

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Monday 6 December 2010

Present:-

Councillor Mrs Henson (Chair)

Councillors Cole, D Baldwin, P J Brock, Edwards, Macdonald, Newby, Prowse, Sheldon, Sutton, Wadham and Winterbottom

Also Present

Interim Director Economy and Development, Head of Planning and Building Control, Head of Legal Services, Development Manager, Planning Solicitor and Member Services Officer (SJS)

Also Present

Devon County Council - Development Management Officer

126

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members declared the following personal (*prejudicial) interests:-

COUNCILLOR	MINUTE
Councillor D Baldwin	127 (member of the Cooperative Society) 128 (member of the Cooperative Society)
Councillor Branston	127 (member of the Cooperative Society)
Councillor P.J. Brock	127 (member of the Cooperative Society) 127 *(owner of a business in Magdalen Road) 128 (member of the Cooperative Society and an owner of a business in Magdalen Road)
Councillor Macdonald	127 (member of the Cooperative Society) 128 (member of the Cooperative Society)
Councillor Prowse	127 (a member of the Police Choir who rehearse on the site, a member of the Cooperative Society, a regular customer of the costcutter store immediately behind the site and a retired Police Officer whose place of employment was the Police Station opposite the site) 128 (a member of the Police Choir who rehearse on the site, a member of the Cooperative Society, a regular customer of the costcutter store immediately behind the site and a retired Police Officer whose place of employment was the Police Station opposite the site) 129 (student landlord)
Councillor Sutton	127 (member of the Cooperative Society) 128 (member of the Cooperative Society)
Councillor Wadham	130 *(member of Alphington Community Association and agent for the application)

Councillor Winterbottom	127 (Trustee of Exeter Municipal Charities)
	128 (Trustee of Exeter Municipal Charities)

127

PLANNING APPLICATION NO.10/1594/03 - R D & E HOSPITAL, GLADSTONE ROAD, EXETER

Councillor D Baldwin declared a personal interest as a member of the Cooperative Society.

Councillor P J Brock declared a personal interest as a member of the Cooperative Society and a personal and prejudicial interest as an owner of a business in Magdalen Road. He left the meeting during consideration of the item.

Councillor Macdonald declared a personal interest as a member of the Cooperative Society.

Councillor Prowse declared a personal interest as a member of the Police Choir who rehearse on the site, a member of the Cooperative Society, a regular customer of the costcutter store immediately behind the site and a retired Police Officer whose place of employment was the Police Station opposite the site.

Councillor Sutton declared a personal interest as a member of the Cooperative Society.

Councillor Winterbottom declared a personal interest as a Trustee of Exeter Municipal Charities.

The Head of Planning and Building Control presented the planning application for redevelopment to provide a foodstore, access, parking, landscaping and associated works at the R D & E Hospital, Gladstone Road, Exeter.

Members were advised that on 28 June 2010 an application on the same site for redevelopment to provide a food store, access, parking, landscaping and associated works had been considered by the Planning Committee. The Head of Planning and Building Control had recommended that the application be approved. It had been resolved that planning permission for the application be refused.

This application was identical to the previous application but sought to address those reasons for refusal through further information. The application would provide a food store with 2,231 square metre of net retail floor space and 227 car park spaces. The proposed building was of a contemporary design. A service area would be situated close to the Gladstone Road entrance. A four metre high red brick wall would enclose the yard and the loading facility was orientated to face away from the neighbouring hospital ward block and would be screened by the store building itself.

The Head of Planning and Building Control updated Members on how this application addressed the previous two reasons for refusal with regards to the sequential test in relation to Bus Station and impact upon emergency services.

He stated that there was no suitable available land within the next three to five years and that Land Securities had now confirmed that the Bus Station site would not be available until 2018. The Police Authority did not now object to the application. With the position of the entrance as far back from traffic lights as possible so as not to affect them; the proposed widening of Gladstone Road to two lanes, the right turn in to the site to be protected by a yellow box, two queue lanes to lights, longer right turn lane on Heavitree Road, and altered light phasing the Highways Authority did not object to the proposal.

The Head of Planning and Building Control updated Members on the traffic assessment, which had been agreed by Devon County Council. This assessment was based on the most critical period Friday's peak at 5pm to 6pm when a traffic increase in Gladstone Road from 231 to 612 vehicles and Heavitree Road of 5% to 7% was anticipated. He reported on a visit to the Ambulance Control Centre with regard to the pattern of ambulance movements.

Members were informed that the applicants had offered to provide a bespoke ambulance bay alongside the Occupational Health Unit building with direct access Heavitree Road.

Members were circulated with an update sheet giving details of the number of objections and clarification of the total site area and floor space.

The recommendation was to approve the application subject to a Section 106 legal agreement and conditions as set out in the report.

The Development Management Officer from Devon County Council (Highways) informed Members that Devon County Council had not dismissed the South West Ambulance Services objections and had looked at various highway options to overcome the concerns. The proposed measures were acceptable to the Highway Authority.

In response to a Member's question, the Development Management Officer stated that Ambulances could be fitted with transponders although he did not envisage that this would be appropriate.

Councillor Branston, having given notice under Standing Order No.44, spoke on this item. He declared a personal interest as a member of the Cooperative Society. He raised the following points:-

- the Police Authority still objected to the application although some of the minor concerns had been addressed
- had met with the Ambulance Service who still objected due to the location of the access to the store and the possible impact it could have on response times
- the three main issues were the effect on the local community, traffic impact and the sequential test
- the postcards of support were mainly from people outside of the city; local residents had objected
- would have a major impact on the air quality which already failed to meet acceptable levels; this would not improve now that Devon County Council had put its plans for the high speed bus for Exeter on hold
- the submission stated that 200 jobs would be created although 150 would only be on a part time basis; a recent survey undertaken by 'Boot's' stated that applications for larger stores resulted in an overall loss of jobs as smaller shops close as a result
- the noise of the delivery vehicles would cause noise pollution for local residents
- would increase parking pressure in the area; where would staff park?
- would have major impact on the already busy road network
- Devon County Council had not produced any evidence that the impact on the road network would be acceptable
- would reduce 'freedom of choice' as the proposal would have a negative impact on the smaller shops in the area
- the site of the proposed Ambulance Bay was not suitable coming out directly on the Heavitree Road
- John Lewis was already going to occupy part of the old Debenhams Building; there would still be vacant floor space in that building for a

- Waitrose store; this also had the advantage of being able to use the King William car park to the rear which was currently under used
- the Police Authority and Ambulance Service objected to this application; it would cause an increase in air pollution and traffic congestion; there were other more suitable sites including the Cranbrook development
- should refuse the application as it was contrary to the Council's own policies.

Councillor Hobden, having given notice under Standing Order No.44, spoke on this item. She raised the following points:-

- representing residents from a wider area
- the need to ensure that the economy of Exeter remained robust and thriving
- it would not be in the best interest of the City to turn down the application
- local traders supported the application
- would bring jobs to the City
- satisfied that it passed the sequential test
- Devon County Council Highways did not object
- the objections could not be sustained
- supported the application.

Mr Le Chevalier (representing South Western Ambulance Service) spoke against this application. He raised the following points:-

- had real concerns of the impact that this proposal could have on the effectiveness of the Ambulance Service
- was not against the development of the site
- had been in this location for 50 years; it was the ideal location
- answered 13,000 calls a year; 10,000 of those were received at the same times as Waitrose proposed opening hours
- when the service was called out every second counted
- had concerns for the safety of his crews
- do not put sirens on until have left the station so as to protect local residents
- the proposed yellow box and the alternative location for an Ambulance Bay were not acceptable
- this supermarket should not be built opposite the access to the Ambulance station.

In answer to Member's questions, Mr Le Chevalier clarified that there were three standby sites within the City, the stand by sites needed to be able to charge equipment; there was not typical day for the service; the proposed Ambulance Bay was not satisfactory as it would involve crossing a bus lane onto a busy road and would also not have any direct access on to Polsloe Road; and there were about 85 staff stationed on the site.

Mr Banham (applicant) spoke in support of the application. He raised the following points:-

- the previous reasons for refusal had now been addressed
- Land Securities had confirmed that the Bus Station site would not be available until 2018
- the Police Authority were satisfied with the extra lane on Gladstone Road and the yellow box
- had proposed a Ambulance bay adjacent to the Occupational Health Unit building with direct access on to Heavitree Road
- Devon County Council Highways had no objection;
- given the view of South West Ambulance Services that 'any' delay to their response times would be opposed would expect that on that basis they would object to further development within the City Centre.

In answer to Member's questions, Mr Banham clarified that a yellow box would be sited opposite the Ambulance Station entrance in Gladstone Road to prevent any congestion of the access. Waitrose had been looking for 10 years for a suitable site in Exeter this had included the Bus Station site and the former Debenhams building.

During a lengthy discussion, Members raised the following points:-

- Waitrose had undertaken extensive research into a suitable location for a store
- Devon County Council Highways had not raised any objections
- would reduce carbon footprint as residents would not have to travel to Sidmouth or Okehampton to visit Waitrose; also delivery vans would not have to travel such a distance
- generally more residents write in to object than they do to support a development
- can not ignore the 124 local residents who objected to the proposal
- a Waitrose store was a positive for Exeter
- the Ambulance Service had not provided any data to support the objections
- this site would be developed; any development would generate traffic
- concerns regarding noise pollution of delivery traffic, parking for staff; and the objections of the Ambulance Service
- why could there not be a yellow box at the junction of Gladstone Road with Heavitree Road?
- should the start times of construction in condition 14 be 7.00am or 8.00am?

The Development Management Officer stated that the County Council had not undertaken its own traffic assessment although they had checked the figures submitted by Waitrose. The Ambulance Service had not undertaken any traffic assessment.

RESOLVED that the application for redevelopment to provide foodstore, access, parking, landscaping and associated works be **approved** subject to a Section 106 legal agreement as detailed in the report and the following conditions:-

- 1) C05 - Time Limit - Commencement
- 2) C15 - Compliance with Drawings
- 3) C17 - Submission of Materials
- 4) C35 - Landscape Scheme
- 5) With the exception of those already identified and in accordance with the submitted landscaping plan, no trees shall be felled, lopped or removed without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To safeguard the rights of control by the Local Planning Authority in these respects and in the interests of amenity.
- 6) C37 - Replacement Planting
- 7) C57 - Archaeological Recording
- 8) C70 - Contaminated Land
- 9) A detailed Green Travel Plan shall be provided and agreed with the Local Planning Authority prior to the opening of the development for trading.
Reason: To ensure that appropriate measures are in place to encourage and develop the use of alternative travel modes to the private car.

- 10) Prior to construction, a programme of works and details of construction traffic access and management shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure that traffic access to the site during the construction phase does not disrupt traffic flow or result in undue detriment to highway safety.
- 11) Unless otherwise agreed in writing, noise levels generated by the fixed plant installed as part of this development shall not exceed an LAeq(1 hour) of 37 dB (0700-2300) and 29 dB (230-00700) at the Grendon Road boundary, and 43 dB (0700-2300) and 32 dB(2300-0700) at the Gladstone Road boundary. Compliance with these levels should be demonstrated prior to occupation and maintained thereafter.
Reason: In the interests of local amenity.
- 12) Unless otherwise agreed in writing, no development shall take place until a report is submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority detailing noise levels from deliveries and handling of these. The report shall contain details of predicted noise levels, hours of deliveries etc. The applicant should submit for approval a deliveries management plan which describes (in an enforceable manner) how the levels specified in the report will be achieved. It should be made clear in the plan that the proposals do not conflict with health and safety requirements, for example in respect of reversing beepers. Thereafter the deliveries shall be managed entirely in accordance with the approved management plan
Reason: In the interests of local amenity.
- 13) The store shall not be open to the public outside the hours of 7am and 11pm. **Reason:** In the interests of local amenity.
- 14) Unless otherwise agreed in writing, construction work and associated deliveries shall not take place outside the hours of 7am and 7pm (Monday to Friday), 8am and 1pm (Saturday) and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.
Reason: In the interests of local amenity.
- 15) Prior to the commencement of development, a Construction/Demolition Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and adhered to during the construction period. This should include details of monitoring and mitigation measures to control the environmental impact of the development during the construction and demolition phases, including site traffic and emissions of noise and dust. This should include details of the phasing and timing of work to minimise noisy activities on Saturdays and measures that will minimise the impact of construction traffic on the local road network, including parking. The CEMP should contain a procedure for handling and investigating complaints as well as provision for regular meetings with appropriate representatives from the Local Authorities during this phase of the development, in order to discuss forthcoming work and its environmental impact.
Reason: In the interests of local amenity.
- 16) No development shall take place until details of the kitchen extraction equipment to be used in the café and food preparation areas has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details should include the information listed in annex B of the DEFRA document 'Guidance on the Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Systems'. Unless otherwise agreed in writing,

the development shall be implemented and subsequently maintained in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: In the interests of local amenity.

- 17) No development shall take place until a Wildlife Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the requirements of the Wildlife Management Plan shall be implemented by the applicant.

Reason: In the interests of preserving and enhancing wildlife opportunities in the area.

- 18) No more than 350 square metres of the overall sales floorspace of the store shall be used for the sale of comparison goods.

Reason: To safeguard the vitality and viability of the existing retail areas.

- 19) No development shall take place until details of the finished floor levels have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the works shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the development takes place at an appropriate level in relation to neighbouring buildings and the street scene.

- 20) No development shall take place until full details of the recycling facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall take place only in accordance with these details.

Reason: In the interests of ensuring the operational efficiency of the facilities and in the interests of visual amenity.

- 21) The sandstone elements of the building hereby approved shall be constructed in "Aerolite" red sandstone unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

- 22) The building hereby approved shall achieve a Final BREEAM Level Excellent in accordance with the requirements of the relevant BREEAM scheme. The building shall not be brought into use unless and until a Final BREEAM Certificate has been issued for it, certifying that Final BREEAM Level Excellent has been achieved.

Reason: To ensure that the development is sustainable and makes efficient use of energy, water and materials.

In the event that the Section 106 legal agreement is not completed before 24 December 2010, authority be delegated to the Head of Planning Services to refuse permission for the reason that inadequate provision has been made for the matters which were intended to be dealt with in the Section 106 agreement.

(Report circulated)

128 **PLANNING APPLICATION NO.10/1596/03 - R D & E HOSPITAL, GLADSTONE ROAD, EXETER**

Councillor D Baldwin declared a personal interest as a member of the Cooperative Society.

Councillor P J Brock declared a personal interest as a member of the Cooperative Society and as an owner of a business in Magdalen Road. He did not vote on this application.

Councillor Macdonald declared a personal interest as a member of the Cooperative Society.

Councillor Prowse declared a personal interest as a member of the Police Choir who rehearse on the site, a member of the Cooperative Society, a regular customer of the costcutter store immediately behind the site and a retired Police Officer whose place of employment was the Police Station opposite the site.

Councillor Sutton declared a personal interest as a member of the Cooperative Society.

Councillor Winterbottom declared a personal interest as a Trustee of Exeter Municipal Charities.

The Head of Planning and Building Control presented the planning application for the re-orientation of car park at the R D & E Hospital, Gladstone Road, Exeter. The proposal would involve the loss of six car parking spaces and the removal of a hedge and tree.

The recommendation was to approve the application subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

RESOLVED that the application for re-orientation of car park be **approved** subject to the following conditions:-

- 1) C05 - Time Limit - Commencement
- 2) C15 - Compliance with Drawings
- 3) C35 - Landscape Scheme
- 4) With the exception of those already identified and in accordance with the submitted landscaping plan, no trees shall be felled, lopped or removed without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To safeguard the rights of control by the Local Planning Authority in these respects and in the interests of amenity.
- 5) C37 - Replacement Planting
- 6) C38 - Trees - Temporary Fencing
- 7) Construction/demolition work shall not take place outside the following times: 8am to 6pm (Mondays to Fridays); 8am to 1pm (Saturdays); nor at any time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.
Reason: In the interests of local amenity.

(Report circulated)

Councillor Prowse declared a personal interest as a student landlord.

The Development Manager presented the planning application for a change of use from a six person house in multiple occupation to an eight person house in multiple occupation, cycle store on south elevation and rooflights (2) on west elevation at 9 Thornton Hill, Exeter.

Members were advised that the ground and first floor layout would remain the same and the two vacant rooms on the second floor would be converted into bedrooms. The only elevational changes would be the insertion of two velux roof lights in the loft storage space.

Members were circulated with an update sheet giving details of an additional letter of objection and information that the Head of Environmental Health Services had confirmed that the new bedrooms had an acceptable standard of amenity. Members were informed of a late letter of the objection that had been received from the Civic Society.

The recommendation was to approve the application subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

Councillor Mitchell, having given notice under Standing Order No.44, spoke on this item. He raised the following points:-

- been before the Committee many times recently with regards to student accommodation in this area
- was already an over concentration of students in this area
- the Council's policies with regards to the zones of student accommodation were out of date
- a similar application for an HMO submitted a few months ago at 7 Thornton Hill had been refused by this Committee; this refusal was now the subject of an appeal
- to keep an element of consistency this application should be refused
- was contrary to the Council's Local Plan Policy H5 as would change the character of the area and create an imbalance
- the report stated that as the property was an end terrace with only one adjoining wall to another HMO; do students not have rights?
- the appeal defence of 7 Thornton Hill stated that the proposal was contrary to the Devon County Structure Plan and the Council's Local Plan policies as it would cause an increase in noise and activity and would be detrimental to local residents amenity; this application would cause the same issues
- was in the Longbrook Conservation Area; this proposal would not enhance or preserve the area and would have a negative impact on the character of the area
- would exacerbate the problems already in the area
- would cause noise nuisance by late comings and goings and loud music; would be lack of maintenance; problems with excess refuse on the street; and cause problems with on street parking
- this application should be refused as it was overdevelopment of the site.

In answer to a Member's question, Councillor Mitchell stated that, although there were parking restrictions in place, it was not possible to prevent students from bringing cars to the City.

Mr H Temple (representing Thornton West Resident's Association) spoke against this application. He raised the following points:-

- majority of local residents objected to this proposal
- it was becoming difficult to retain a mixed community in the area with the recent approvals for student accommodation on the Bishop Blackhall site and adjacent tennis courts
- would increase anti social behaviour, late night noise in the area and problems with refuse
- not many families left living in the area
- asked Committee to reject the application.

Mr D Canter (applicant) spoke in support of the application. He raised the following points:-

- had reassured neighbours that this proposal would not cause problems and he would respond to any reasonable concerns
- the Bishop Blackhall site was on Pennsylvania Road
- was different to the application for 7 Thornton Hill as this property was already a HMO
- this application should be assessed on its own merits
- this proposal was not for the creation of a new HMO
- cycle and refuse storage would be provided
- the size of the rooms were above the minimum standards
- would not impact on the neighbours.

In answer to Member's questions, Mr Canter clarified that he currently lived overseas although he had a Manager who lived in the city who would deal with any problems, he had had only one email of complaint which had been dealt with and the property had been let as a HMO since September 2009.

Whilst some Members did have concerns regarding additional student accommodation in this area, other Members were of the view that this proposal was a modest increase and was acceptable.

RESOLVED that the application for change of use from a six person house in multiple occupation to an eight person house in multiple occupation, cycle store on south elevation and rooflights (2) on west elevation be **approved** subject to the following conditions:-

- 1) 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 ensure compliance with sections 91-92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- 2) 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 the 12 October 2010, as modified by other conditions of this consent.
Reason: In order to ensure compliance with the approved drawings.
- 3) Samples of the materials it is intended to use externally in the construction of the development shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and the development shall not be started before their approval is obtained in writing and the materials used in the construction of the development shall correspond with the approved samples in all respects.
Reason: To ensure that the materials conform with the visual amenity requirements of the area.
- 4) All new rooflights shall be of a conservation type, the exact type and size of which shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority prior to its fixing.
Reason: To protect and preserve the character of the listed building.
- 5) No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until all residents have been issued with a Green Travel Pack to inform them that they will not qualify for on-street parking permits and shall include the locations, routes and times of public transport services, the locations of walking and cycle routes, central shopping and leisure facilities in accordance with details that shall previously have been submitted to, agreed

and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall be updated annually.

Reason: To ensure that all residents are aware of the car free status of the development.

- 6) No part of the development hereby approved shall be brought into its intended use until the cycle parking facilities have been provided in accordance with the requirements of this permission and retained for that purpose at all times.

Reason: To ensure that adequate facilities are available for the traffic attracted to the site.

(Report circulated)

130 **PLANNING APPLICATION NO.10/1718/03 - THE COMMUNITY CENTRE,
CHURCH ROAD, ALPHINGTON, EXETER**

Councillor Wadham declared a personal and prejudicial interest as a member of Alphington Community Association and as the agent for the application. He left the meeting during consideration of the item.

The Head of Planning and Building Control present the planning application for a community noticeboard on the east boundary at the Community Centre, Church Road, Alphington, Exeter.

The recommendation was to approve the application subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

RESOLVED that the application for a community noticeboard on the east elevation be **approved** subject to the following conditions:-

- 1) C05 - Time Limit - Commencement
- 2) C15 - Compliance with Drawings
- 3) Unless otherwise agreed in writing, the aluminium frame and legs of the notice board hereby permitted shall be coloured black.
Reason: In the interests of the character and appearance of the adjacent listed building and the Alphington Conservation Area.

(Report circulated)

131 **TREE PRESERVATION ORDER NO. 623 (FOLLETT ORCHARD, FOLLETT
ROAD, EXETER) 2010**

The Development Manager presented the report to update Members on an objection that had been received by the Council to Exeter City Council Tree Preservation Order No. 623 (Follett Orchard, Follett Road, Topsham, Exeter) 2010.

Members were advised that Tree Preservation Order No. 623 protected one Eucalyptus tree in the side garden of Follett Orchard, Follett Road, Topsham, Exeter. The Tree Preservation Order was made following a conservation area notification to prune branches back to the main trunk of the Eucalyptus which overhung the boundary with Barn House, Exe Street, Topsham.

Mr Pidgeon (owner of the tree) spoke in support of the Tree Preservation Order. He raised the following points:-

- the Tree Preservation Order was made as a result of an application to prune the tree

- the tree was at no risk of dropping its branches
- heavy pruning could result in damage to the tree; even causing silver leaf disease
- any re-growth would be rapid and these branches would be more likely to drop
- the residents at 'Barn House' who wanted to prune the tree had only recently moved in to the property
- the tree had been planted long before the surrounding dwellings were built and should be protected.

RESOLVED that the order be confirmed without modification.

(Report circulated)

132 **TREE PRESERVATION ORDER NO. 624 (5 HARRINGTON LANE, EXETER) 2010**

The Development Manager presented the report to update Members on details of objections that had been received by the Council to Exeter City Council Tree Preservation Order No. 624 (5 Harrington Lane, Exeter) 2010.

Members were advised that Tree Preservation Order No. 624 protected one Horse Chestnut, three Thujas and two Cedar trees located within the side garden of 5 Harrington Lane, Exeter. Tree Preservation Order 624 was made following a report that the trees were to be felled. The owner would like to keep the Cedar trees. However, one of the Cedar trees was in decline with the crown thinning and damage around the base of the tree. The two trees had grown together and the removal of one would leave the other susceptible to damage from high winds. It was proposed to exclude the Cedars from the Tree Preservation Order.

RESOLVED that the order be confirmed with a modification to exclude the two cedar trees.

(Report circulated)

133 **PLANNING DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED POWERS AND WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS**

The report of the Head of Planning and Building Control was submitted.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

(Report circulated)

134 **LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT**

The Head of Planning and Building Control presented the report to consider the content of the Local Development Framework Annual Monitoring Report. He updated Members on the main conclusions with regards to the Local Development Scheme and the monitoring results and advised that the Annual Monitoring Report, if approved, would be submitted to the Secretary of State.

Members were advised that, due to the judgement on the abolishment of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), submission of the Core Strategy was now delayed slightly for further work to justify 12,000 homes instead of 15,000 homes and the Council was also waiting to see what impact the Localism Bill could have. The Council was expected to submit the Core Strategy in early January 2011.

The housing completions were down to 365 and this was the third year that they had fallen from the peak of 891 in 2006/07. The Council was required to maintain a five year supply of housing otherwise it could be in danger of developers going to appeal. The Council currently had five years and one month's supply of housing land.

RESOLVED that the Annual Monitoring Report 2010 be approved for submission to the Secretary of State.

(Report circulated)

135

ENFORCEMENT PROGRESS REPORT

The Head of Planning and Building Control presented the report updating Members on enforcement matters. Members were advised that the appeal decision on 26 Victoria Road, Topsham had been dismissed and the notice varied.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

(Report circulated)

136

APPEALS REPORT

The Head of Planning and Building Control presented the report detailing the schedule of appeal decisions and appeals lodged.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

(Report circulated)

137

SITE INSPECTION PARTY

RESOLVED that the next Site Inspection Party will be held on Tuesday 4 January 2011 at 9.30 a.m. The Councillors attending will be Edwards, Prowse and Wadham.

(The meeting commenced at 5.30 pm and closed at 8.25 pm)

Chair