMA-DAA-ZA-04-DR-A-PLA03104_P3.

Proposed Fourth Floor Plan - Building B SMA-DAA-ZB-04-DR-A-PLB03104_P4.
Proposed Fourth Floor Plan (site) SMA-DAA-ZZ-04-DR-A-PL03104_P4.
Proposed Fifth Floor Plan - Building A SMA-DAA-ZA-05-DR-A-PLA03105_P3.
Proposed Fifth Floor Plan - Building B SMA-DAA-ZB-05-DR-A-PLB03105_P4.
Proposed Fifth Floor Plan (site) SMA-DAA-ZZ-05-DR-A-PL03105_P5
Proposed Roof Plan - Building A SMA-DAA-ZA-06-DR-A-PLA03106_P3.
Proposed Roof Plan - Building B SMA-DAA-ZB-06-DR-A-PLB03106_P4.
Proposed Roof Plan (site) SMA-DAA-ZZ-06-DR-A-PL03106_P4.

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

Items 6 and 7: Planning Applications Nos. 25/0895/FUL and 25/0896/LBC – Site of the Royal Clarence Hotel, Cathedral Yard.

Since the publication of the Committee Report and recommendation it has been found that report was accompanied by a demolition drawing instead of the Site Location Plan. The Site Location Plan has been published as a supplement.

A revised consultation response has been received from the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings withdrawing their objection to the proposal. They note that the revised information and that the steel frame for the Well House is a 'massive step forward' alongside the retention measures proposed for the historic fabric. Whilst demolition is proposed for upper floors of the Well House these have had significant modern interventions and have partially collapsed. The proposals are broadly in agreement with the CARE guidance on demolition of historic fabric. There are some aspects that remain outstanding and should be secured by condition including specification of repairs, details of internal finishes and information on insulation, sound and fire separation.

An updated Demolition Method Statement has been received that updates the drawings appendices to match the full plans submitted. Recommended condition no.3 (Work Methodology) has been updated to reference the latest revision.

Drawing ES24.100 S-02-0201 Rev P3 (First Floor Layout – Well House) was found to incorrectly show a concrete floor. This has been updated on revised drawing ES24.100-S-02-0201 Rev P4 and updated in the approved drawings condition.

The affordable housing calculations have been found to be indexed incorrectly. The original calculations concluded a contribution of £2,187,200.88, however the correct rate is £2,394,258.82. This updated amount replaces the figures stated in Section 15.0 (financial issues) and Section 16.0 (Assessment) part 12 (Affordable Housing, s106 Obligations and Viability). It also updates Section 18.0 (recommendation) which will be stated in full later in this update sheet.

There have been internal discussions regarding the wording of planning conditions, and these have been updated to reflect further advice from the Council's Heritage Officer. The recommendations and conditions set out in Section 18.0 are revised as follows:

Recommendation

25/0895/FUL

**DELEGATE TO HEAD OF CITY DEVELOPMENT TO GRANT PERMISSION
SUBJECT TO THE COMPLETION OF A LEGAL AGREEMENT UNDER SECTION
106 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (AS AMENDED) TO
SECURE THE FOLLOWING:**

- a. £1,284.72 per dwelling for recreational impacts on the Exe Estuary protected marine site.

Subject to a Deferred Contributions Mechanism:

- b. 35% Affordable Housing to be paid as a financial contribution of £2,394,258.82.
- c. £16,083 for expansion of oversubscribed GP surgeries at Barnfield Hill, Southernhay House, St Leonards Practice and St Thomas Health Centre.

All S106 contributions should be index linked from the date of resolution.

And the following conditions:

1. Time Limit

The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which this permission is granted.

Reason: To comply with Section 91(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. Approved Plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved plans listed below, unless modified by the other conditions of this permission:

24046 P01.01 rev A – Site Location Plan

S-01-F001-P4-Pile Layout (below Basement Level)

S-01-F002-P3-Pile Layout (below Ground Level)

S-01-F003-P5-Foundation Layout (below Basement Level)

S-01-F004-P3-Foundation Layout (below Ground Level)

25.07-EDS-XX-B1-DR-A-(06)10-P03-Demolition Basement Plan

25.07-EDS-XX-00-DR-A-(06)11-P03-Demolition Ground Floor Plan

25.07-EDS-XX-01-DR-A-(06)12-P03-Demolition First Floor Plan

25.07-EDS-XX-M1-DR-A-(06)13-P03-Demolition First Floor Mezzanine Plan

25.07-EDS-XX-02-DR-A-(06)14-P03-Demolition Second Floor Plan

25.07-EDS-XX-03-DR-A-(06)15-P03-Demolition Third Floor Plan

25.07-EDS-XX-04-DR-A-(06)16-P03-Demolition Roof Plan

25.07-EDS-XX-01-DR-A-SK013-P01-Proposed Breakthrough of Existing Historic Wall

24193 P0200revH - Royal Clarence Proposed Basement Floor Layout Plan

24193 P0201revM - Royal Clarence Proposed Ground Floor Layout Plan

24193 P0202revP - Royal Clarence Proposed First Floor Layout Plan

24193 P0203revJ - Royal Clarence Proposed First Floor Mezzanine Well House Layout Plan

24193 P0204revL - Royal Clarence Proposed Second Floor Layout Plan

24193 P0206revH - Royal Clarence Proposed Fourth Floor Layout Plan

24193 P0207revH - Royal Clarence Proposed Fifth Floor Layout Plan

24193 P0208revA - Royal Clarence Proposed Roof Plan

ES24.100-S-02-0200-Ground Floor Layout - Well House-P3

ES24.100-S-02-0201-First Floor Layout - Well House-P4

ES24.100-S-02-0202-First Floor Mezz Layout - Well House-P3

ES24.100-S-02-0203-Second Floor Layout - Well House-P3

ES24.100-S-02-0204-Third Floor Layout - Well House-P3

ES24.100-S-02-0205-Roof Layout - Well House-P3

ES24.100-S-01-B001-Basement Layout Structural General Arrangement-P8

ES24.100-S-01-0001-Ground Floor Layout Structural General Arrangement-P9

ES24.100-S-01-0004-First Floor Layout Structural General Arrangement-P9

ES24.100-S-01-0007-First Floor Mezzanine Structural Layout General Arrangement-P3

ES24.100-S-01-0010-Second Floor Layout Structural General Arrangement-P8

ES24.100-S-01-0013-Third Floor Layout Structural General Arrangement-P8

ES24.100-S-01-0016-Fourth Floor Layout Structural General Arrangement-P9

ES24.100-S-01-0019-Fifth Floor Layout Structural General Arrangement-P6

24193 P0200 rev H - Royal Clarence Proposed Basement Floor Layout Plan

24193 P0201 rev M - Royal Clarence Proposed Ground Floor Layout Plan

24193 P0202 rev P - Royal Clarence Proposed First Floor Layout Plan

24193 P0203 rev J - Royal Clarence Proposed First Floor Mezzanine Floor Layout Plan

24193 P0204 rev L - Royal Clarence Proposed Second Floor Layout Plan

24193 P0205 rev L - Royal Clarence Proposed Third Floor Layout Plan

24193 P0206 rev H - Royal Clarence Proposed Fourth Floor Layout Plan

24193 P0207 rev H - Royal Clarence Proposed Fifth Floor Layout Plan

24193 P0208 rev A - Royal Clarence Proposed Roof Plan

24193 P0401 rev D - Royal Clarence Proposed Front Elevation

24193 P0402 rev D - Royal Clarence Proposed Side Elevation Lamb Alley

24193 P0403 rev D - Royal Clarence Proposed Rear Elevation

24193 P0404 rev D - Royal Clarence Proposed Side Elevation Martins Lane

25.07-EDS-XX-ZZ-DR-A-(08)20-P01-Proposed Sections 1 & 2

25.07-EDS-XX-ZZ-DR-A-(08)23-P01-Proposed Sections C & D

25.07-EDS-XX-ZZ-DR-A-(08)24-P01-Proposed Sections E & F

Reason: To ensure the development is constructed in accordance with the approved plans, unless modified by the other conditions of this permission.

3. Work Methodology

The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the work methodology outlined in the following submitted documents at all times:

Demolition Method Statement (24193 P05.07 rev C – 26 July 2025)

Heritage Appraisal (Avalon – December 2025)

Visual Inspection Report (Matt MacDonald, RCH-MMD-XX-XX-RP-X-000001 Rev P01 – October 2025)

Reason: To ensure suitable protection and conservation of the existing historic fabric.

4. Phasing Plan

Pre-commencement

Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved a works phasing plan shall be submitted in writing to, and be approved by, the Local Planning Authority. The phasing plan shall include the proposed order of all demolition and construction work and potential crossover.

Reason: To limit further harm to the heritage features from the development.

5. Archaeology 1:

Pre-ground works

No ground works shall take place until the implementation of a programme of archaeological works has been secured in accordance with a written scheme of investigation (WSI), which has previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out at all times in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure that an appropriate record is made of archaeological evidence that may be affected by the development, in accordance with saved Policy C5 of the Local Plan First Review and paragraph 218 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024). These details are required pre-commencement as specified to ensure that the archaeological works are agreed and implemented prior to any disturbance of archaeological deposits by the commencement of preparatory and/or construction works.

6. Structural Work Royal Clarence

Pre-installation

Prior to installation of any part of the concrete frame details of how the structure will interface with the historic fabric shall be submitted to, and approved by, by the Local Planning Authority in writing. These details shall include locations of steels, sectional drawings, and details, and methodology of location of any fixings, specific construction methodology and temporary works details.

The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details at all times.

Reason: To ensure suitable integration with, and to prevent harm to, the historic fabric of the building.

7. Structural Works Well House

Pre-installation

Prior to installation of the steel frame the following details shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority:

- Specifications, including drawings, of how the steels will interact with the spine wall.
- Detailed construction methodology specific for these works.

The works shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure suitable integration with, and prevent harm to, the remaining areas of the Well House and spine wall.

8. Structural Works

Pre-specific works

Following safe work access being created on site any alterations to the approved structural details shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To limit harm to the historic fabric of the site.

9. Construction Method Statement

The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the submitted Construction Method Statement (dated March 2025, received 09 July 2025) at all times during the demolition and construction period.

Reason: To ensure that the construction works are carried out in an appropriate manner to minimise the impact on the amenity of neighbouring uses and in the interests of the safety and convenience of highway users.

10. Noise Impacts

Pre-use

Prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted, the noise mitigation measures set out in the "Noise Impact Assessment of Commercial Sound Sources" dated 5 August 2025 shall be implemented in full. The measures shall be maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the residents of proposed development.

11. SAP Calculations

Within 3 months of completion

The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the details set out in the submitted Energy and Sustainability Statement Title Rev 1 (28 November 2025). Within 3 months of practical completion of the building a report shall be submitted to, and be approved by, the Local Planning Authority from a suitably qualified consultation to demonstrate compliance and that a 19% reduction in CO2 emissions over that necessary to meet the requirements of the 2013 Building Regulations can be achieved, or if the building is constructed to the 2022 Building Regulations that a 10% reduction in CO2 emissions above the levels set out in Part L of the 2022 Building Regulations has been achieved.

Reason: In the interests of sustainable development and to ensure that the development accords with Policies CP14 and CP15 of the Core Strategy.

12. Air Source Heat Pumps

Pre-installation

Air Source Heat Pumps shall not be installed on the site unless the number, location and technical details have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that they do not harm the significance of heritage assets either on or around the site.

13. Solar Panels

Pre-Installation

Photovoltaic panels shall not be installed on the site unless the number, location and technical details have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority together with an accompanying heritage statement.

Reason: To ensure that they do not harm the significance of heritage assets either on or around the site.

14. Materials

Pre-superstructure

Prior to work on the super structure of the building product specification sheets and samples, including confirmation of colour, of the external facing materials and roof materials (including rainwater goods and the rear (northwest) balustrade/parapet) of the building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The building shall be constructed in accordance with the approved materials.

Reason: In the interests of good design and the preservation of heritage assets (on and around the site), including their settings, in accordance with Policy CP17 of the Core Strategy, saved Policies C1, C2, C4 and DG1 of the Exeter Local Plan First Review, and paragraphs 131 and 207 of the NPPF.

15. Biodiversity Enhancement Plan

The development hereby approved shall be undertaken in full accordance with the mitigation measures outlined in the submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Bat Emergence Survey (250613 rev03A December 2025).

Reason: To enhance biodiversity on the site in accordance with paragraph 9.28 and Appendix 2 of the Residential Design Guide SPD, and paragraph 187 of the NPPF.

16. Window/Door Details

Pre-Installation

Prior to the installation of any new fenestration (windows/doors) large scale internal and external details, including sections to a scale of not less than 1:20, of the proposed windows/doors, along with confirmation of materials and finishes, shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning

Authority. The works shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of good design and the preservation of heritage assets (on and around the site), including their settings, in accordance with Policy CP17 of the Core Strategy, saved Policies C1, C2, C4 and DG1 of the Exeter Local Plan First Review, and paragraphs 131 and 207 of the NPPF.

17. Obscure Glazing Lamb Alley

Pre-Installation

The two upper floor windows shown on drawing number (24193 P0402 rev D - Royal Clarence Proposed Side Elevation Lamb Alley) shall be obscured glazed. Prior to the installation of the windows details of the obscured glazing, including level of obscurity, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The glazing shall be maintained as approved thereafter.

Reason: To protect the privacy of the occupiers of the apartment and neighbouring residents in accordance with saved Policy DG4 of the Exeter Local Plan First Review.

18. Lamb Alley Balustrade

Pre-Installation

The glazed balustrade shown on drawing number 24193 P0402 rev D (Royal Clarence Proposed Side Elevation Lamb Alley) shall be obscured glazed. Prior to the installation of the balustrade details of the obscured glazing, including level of obscurity, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The glazing shall be maintained as approved thereafter.

Reason: To protect the privacy of the occupiers of the apartment and neighbouring residents in accordance with saved Policy DG4 of the Exeter Local Plan First Review.

19. External Lighting

No external lighting shall be installed on the site unless details of the lighting have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (including location, type, and specification). The details shall demonstrate how the lighting has been designed to minimise impacts on local amenity and wildlife (including isoline drawings of lighting levels and mitigation if necessary), and how it will either preserve or enhance the significance of heritage assets on or around the site. The lighting shall be installed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of local amenity, wildlife, and the significance of heritage assets.

20. Crime Prevention

Pre-Use/Occupation

Prior to the first occupation or use of the development hereby approved, the measures set out in the submitted 'Supplementary Planning Information Crime Prevention for New Residential Proposals' (24193 P05.03 Rev A, dated 18th June 2025) shall be implemented in full. The approved measures shall be retained and maintained at all times thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of crime prevention and safety in accordance with saved Policy CP7 of the Exeter Local Plan First Review.

21. Cycle Store
Pre-Occupation

Prior to first occupation of any of the apartments in the development hereby approved, details of bike store numbers, method of securing bikes and access controls shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The bike store shall be made available in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation and retained solely for that use at all times thereafter.

Reason: To encourage sustainable travel in accordance with saved Policy T3 of the Exeter Local Plan First Review and the Sustainable Transport SPD.

22. Noise And Odour
Pre-Use

Prior to first the use of the commercial units hereby permitted, the noise and odour mitigation measures set out in the submitted 'Ventilation and Extraction Statement' (24193 P05.06 Rev A, dated 16 July 2025) shall be implemented in full. The measures shall be maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the residents of proposed development and nearby residential dwellings.

23. Archaeology 2:
Pre-Use

The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied/brought into use until a post investigation assessment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with the archaeological written scheme of investigation (WSI) approved under condition 6 of this decision notice. The post investigation assessment shall provide details of the analysis, publication and dissemination of results, including archive deposition where applicable.

Reason: To accord with paragraph 218 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), which requires developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of heritage assets, and to ensure that the information gathered becomes publicly accessible.

24. Waste Audit Statement

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Waste Audit Statement (24193 P05.90 revision A, dated 15 December 2025)

Reason: To minimise the amount of waste produced and promote sustainable methods of waste management in accordance with Policy W4 of the Devon Waste Plan and the Waste Management and Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document.

25. External Doors and Gates

All external doors and gates on the site adjoining public footways shall be inward opening or hung to not overhang the public footway when opening.

Reason: In the interests of the safety of pedestrians using adjoining public footways in accordance with paragraph 117 of the NPPF.

26. Waste and Bin Stores

No waste or recycling bins or containers shall be stored outside the integral bin stores of the building hereby approved except upon the day(s) of collection.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the neighbourhood and convenience of highway users.

27. Noise Control

The total noise from the development shall not exceed a rating noise level (measured in accordance with BS4142:2014) of 34 dB (07:00 to 23:00) and 24 dB (23:00 to 07:00) at any noise sensitive receptor, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of the amenity of the locality.

INFORMATIVES

1. Informative: S106

A legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 relates to this planning permission.

2. Informative: CIL liability

The Local Planning Authority considers that this development will be CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) liable. Payment will become due following commencement of development. Accordingly, your attention is drawn to the need to complete and submit an 'Assumption of Liability' notice to the Local Planning Authority as soon as possible. A copy is available on the Exeter City Council website.

It is also drawn to your attention that where a chargeable development is commenced before the Local Authority has received a valid commencement notice (i.e. where pre-commencement conditions have not been discharged) the Local Authority may impose a surcharge, and the ability to claim any form of relief from the payment of the Levy will be foregone. You must apply for any relief and receive confirmation from the Council before commencing development. For further information please see www.exeter.gov.uk/cil.

3. Informative: Appropriate Assessment

In accordance with Chapters 1 and 2 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, this development has been screened in respect of the need for an Appropriate Assessment (AA). Given the nature of the development, it has been concluded that an AA is required in relation to potential impact on the relevant Special Protection Area (SPA), the Exe Estuary, which is a designated European site. This AA has been carried out and concludes that the development is such that it could have an impact primarily

associated with recreational activity of future occupants of the development. This impact will be mitigated in line with the South East Devon European Site Mitigation Strategy prepared by Footprint Ecology on behalf of East Devon and Teignbridge District Councils and Exeter City Council (with particular reference to Table 26), which is being funded through a proportion of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) collected in respect of the development being allocated to fund the mitigation strategy. Or, if the development is not liable to pay CIL, to pay the appropriate habitats mitigation contribution through another mechanism (this is likely to be either an undertaking in accordance with s111 of the Local Government Act 1972 or a Unilateral Undertaking).

4. Informative: Positive and Pro-active working

In accordance with Paragraph 39 of the National Planning Policy Framework the Council has worked in a positive and pro-active way with the Applicant and has negotiated amendments to the application to enable the grant of planning permission.

5. Informative: Kitchen extraction systems

The developer should be aware that the effectiveness of kitchen extract systems depends on the nature and intensity of use and any approval in planning should not be taken to mean that no odour problems will occur in future. If complaints are received, these will be investigated by the Environmental Health Team and improvements to the system may be required.

REFUSE PERMISSION FOR THE REASON SET OUT BELOW IF THE LEGAL AGREEMENT UNDER SECTION 106 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (AS AMENDED) IS NOT COMPLETED BY 20 July 2026 OR SUCH EXTENDED TIME AS AGREED IN WRITING BY THE SERVICE LEAD (CITY DEVELOPMENT)

In the absence of a Section 106 legal agreement in terms that are satisfactory to the Local Planning Authority being completed within an appropriate timescale, and which makes provision for the following matters –

- £1,284.72 per dwelling for recreational impacts on the Exe Estuary protected marine site.

Subject to a Deferred Contributions Mechanism:

- 35% Affordable Housing to be paid as a financial contribution of £2,394,258.82.
- £16,083 for expansion of oversubscribed GP surgeries at Barnfield Hill, Southernhay House, St Leonards Practice and St Thomas Health Centre.

the proposal is contrary to Exeter Core Strategy 2012 Objectives 3, 6 and 10, and policies CP7, CP10 and CP18, and Exeter City Council Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2014.

22/0237/LBC

**DELEGATE TO HEAD OF CITY DEVELOPMENT TO GRANT LISTED
BUILDING CONSENT SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. Time Limit

The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which this permission is granted.

Reason: To comply with Section 91(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. Approved Plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved plans listed below, unless modified by the other conditions of this permission:

24046 P01.01 rev A – Site Location Plan

S-01-F001-P4-Pile Layout (below Basement Level)

S-01-F002-P3-Pile Layout (below Ground Level)

S-01-F003-P5-Foundation Layout (below Basement Level)

S-01-F004-P3-Foundation Layout (below Ground Level)

25.07-EDS-XX-B1-DR-A-(06)10-P03-Demolition Basement Plan

25.07-EDS-XX-00-DR-A-(06)11-P03-Demolition Ground Floor Plan

25.07-EDS-XX-01-DR-A-(06)12-P03-Demolition First Floor Plan

25.07-EDS-XX-M1-DR-A-(06)13-P03-Demolition First Floor Mezzanine Plan

25.07-EDS-XX-02-DR-A-(06)14-P03-Demolition Second Floor Plan

25.07-EDS-XX-03-DR-A-(06)15-P03-Demolition Third Floor Plan

25.07-EDS-XX-04-DR-A-(06)16-P03-Demolition Roof Plan

25.07-EDS-XX-01-DR-A-SK013-P01-Proposed Breakthrough of Existing Historic Wall

24193 P0200revH - Royal Clarence Proposed Basement Floor Layout Plan

24193 P0201revM - Royal Clarence Proposed Ground Floor Layout Plan

24193 P0202revP - Royal Clarence Proposed First Floor Layout Plan

24193 P0203revJ - Royal Clarence Proposed First Floor Mezzanine WellHouse Layout Plan

24193 P0204revL - Royal Clarence Proposed Second Floor Layout Plan

24193 P0206revH - Royal Clarence Proposed Fourth Floor Layout Plan

24193 P0207revH - Royal Clarence Proposed Fifth Floor Layout Plan

24193 P0208revA - Royal Clarence Proposed Roof Plan

ES24.100-S-02-0200-Ground Floor Layout - Well House-P3

ES24.100-S-02-0201-First Floor Layout - Well House-P3

ES24.100-S-02-0202-First Floor Mezz Layout - Well House-P4

ES24.100-S-02-0203-Second Floor Layout - Well House-P3

ES24.100-S-02-0204-Third Floor Layout - Well House-P3

ES24.100-S-02-0205-Roof Layout - Well House-P3

ES24.100-S-01-B001-Basement Layout Structural General Arrangement-P8
 ES24.100-S-01-0001-Ground Floor Layout Structural General Arrangement-P9
 ES24.100-S-01-0004-First Floor Layout Structural General Arrangement-P9
 ES24.100-S-01-0007-First Floor Mezzanine Structural Layout General Arrangement-P3
 ES24.100-S-01-0010-Second Floor Layout Structural General Arrangement-P8
 ES24.100-S-01-0013-Third Floor Layout Structural General Arrangement-P8
 ES24.100-S-01-0016-Fourth Floor Layout Structural General Arrangement-P9
 ES24.100-S-01-0019-Fifth Floor Layout Structural General Arrangement-P6
 24193 P0200 rev H - Royal Clarence Proposed Basement Floor Layout Plan
 24193 P0201 rev M - Royal Clarence Proposed Ground Floor Layout Plan
 24193 P0202 rev P - Royal Clarence Proposed First Floor Layout Plan
 24193 P0203 rev J - Royal Clarence Proposed First Floor Mezzanine Floor Layout Plan
 24193 P0204 rev L - Royal Clarence Proposed Second Floor Layout Plan
 24193 P0205 rev L - Royal Clarence Proposed Third Floor Layout Plan
 24193 P0206 rev H - Royal Clarence Proposed Fourth Floor Layout Plan
 24193 P0207 rev H - Royal Clarence Proposed Fifth Floor Layout Plan
 24193 P0208 rev A - Royal Clarence Proposed Roof Plan
 24193 P0401 rev D - Royal Clarence Proposed Front Elevation
 24193 P0402 rev D - Royal Clarence Proposed Side Elevation Lamb Alley
 24193 P0403 rev D - Royal Clarence Proposed Rear Elevation
 24193 P0404 rev D - Royal Clarence Proposed Side Elevation Martins Lane
 25.07-EDS-XX-ZZ-DR-A-(08)20-P01-Proposed Sections 1 & 2
 25.07-EDS-XX-ZZ-DR-A-(08)23-P01-Proposed Sections C & D
 25.07-EDS-XX-ZZ-DR-A-(08)24-P01-Proposed Sections E & F
 Reason: To ensure the development is constructed in accordance with the approved plans, unless modified by the other conditions of this permission.

3. Well House Roof

Pre-roof removal

Prior to removal of the in situ Well House roof details of temporary measures to protect the existing fabric of the Well House during the duration of the work shall be submitted in writing to, and be approved by, the Local Planning Authority. The measures shall include details of protection and methodology of protection works and removal.

The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details at all times.

Reason: To ensure suitable protection of the historic fabric during construction.

4. Historic Recording

All demolition and interventions into the historic fabric shall be carried out under a RCHME level 3 building recording. The results shall be published and archived

in accordance with a scheme submitted in writing to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure suitable recording and presentation of the historic fabric.

5. Material Finishes

Prior to any works to the existing historic fabric full details of the internal finishes shall be submitted in writing to, and be approved by, the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include a room-by-room schedule, details of cable/pipe routing, fixing methods to the historic fabric, restoration measures to retained walls and treatment of the spine wall paintings.

The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details at all times.

Reason: To minimise the level of harm to the historic fabric.

Informatives

1. Informative: Positive and Pro-active working

In accordance with Paragraph 39 of the National Planning Policy Framework the Council has worked in a positive and pro-active way with the Applicant and has negotiated amendments to the application to enable the grant of planning permission.

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 benefitted from an initial design review meeting that was undertaken early in the pre-application stage (summary attached).

We now set out below our final comments and assessment – having provided considerable informal and formal feedback to the applicants during the pre-application and post-submission periods in a series of meetings. A final set of revised drawings and Design and Access Statement (addendum 3) have now been issued in response to our latest observations.

1. Summary Assessment

- 1.1 We have been grateful for the amendments and adjustments to the project that the applicants and their agents have been willing to explore and propose during the application process. The ‘fit’ between the general development proposition and the sensitivities of the site and its setting has remained challenging - and is due to the inherent characteristics of the singular project brief being attempted and the degree of design flexibility it affords. A greater variety of building or use types would have afforded greater flexibility in addressing the complexity of the site. The demands of creating an efficient and viable development form together with the rationality of contemporary construction techniques and regulations have only been partly, but not fully, reconciled with the historic townscape.
- 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.

- 1.2 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. 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 Bartholemew 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 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 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 adopts the general language of the proposed project but then replicates the scale of the existing North Street properties. This element bridges over the passageway, which has been enlarged in width.
- 1.5 Block A has therefore been improved through discussion and negotiation, but the main weakness (of the lowest floor level failing to reach down to the level of Bartholemew Street East) has remained as a frustration and denies the optimum positioning of a main entrance that might have provided excellent accessibility and an appropriate legibility for the project occupying this significant corner position within the town/cityscape. The proposals include for external low-level display to be incorporated within the façade design at the corner, concealing what would otherwise be inert 'under build' fabric here - below the ground floor level. This provides some mitigation but is

certainly sub-optimal in terms of good urban design. The dislocation between internal floor levels and pavement level continues along Bartholemew Street East but active uses (except for a bike store) have been arranged along this edge of the building. In many ways, this merely replicates the existing lack of relationship between the edge of the site and the street here, but the project might usefully have been seen as an opportunity to improve upon this condition.

- 1.6 The contribution that Block B makes to ‘healing/mending’ Mary Arches Street is relatively weak and the scale of the five-storey building is hard to justify in terms of its taller massing compared to buildings opposite and the formal dominance it projects. Its plan form in relation to the street would have benefitted from greater subtlety (curved or faceted edge?) and active uses would have been useful to deploy in re-activating the public realm at ground floor, had they been available within the brief. A default good response to the character of Mary Arches Street would promote a ‘back of pavement’ relationship between the proposed building and the public realm. The modest strip of planting including some under-scale trees is not a good alternative, produces a disengaged ‘set back’ and weakens the character of the Conservation Area. Recent compositional adjustments to the appearance have made minor improvements which have provided some mitigation, but the presence of the completed building is still likely to appear to be uncomfortably assertive in this location. Strategic views to the Cathedral and other key heritage assets/landmarks are unlikely to be affected (as confirmed by the recent Allies and Morrison study) but the localised impacts on street scene and townscape within the Conservation Area are a separate consideration.

- 1.7 Whilst recognising and acknowledging the technical and economic reasons which give rise to compromise, we cannot ignore our objective conclusion that some sub-optimal design outcomes are therefore in prospect. Whilst the degree of harm is certainly less than the dire situation of the site as it currently exists, an exemplary design might have been able to conserve and enhance the Conservation Area to a greater extent.

2. HTVIA commentary

- 2.1 “Verified View looking at corner of North Street and Bartholomew Street East”:

2.1.1 The glazing presenting at the lowest levels to the corner seems to depict a double-height space, whereas this will be the single height workspace sitting above the glazed panels to the relatively shallow display area at pavement level.

- 2.1.2 Not clear how members of the public would be able to satisfactorily relate to the displays presenting to Bartholemew Street East given the intervening planting bed?
- 2.1.3 The image confirms the considerable challenge in resolving the threshold and entrance to the building with the steeply sloping nature of North Street.
- 2.1.4 The main entrance appears diminutive and not sufficiently legible compared to the scale of the development that it serves.
- 2.1.5 Detailing of the roof scape would benefit from greater refinement including possible reconsideration of material specification.
- 2.1.6 Six trees are shown along the Bartholemew Street East frontage – five appear on the landscape drawings.
- 2.2 “Verified View looking at corner of Bartholomew Street East and Mary Arches Street”
 - 2.2.1 Main tree depicted seems to be in front of the proposals within the street whereas it is located beyond the building footprint.
 - 2.2.2 The four small trees and low wall to the frontage shown on the landscape drawing are not included in the image.
 - 2.2.3 Detailing of the roof scape would benefit from greater refinement including possible reconsideration of material specification.
 - 2.2.4 Viewpoint is taken from a position that is much lower than the level of the site which minimises the scale impacts.
- 2.3 “Verified View looking down Mary Arches Street from Fore Street”
 - 2.3.1 Height of Ground Floor seems compressed compared to floor to floor intervals above – has the Ground Level of the model been set to the correct height relative to the site?
 - 2.3.2 Detailing of the roof scape would benefit from greater refinement including possible reconsideration of material specification.
 - 2.3.3 The appearance of the ‘vertical mansard’/attic storey that is clad in the roofing finish is poor. Weak townscape response as part of the setting of St Mary Arches church.
 - 2.3.4 The four small trees and low wall to the frontage shown on the landscape drawing are not included in the image.
- 2.4 “View looking at Building B” (unverified CGI)
 - 2.4.1 Confirms ungainly/inelegant appearance of metal-clad attic storey as a cranked side elevation (as 3.3.3 above).

- 2.5 “View looking at Public Realm” (unverified CGI)
 - 2.5.1 Interface of proposals with the boundary to Mecca Bingo site does not appear to be accurately depicted / reflect the landscape drawings.
 - 2.5.2 Large format paving not entirely suited to the semi-public route through an historic urban block.
 - 2.5.3 Detailing of the roof scape would benefit from greater refinement including possible reconsideration of material specification.
- 2.6 We would have welcomed updated verified views from St David’s Hill / The Iron Bridge (see point 1.1 above).

3. Response to revised plans (January 2026)

- 3.1 Our most recent set of comments (19.12.2025) set out a range of other (secondary) concerns about the design that it seemed possible to address before determination of the application, and we are broadly content with the architectural revisions. A companion set of revised landscape drawings was also submitted but these do not seem to have been able to address our comments regarding the design of landscape and the public realm.
- 3.1 The most recent revisions to the architectural design of the application included:
 - 3.1.1 Confirmation of the design detail at the corner of Block A, as it addresses North Street / St Bartholemew Street – to ensure that lower-level external display is proposed below the Ground Floor Level - providing some mitigation of the effect of the raised internal floor relative to the adjacent pavement.
 - 3.1.2 Reinstatement of glazed openings to all ground floor accommodation addressing North Street.
 - 3.1.3 Further improvements to the main entrance and entry sequence to the building.
 - 3.1.4 Clearer and simpler proposals for resolving the entry ‘threshold’ to Block A and its relationship to the sloping public realm of North Street. The detail of this public/private interface will need further careful scrutiny and submission of full design information should be the subject of a planning Condition.
 - 3.1.5 Better articulation of the linking element that bridges over the passageway and connects Block A with the existing streetscape frontages of North Street.

- 3.1.6 Introduction of a minor canopy to the entrance of Block B, improving legibility and asserting a stronger sense of passive security over the adjacent open space.
- 3.1.7 More generous external lobby serving the cycle stores, to allow for better ease of access/egress.
- 3.2 The further set of issues relating to the landscape/public realm design included:
 - 3.2.1 Gating / connection detail between the upper passageway from North Street to the main pedestrian route within the interior of the block.
 - 3.2.2 Accommodation of existing domestic bins that are currently casually stored (by third parties) within the interior of the block.
 - 3.2.3 Curtilage treatment / detail design at the front of Block B as part of the response to re-forming Mary Arches Street.
 - 3.2.4 Identification/definition of Bin collection points/refuges (lower and upper levels).
 - 3.2.5 Mitre Lane details (including the introduction of a further street tree as replacement for proposed seating area at corner + the area between the southwest elevation of Block A and the end of the street remains ill-defined).
 - 3.2.6 Clarity over the placement and appearance (including any mitigating landscape treatments) of the acoustic fence providing separation to the Mecca Bingo site.
 - 3.2.7 These matters have not been satisfactorily resolved and would need to be addressed through the imposition of one or more Conditions applied to any consent. We recommend that all aspects of the landscape design are reviewed (minor coordination issues are necessary and further improvements are desirable) and so a suitable Condition would usefully call for the re-submission of all landscape drawings together with planting schedules, specifications, etc. for our further written approval.
 - 3.2.8 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.

Mark Pearson, **Principal Officer, Urban Design and Landscape**, 15.01.26