

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Monday 30 March 2015

### **Present:**

Councillor Bialyk (Chair)  
Councillors Spackman, Denham, Edwards, Lyons, Mitchell, Newby, Raybould, Sutton,  
Williams and Winterbottom

### **Apologies:**

Councillor Choules

### **Also Present:**

City Development Manager, Principal Project Manager (Development) (MH) and Democratic  
Services Officer (Committees) (HB)

21

### **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were made by Members.

22

### **PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 14/4857/03 - 30 MARLBOROUGH ROAD, EXETER**

The City Development Manager presented the application for a new dwelling on  
land adjacent to No. 30 Marlborough Road, Exeter.

The recommendation was for approval subject to the conditions as set out in the  
report.

**RESOLVED** that planning permission for a new dwelling on land adjacent to No 30  
Marlborough Road, Exeter be **REFUSED** as the proposed dwelling would occupy  
an atypically small and prominent plot within Marlborough Road and would appear  
cramped and intrusive within the street-scene to the detriment of the character and  
appearance of the St Leonard's Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore  
be contrary to Paragraphs 64, 131-134 and 137 of the National Planning Policy  
Framework, Policy CP17 of the Exeter Core Strategy and Policies C1 and DG1 of the  
Exeter Local Plan First Review.

23

### **PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 14/2066/01 - LAND NORTH OF EXETER ROAD, TOPSHAM, EXETER**

The Principal Project Manager (Development) presented the application for a  
phased development of a 60 bed residential care home, 47 assisted living  
apartments and 55 age restricted dwellings.

Councillor Leadbetter, having given notice under Standing Order No 44, spoke on  
the item. He referred to the huge concerns of Topsham residents regarding the  
continual erosion of the green space between Exeter and Topsham and called for  
the protection of the Topsham Gap. He supported the recommendation for refusal.

Mr Russell spoke against the application. He raised the following points:-

- if the Topsham Gap is lost, Topsham will no longer be separated from Exeter;
- developments of this land should be resisted in accordance with the Council strategic housing policy up to 2026;
- over 1,000 Topsham residents oppose this development;
- with other developments at Newcourt and forthcoming proposals from Aldi and Heritage Homes there will be increased pressure on the local infrastructure;
- support Council stance at the Home Farm inquiry and its opposition to development on this site; and
- allowing this development will open the floodgates for further developments.

It was noted that the Council had received notification from the Planning Inspectorate that the applicant had appealed against the non-determination of the application by the Council within the prescribed period (i.e. 13 weeks from the submission date). In connection with the appeal, the Council was required to indicate what its decision would have been. Consequently, the purpose of the report was to seek a resolution from the Committee as to what its decision would have been were it free to determine the application.

The recommendation was for refusal.

**RESOLVED** that the Committee is minded to **REFUSE** planning permission for a phased development of a 60 bed residential care home, 47 assisted living apartments and 55 age restricted dwellings for the following reasons:-

- (1) the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Exeter City Council Core Strategy 2012 (the Vision, Spatial Strategy and policies CP1, CP3 and CP16), Exeter Local Plan First Review 1995-2011 (saved policies H1, H2 and LS1) and the emerging Exeter Draft Development Delivery DPD 2013 (policies DD9 and DD30) because:-
  - (i) it would result in development outside the identified strategic locations for growth contrary to the Statutory Development Plan for the area,
  - (ii) the proposal would harm the landscape setting of the city through development on the strategic gap between Topsham and Exeter that would contribute to the coalescence of the two settlements, and it would set an undesirable precedent for other nearby residential development within the strategic gap that individually, or collectively, would harm the character of the area and setting of the historic settlement of Topsham; and
- (2) in the absence of a planning obligation in terms that are satisfactory to the Local Planning Authority, and which makes provision for affordable housing, the proposal is contrary to Exeter Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2012 policy CP7, and Exeter City Council Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2014.

**APPLICATION NO. 14/4750/07 - FLAT 8, EXETER CASTLE, EXETER**

The City Development Manager presented the application for internal alterations to create mezzanine floors and installation of 3 No. roof-lights.

He reported that English Heritage had re-iterated its objection to the revised plans.

Members were circulated with an update sheet - attached to minutes.

Mr Gollop spoke in support of the application. He raised the following points:-

- purchased the Castle in 2013 and passionate about its use as a family home and re-instatement for use by the community with the intention of bringing the whole site to life;
- will continue to develop the facilities at Exeter Castle for weddings, corporate events, food festivals as well as offering luxury accommodation and will partner with stakeholders and the local community to develop as hub for business and social events and intend to invest in the long term protection of the Castle; and
- accept error made in proceeding with works without permission having not received the correct guidance and advice and have since worked in accordance with advice of planning officers.

The recommendation was for approval subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

**RESOLVED** that planning permission for internal alterations to create mezzanine floors and installation of 3 No. rooflights be **APPROVED**, subject to the following conditions:-

- 1) C08 - Time Limit - L.B. and Conservation Area.
- 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 16 March 2015 (*ArchitEXE Ltd dwg. no. 13/29/02E*), as modified by other conditions of this consent.  
**Reason:** In order to ensure compliance with the approved drawings.

**LAND TO THE REAR OF CRAWFORD HOTEL, ALPHINGTON ROAD, EXETER**

The City Development Manager presented the application for a development of four dwellings (three terrace units and one detached).

He advised that the Environment Agency had no objection on flood prevention and drainage grounds.

Members were circulated with an update sheet - attached to minutes.

Councillor Clark, having given notice under Standing Order No 44, spoke on the item. She read out a letter from a resident of Percy Road on behalf of the residents of Percy and Courtenay Roads raising the following points:-

- support the building of houses and the nature of the development but opposed to the proposed access which will impact adversely on public safety and quality of life;

- the existing parking situation is very difficult and will increase in severity through the use of Percy Road for access purposes;
- the increased traffic will disrupt a quiet residential area and with parking on both sides of the road the additional traffic will present a danger to residents, especially children;
- will lead to the use of Percy Road by heavy goods vehicles including delivery vehicles and construction traffic which will increase noise and dangerous road conditions; and
- the solution is for an access off Retail Park Close which will reduce impact on local residents.

Councillor Clark endorsed the above points and added:-

- 16 residents have objected on the website and have spoken to five;
- do not object to the development but to the proposed access and many residents refer to an access to the rear as the ideal solution rather than use of the narrow cul de sac of Percy Road;
- the Highway officer did not object but was not aware at the time that there was an option of utilising City Council land to facilitate an alternative access - this would offer both a short and long term answer to the benefit of residents.

Members considered that a preferable solution would be to access the site from Retail Park Close which could also allow an extension of the site and thus an increase in its capacity for development.

The recommendation was for approval subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

**RESOLVED** that planning permission for a development of four dwellings (three terrace units and one detached) be **DEFERRED** for discussions with the City Council regarding the possibility of access from Retail Park Close.

26

### **LIST OF DECISIONS MADE AND WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS**

The report of the Assistant Director City Development was submitted.

**RESOLVED** that the report be noted.

27

### **APPEALS REPORT**

The schedule of appeal decisions and appeals lodged was submitted.

**RESOLVED** that the report be noted.

28

### **SITE INSPECTION PARTY**

**RESOLVED** that the next Site Inspection Party will be held on Tuesday 14 April 2015 at 9.30 a.m. The Councillors attending will be Edwards, Lyons and Mottram.

(The meeting commenced at 5.30 pm and closed at 7.05 pm)

Chair