

PLANNING COMMITTEE

09 February 2026

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Correspondence received and matters arising following preparation of the Agenda

Item 5: Planning Application No. 25/1082/FUL - Clarendon House

10.0 Consultations

The following additional response(s) have been received in addition to the responses received and reported in Section 10 of the Agenda Report.

Tree Manager (Devon Tree Services for ECC):

Report to be amended to replace the words:

“(No further response received following review of additional information).”

With:

“Further Response Following Review of Additional Information:

“Following review of the submitted Arboricultural Method Statement, it satisfactorily addresses my concerns regarding the protection and retention of Tree T4. No Objection”

A further objection has been received from the **Exeter Civic Society**. As a result, the following wording should be added to the report under their first objection on pages 47-49:

“Further Response Following Review of Additional Information:

After reviewing additional documents and researching policy context, ECS argue that the heritage harm caused by the scheme has not been properly assessed. They consider that national guidance requires a cumulative assessment of harm, considering other nearby tall buildings and emerging developments. In the absence of such an assessment they argue that it is not possible to conclude that the harm is outweighed by public benefits.

They state that the Council’s Urban Design & Landscape Officer has stated that ‘preserving key views would require a maximum six-storey height, demonstrating that a less harmful alternative exists but has not been explored. Reference is made to NPPF heritage policy requiring justification and minimising of harm.

They reiterate concerns about overbearing massing, overshadowing, and the risk of setting a precedent for further high-rise development that could irreversibly alter Exeter’s character. They also argue the scheme conflicts with NPPF guidance on avoiding entrenchment of townscape decline.

In relation to emerging Exeter Plan Policy H6 [officers assume that they mean H10 as that is the policy that refers to PBSA], they state that communal kitchen provision is insufficient, especially for 134 studio rooms. They also note the absence of car-share

measures required in comparable approvals. The Society concludes that avoidable harm should not be accepted and urges refusal.”

11.0 Representations

Three additional representations have been received from members of the public. Of these an objection from one had already been received and had been taken into account in the summary of representations. As this does not raise any new issues, no formal change to the report is required.

The second objection raises concerns relating to the need for student housing and the scale of the building and its design, which it states should create a welcoming entrance to the city centre but instead is ‘an ugly monstrosity’.

The final additional objection focuses on the impacts on the view of the Cathedral from Clifton Hill. This objector states that this has not been analysed and should be assessed before determination. Officers advise in response that clearly this assessment has been undertaken and members will be aware of the results when taking a decision.

Following these additional representations, the summary of public representations reported in section 11 of the report should be updated to the following:

“Comments have been made by **21** contributors. 20 of these object, with 1 neutral commentator requesting information about the business opportunities presented by the development. The 21 objections include one from one of the ward Councillors, and two from heritage/amenity groups: the Devon Buildings Group and the Devon Archaeological Society.”

16.0 Planning Assessment

Following a review of the recently updated Local Plan evidence base in relation to retail uses, officers have reappraised the acceptability of one of the uses which would be permitted for the 210sq m ground floor commercial/community use. Following this further review, officers have reached a slightly different conclusion.

For this reason, officers propose a change to the wording of the first paragraph of page 64 of the report, which falls under the main heading:

1. The Principle of the Proposed Uses

And the subheading:

Principle of Proposed Commercial / Community Use

From

“For these reasons, officers consider the ground floor uses acceptable in principle, and do not consider conditions to limit uses within these Use Classes to be necessary”

To:

“For these reasons, whilst officers consider the proposed ground floor uses acceptable in principle, a retail use in this location would not be acceptable without further assessment. As such a condition is proposed to prevent a change of use of the floorspace to retail (Use Class E(a)) without the need for planning permission.”

Officers also propose to add a condition as set out under comments for S18.0 below.

Corrections and Clarifications

A number of minor errors have been identified in the report. Corrections are as follows:

1. The report states (page 72, 102) that the scheme was considered at two sittings of the Exeter Design Review Panel whereas in fact it was three: 12th September 2023, 29th February 2024, and 4th September 2024.
2. The likely CIL receipt reported on page 60 of the report was based on all the floorspace proposed (5772sq m GIA). The calculation overlooked that fact that the 210 sq m commercial/community unit would be liable at a rate of £0/sq m. As such, the calculation for the estimated CIL receipt should read as follows:

*Total GIA proposed (11,182sq m) – GIA to be demolished (5410sq m) – GIA charged at £0/sq m (210) = Net additional (chargeable) GIA (5562sq m) @ £157.48 per sq m = **£875,903.76**.*

Members' attention is drawn to the fact (as confirmed in the following sentence) that the final amount will be confirmed to the applicant in a CIL liability notice in any case, but that the estimated liability is revised as set out above.

The incorrect CIL figure is also included on page 99, where it should be replaced with the figure **£875,903.76**.

3. Whilst the report correctly states the proposed Biodiversity Net Gain as 139% on pages 22 and 80, it incorrectly quotes it as 129% on page 99.
4. In respect of comments made towards the bottom of page 99, Members are asked to note the following clarification: as the financial contributions secured towards greenspace and primary healthcare, along with the CIL receipt, are payments to mitigate the impacts of the development, they should not be considered to be public benefits to be weighed against heritage harm. This is important as the heritage balancing exercise in this case is critical to the determination of the application.
5. Finally, members of the committee should note that all of the planning conditions have been agreed by the applicant, including that proposed as an additional condition on the update sheet below.

18.0 Recommendation

Add the following condition, as number 38:

Notwithstanding S55(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and/or the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, and any Order revoking and re-enacting that

Order with or without modification, the commercial unit at ground floor shall not be used for purposes within Class E(a) (Shop other than for the sale of hot food) as defined in the Use Classes Order 1987 (as amended) without the express approval in writing in advance of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To maintain control over the location of retail uses which may not be considered to be acceptable in this location as a result of the fact that whilst it lies within the City Centre boundary, it lies outside the area identified as the 'Primary Shopping Area' (within both the adopted Development Plan and the submitted Exeter Plan) which is the sequentially preferred location for retail uses.