

**PLANNING COMMITTEE
30 SEPTEMBER 2013**

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Correspondence received and matters arising following preparation of the Agenda

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Item 4 Pages 5-14 Ref: 13/3135/03 Clydesdale Road and Belvidere Road Exeter</p> | <p>No further update.</p> |
| <p>Item 5 Pages 15-46 Ref: 13/3822/03 Exeter Golf & Country Club Topsham Road Exeter</p> | <p>A letter has been received from Barton Willmore, agents for Persimmon Homes and Charles Church, who have seen the officer's report and support its recommendation. It is précised as follows:</p> <p>BW consider that there are a number of issues contained with the letter from JLL which are inaccurate or stray from planning considerations. JLL suggest that the reason for the current application is because Persimmon refused to make a financial contribution – this is entirely inappropriate. There is absolutely no reason why Persimmon should be obligated to pay the Club to fulfil their responsibilities.</p> <p>JLL suggest that the future of the Club rests entirely on this proposal and criticises Persimmon by suggesting that they do not consider the Club's future operation to be a good enough reason for the fencing. There is no doubt that the fencing will have a significant impact on the visual appearance not only of the immediate locality but also the wider area. This is a high impact solution to the problem. JLL's Planning Statement states that this is the Club's preferred option. We have seen no justification to demonstrate that this option is the most appropriate solution. We have seen no justification as to why this netting is required on the boundary of the RNSD site but not for the other boundaries with existing dwellings.</p> <p>JLL's letter quotes the insurer's statement. This statement does not mean that by refusing the application that the Club would be unable to operate, they would have taken 'every reasonable measure' to secure boundaries from risk but their preferred solution would be found to be unacceptable. It would be for the Club to look at other 'reasonable measures'. We have seen evidence to suggest that existing holes could be re-orientated and cannot see a fence as the only possible way of retaining the operation of the Club.</p> <p>G&CC's own practice ground is allocated for development within the Newcourt Masterplan. We question why the Club consider the RNSD site to be a risk whilst allowing development of their own land. This undermines their justification for the application.</p> <p>JLL refer to pictures of examples of netting, however, none of the examples are in a residential context and few are of the scale proposed. Any suggestion that these images provide a true representation of the appearance of the netting is entirely misleading. There is no reason why an inappropriate form of development should be permitted purely because it is the Club's preferred option. It is not the only option to</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>safeguard the Club's operation and the Council should not be afraid to refuse the application on the basis of the threat that its future would be at risk when there is no evidence that demonstrates that there are no other options available. We support the reasons for refusal.</p> |
| <p>Item 6 Pages 47-56 Ref: 13/3883/03 16 Marlborough Road Exeter</p> | <p>No further update.</p> |
| <p>Item 7 Pages 57-62 Ref: 13/3654/03 Longacre Higher Hoopern Lane Exeter</p> | <p>Arboricultural Report received 23 September.</p> <p><i>Summary of the impact of the proposed development on the existing trees:</i></p> <p>The proposed development is to extend the existing house on a very similar foot print to the existing one, with an extension on the footprint of the original building. The proposed installation of a new floor to the northern section will not alter the relationship between the house and the trees. (See para 12.4-12.6 of Arb. Report).</p> <p>The site contains minor trees within the front (southern) garden and a large mature group of trees in the rear (northern) garden. The adjacent site to the east contains a line of large (TPO) Monterey pines that are close to the site boundary.</p> <p>The proposed footprint of the building will have a very similar relationship with the trees as existing. Whilst the trees are relatively dominant the proposed extensions and alterations will not worsen the relationship between the trees and the house. The extension will be built on the footprint of the existing concrete slab and all the works will take place outside the root protection areas of the trees. In the rear garden roots are restricted by an existing retaining wall that is being retained.</p> <p>The impact of the proposed development on the good quality trees will be very low. A total of three trees are proposed for removal including:</p> <p>Tree 1 (Ash). To provide more space for the adjacent pines and to provide space for construction and storage.</p> <p>Tg1 (Spruce trees). Comprises of poor quality spruce trees with a very limited viability. Their removal provides space to construct the extension. Their loss will not be visible from outside the site.</p> <p>Tg 6a & b (small trees and shrubs) as they are in direct conflict with the building position). Their removal will entail the loss of small trees and shrubs that only provide an internal benefit to the site. Their removal will provide room for machinery and storage space allowing the better quality trees to be protected without any conflict with the construction operations. The loss of these trees will have no impact on the wider landscape.</p> <p>The Tree Protection Plan has been confirmed by the ECC Arboricultural Officer that the development can be achieved without detriment to the adjacent trees.</p> |

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Item 8 Pages 63-70 Ref: 13/3429/03 Millbrook Village Topsham Road Exeter | No further update. |
| Item 9 Pages 71-76 Ref: 13/4068/29 Pinn Court Farm Pinn Court Lane Exeter | No further update. |