

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
HELD AT FOLLATON HOUSE, TOTNES, ON WEDNESDAY, 13 JANUARY 2010**

MEMBERS

* Cllr G J Fielden - Chairman

* Cllr D W May - Vice-Chairman

* Cllr H D Bastone

* Cllr J Brazil

* Cllr B F Cane

∅ Cllr R J Carter

* Cllr S E Cooper

* Cllr P Coulson

∅ Cllr J D Hawkins

* Cllr M J Hicks

* Cllr P W Hitchins

* Cllr I Longrigg

* Cllr D M O'Callaghan

* Cllr J T Pennington

* Cllr R Rowe

* Cllr J W Squire

* Cllr R C Steer

* Cllr R J Vint

* Cllr A Ward

* Cllr J A Westacott MBE

* Denotes attendance

∅ Denotes apologies for absence

Also in attendance and participating: for application number 49/1162/08/F: Cllr J I G Blackler and application number 27/1857/09/CU: Cllr M F Saltern

Officers in attendance:

All Agenda Items: Head of Planning and Building Control, Area Planning Officer (Western Area), Solicitor and Senior Member Support Officer;

Agenda items 56/0928/09/O and 52/1442/09/F: Area Planning Officer (Eastern Area);

Agenda item 52/1442/09/F Landscape and Recreation Officer;

Agenda items 56/0928/09/O, 52/1442/09/F, 49/1162/08/F and 62/0785/09/F Affordable Housing Manager and Enabling and Development Officer.

Also in attendance: an officer from the County Highways Authority

DC.44/09 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 9 December 2009 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

DC.45/09 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members and officers were invited to declare any interests in the items of business to be considered during the course of the meeting. These were recorded as follows:-

Cllr R Rowe declared a personal interest in planning application number 52/1442/09/F (Residential development comprising the erection of 50 houses and associated roads, parking and open space – Rowes Farm, Aish Road, Stoke Gabriel, TQ9 6PX) by virtue of being the Chairman of Stoke Gabriel in Bloom Committee on which one of the objectors was also a member.

For clarification, Cllr Rowe also asked that the minutes state that whilst the site shared the same title as her surname, she has no connection with Rowes Farm.

Cllr Cane declared a personal and prejudicial interest in planning application number 49/1162/08/F (Erection of 65 dwellings (25% affordable housing), provision of site for future village hall and car park, open space, access, servicing and landscaping – Harris Way Development Site West, Lee Mill, Ivybridge) by virtue of being related to the applicant. Subsequently he left the meeting during consideration of this item.

Cllr Cane declared a personal and prejudicial interest in planning application number 62/0785/09/F (construction and conversion to provide 21 residential units with associated works – National Shire Horse Centre, Dunstone, Yealmpton, Plymouth) by virtue of him renting land from the applicant. Subsequently he left the meeting during consideration of this item.

Cllr Fielden declared a personal and prejudicial interest in planning application number 62/0785/09/F (construction and conversion to provide 21 residential units with associated works – National Shire Horse Centre, Dunstone, Yealmpton, Plymouth) by virtue of him having acted for the applicant's company in his employment capacity. Subsequently he left the meeting during consideration of this item.

Cllr May declared a personal interest in application number 62/0785/09/F (construction and conversion to provide 21 residential units with associated works – National Shire Horse Centre, Dunstone, Yealmpton, Plymouth) by virtue of him knowing both the applicant and the objector. He remained in the meeting during the discussion and abstained from taking part in the vote on this application.

Cllrs Coulson, Hicks, Hitchins, and Squire declared a personal interest in planning application number 62/0785/09/F (construction and conversion to provide 21 residential units with associated works – National Shire Horse Centre, Dunstone, Yealmpton, Plymouth) by virtue of their knowing of the applicant. These Members all remained in the meeting and took part in the vote and debate thereon.

DC.46/09 **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The Chairman announced that the following members of the public had registered their wish to speak at the meeting:-

- 56/0928/09/O: Objector – Mr Tony Whitty; Supporter – Mr Peter Sutton; Mixed use development comprising, up to 6,300 sq.m. marine and business centre and further offices; up to 11,000 sq.m. boat storage; a continuing care retirement community including up to 60 bed nursing home and up to 100 assisted living units and communal facilities; up to 250 dwellings comprising open market, affordable housing and live/work accommodation; up to 950 sq.m. of café and restaurant uses; small scale retail, financial and professional services; public plaza; car parking; internal roads, cycleways and paths; formal and informal open recreation space; wetland area; riverside walkway; and electricity substations – Baltic Wharf Ltd, Baltic Wharf, Totnes, TQ9 5EW;
- 52/1442/09/F: Objector – Mr Clive Hammett; Supporter – Mrs Charlotte Bentley: Residential development comprising the erection of 50 houses and associated roads, parking and open space – Rowes Farm, Aish Road, Stoke Gabriel TQ9 6PX;
- 49/1162/08/F: Supporters – Mrs Sally Fairman and Mr D Dunlop (NB: these supporters shared the three minute time slot allowed); Erection of 65 dwellings (25% affordable housing), provision of site for future village hall and car park, open space, access, servicing and landscaping - Harris Way Development Site West, Lee Mill, Ivybridge;
- 62/0785/09/F: Objector – Mr Stephen Body; Supporter – Mr Gavin Davies; Construction and conversion to provide 21 residential units with associated works – National Shire Horse Centre, Dunstone, Yealmpton, Plymouth;
- 35/1772/09/F: Objector – Mr Andrew Whittaker; Supporter – Mrs Amanda Burden; Retrospective application for retention of agricultural equipment store with associated change of levels of land. Resubmission of 35/0479/09 – Gate Farm, Brownston, Ivybridge, PL21 0SQ;
- 58/2002/09/F: Supporter – Mr Alan Howarth; Re-submission of 58/0981/09/F for erection of detached dwelling with integral garage in garden, south of existing dwelling – 44 Hawthorn Park Road, Wembury, PL9 0DB;
- 27/1857/09/CU: Objector – Mr Mel Vincent; Change of use from retail unit (A1) to Dental Surgery (D1) – 56 Fore Street, Ivybridge, PL21 9AE;
- 41/1894/09/F & 41/1893/09/CA: Supporter – Mrs Johnstone; (i) demolition of existing building (B2 use) and replacement with a live/work unit & (ii) Conservation Area Consent for demolition of existing building (B2 use) and replacement with a live/work unit – The Bothy, Church Street, Salcombe, TQ8 8DH.

DC.47/09 **SITE INSPECTIONS**(a) **Applications deferred at this meeting****RESOLVED**

That a Site Inspection Group comprising the Chairman and four other Members who were present at the meeting be appointed to consider applications deferred at this meeting for that purpose.

(b) **Report of the Site Inspection Group held on 23 November 2009**(i) **(02/1827/09/F) Resubmission of householder application 02/1025/08/F for alterations and extension to dwelling – Ashleigh, Rock Hill, Aveton Gifford, TQ7 4JT**

A report was presented of the Committee Site Inspection Group in respect of the above planning application, which contained a recommendation that the application be conditionally approved.

A Member of the Site Inspection Group introduced the item and stated that the Group had looked in detail at the application site and felt that, on balance, the application should be conditionally approved. Other Members of the Group agreed and the following motion was **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED** and on being put to the vote was declared **CARRIED**:

‘That in respect of application number 02/1827/09/F the application be conditionally approved’.

It was then:-

RESOLVED

That in respect of application number 02/1827/09/F, the application be conditionally approved.

DC.48/09 **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The Head of Planning and Building Control submitted details of planning applications as indicated in Appendix A to these minutes.

During discussion of these planning applications, the following motions (which were in contradiction to the planning officer recommendations in the published agenda report, or were determined by a Chairman’s casting vote) were **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED** and on being put to the vote were either **CARRIED** or **LOST**:-

- a) In respect of application 56/0928/09/O (Mixed use development comprising, up to 6,300 sq.m. marine and business centre and further offices; up to 11,000 sq.m. boat storage; a continuing care retirement community including up to 60 bed nursing home and up to 100 assisted living units and communal facilities; up to 250 dwellings comprising open market, affordable housing and live/work accommodation; up to 950 sq.m. of café and restaurant uses; small scale retail, financial and professional services; public plaza; car parking; internal roads, cycleways and paths; formal and informal open recreation space; wetland area; riverside walkway; and electricity substations – Baltic Wharf Ltd, Baltic Wharf, Totnes, TQ9 5EW), the Area Planning Officer (APO) introduced the report by stating that this was an outline application and in principle approval was being sought. The APO showed a number of plans and photographs to help illustrate the application and the separate zones for different use were identified.

Section plans were also shown to attempt to indicate heights within the development. The APO also gave an explanation in relation to the numbers of residential units proposed. The Committee was reminded that at the Council meeting on 17 December 2009, Members had agreed to allocations of housing across the District to be included in the Site Allocation DPD (Minute 65/09 refers). The numbers proposed in this application did not match those proposed in the Site Allocation DPD, however the numbers in the DPD were for a smaller area, and the numbers proposed in this application were felt to be acceptable on a dwellings per hectare basis for a built up area as stated in Policy CS2. In fact, both the Totnes Southern Area and the Waterside Area were based on higher figures and these examples showed that the numbers were not sacrosanct but that each development should be based on the characteristics of the site. Finally, the APO then advised Members of corrections to the published case officer report as follows:

- Page 20 – Totnes Preferred Options did not specifically state a residential figure of about 150;
- Page 72 Para 9.46 – the development will be ‘cost neutral’ to the developer who will get no additional profit;
- Page 83 Para 10.28 – the ‘Totnes Transport Package Group’ should be replaced with Devon County Council; and
- Page 84 Para 10.29 – the Education contribution percentages should read 40%, 40% and 20% respectively.

During the discussion, the points raised included the following:

- Concerns were raised over the visual impact arising from the proposals. A local Ward Member felt that this site was the gateway to Totnes from the river and the development would give an urban edge to the river frontage;
- Concerns were raised over the height of the proposed buildings;

- Concerns were also raised over the numbers of units to be built and the departure from the Site Allocation DPD in the proposed numbers of affordable homes. It was also felt that the density of units proposed constituted over development;
- Several Members raised concerns over the impact of increased traffic in a town which was already congested. In response, the County Highways Officer advised that new developments generated new traffic and the planning authority must decide upon which sites to develop. This site was deemed one of the more sustainable sites because of its proximity to the town centre, and whilst some s106 money would be used for 'hard' highway works, some could also be allocated to public transport or park and ride sites;
- Concerns were raised over the proximity of the sheltered accommodation units to the industrial units, and that to ensure quality of life within the sheltered accommodation would require restrictions on the type of industry allowed and the times at which it could operate;
- Concerns were raised over the redeployment of businesses currently operating on the site and that the siting of the marine/business centre and boat storage areas would not enable future expansion of those employment uses;
- A Member raised questions regarding the percentage of affordable homes and whether HCA funding was available, and in response the Affordable Housing Manager advised that no HCA funding was available at this time as schemes must be much more advanced to qualify;
- A Member raised concerns about the inadequacy of St Peters Quay to be able to accommodate the increased traffic flows, despite the proposed alterations to the highway.

In contrast to the above concerns, some Members felt that this was in fact an exciting opportunity for a much needed redevelopment in Totnes, and the application should be approved in outline and that the details could be finalised in the future. Many Members felt that the site needed to be developed. However the overriding view was that the proposed development was too large for the site. Therefore, the following motion was **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED** and on being put to the vote was declared **CARRIED**:-

'That the application be refused.'

Reasons for Refusal

1. Non accordance with figures in the Site Allocation DPD
2. Overdevelopment
3. Adverse impact on landscape character
4. Highways/Inadequacy of St Peters Quay approach road
5. Affordable Housing

b) In respect of application 52/1442/09/F (Residential development comprising the erection of 50 houses and associated roads, parking and open space – Rows Farm, Aish Road, Stoke Gabriel TQ9 6PX), the Area Planning Officer showed plans and aerial photographs to identify the proposed site. This was a fully detailed application and plans of the proposed street scene were shown which showed that the design of the proposed units was traditional rather than contemporary. The APO did add that whilst no internal or external consultees had raised objections, the impact on residential amenity was a subjective issue which should be borne in mind. Officers had raised concerns in relation to one property in particular (Plot 18). Following consequent discussions, the developer had reoriented the dwelling and revised the design and officers were now able to support the application. The APO stated that there had been ecology concerns raised and the Landscape and Recreation Manager was in attendance and could respond to any queries. He advised that the foul sewer in Aish Road had formally been adopted by South West Water, the Fire Authority was raising no objections to the proposed layouts, and finally, that legal advice from the developer and from the Council indicated that a suggested £10,000 contribution towards the cemetery was not relevant and therefore should not form part of the agreement.

During discussion, the following points were raised:

- In response to concerns regarding the wildlife currently on site, the Landscape and Recreation Manager confirmed that the ecology survey submitted by the applicants had been reviewed and he was satisfied at the level of survey and the interpretation. The survey did address the Council's responsibilities under a wide range of legislation;
- The Enabling and Development Officer confirmed that a number of units of affordable housing would be allocated to people with a strong local connection and gave examples such as, residents who already live in the village, or have had to move out of the village, or work in the village, or who have children at school or family in the village. In addition the shared ownership properties would also be prioritised for local people;
- Concerns were raised that a number of homes for the open market would be bought for the purposes of rental or for second homes as currently, of 450 homes in the village, 80 were not lived in on a regular basis;
- Concerns were also raised over the number of larger affordable homes provided by this application, as Members felt that three bedroom units were needed in the village;
- Many Members had concerns over the proximity of the development to existing residential areas and the resulting impact on residential amenity;

- Concerns were raised over the impact on the narrow roads of the increased traffic as the village centre was, in effect, a cul-de-sac with one way in and out. There were also concerns over the lack of traffic surveys conducted, although the County Highways Officer explained that it was standard practice that developers purchase traffic data from either the Highways Authority or undertake the survey themselves;
- Public transport was limited which affected the sustainability of the proposals;
- A Member stated that young people in the South Hams were desperately in need of homes and it was important that sites were developed for them to live;
- Concerns were also stated that the proposed site did not agree with the site being promoted as part of the Site Allocation DPD;

Finally, whilst many Members agreed that Stoke Gabriel needed affordable housing, the general view was that this proposal was not appropriate. Therefore, the following motion was **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED** and on being put to the vote was declared **CARRIED**:-

‘That the application be refused.’

Reasons for Refusal

1. Highways/Inadequate approach roads
 2. Impact on visual landscape
 3. Adverse effect on ecology
 4. Adverse impact on residential amenity
- c) In respect of application 49/1162/08/F (Erection of 65 dwellings (25% affordable housing), provision of site for future village hall and car park, open space, access, servicing and landscaping – Harris Way Development Site West, Lee Mill, Ivybridge), the Area Planning Officer advised Members that this application had been deferred from the Development Control Committee meeting held on 7 October (minute DC.32/09 refers), to enable further investigations to be made on an improved level of affordable housing provision. Since then, further discussions had taken place and it was confirmed that a management company would be set up to manage the future of landscape areas and discussions had taken place with Devon County Council in relation to the Green Lane. A level of 25% affordable housing had now been guaranteed; this was a departure from established policies and Members need to decide whether this ratio was acceptable. In addition, the proposal was outside of the Development Boundary. Finally, the developers had confirmed that if permission was granted, then they would start work on site within the next 12 months.

During discussion the following points were raised:

- The local Ward Member confirmed that there was local support for the application and a number of families were looking for immediate housing. The site also benefited from local employment sites and good transport links;
- A Member stated that the Monitoring Officer had previously advised that policy should not become a constraint that prevented applications from being considered on their merits, and that Members should ask themselves in each case if there were sound reasons why an application should be an exception to policy;
- The Committee had determined the Sherford proposals at 25% affordable housing in view of the downturn in the economy, so there was no reason that the same could not apply in this instance. Therefore the level of 25% affordable housing was deemed acceptable with a condition included that gave the ability to review that level should the economy improve;
- The Affordable Housing Manager confirmed that the offer of 25% affordable housing from the developer was effectively without a requirement for grant subsidy. In reply, Members asked that the HCA be approached because if they did supply grant then the level of 25% would increase.

Members generally supported the application on the grounds of community support and the provision of a village hall if conditionally approved. Members wished to include a clause in the Section 106 Agreement relating to the ability to increase the level of affordable housing if the economy improved. In addition if the development is not commenced within 12 months, the scheme be reviewed and a new viability assessment undertaken, and if the market conditions have improved the level of affordable housing be increased. The minimum level of AH provision shall be 25%. The Area Planning Officer advised that a section 106 would also be required to include affordable housing in Phase 1, a Highways contribution of £10,000 and a sport and recreation contribution of £30,000, an education contribution if necessary, provision of the site for a community hall and car park and a management company being set up to manage the landscape areas. He also advised that determining the planning conditions should be delegated to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chairman and Ward Member. Following the discussion the following motion was **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED** and on being put to the vote was declared **CARRIED**:-

‘That the application be conditionally approved.’

- d) In respect of application 62/0785/09/F (Construction and conversion to provide 21 residential units with associated works – national Shire Horse Centre, Dunstone, Yealmpton, Plymouth), the Area Planning Officer showed plans and photographs to illustrate the extent of the site. He advised that some of the buildings would be removed as they formed part of the Shire Horse Centre. There had been a previous application which had been withdrawn. This proposal had a desirable approach and physically related to the hamlet itself. There was a correction to the published case officer report emphasised, in that 12 new build dwellings were proposed (not 11). The proposal also included a form of pedestrian interaction to the hamlet as an integral part of the scheme. Drawings of the proposed street scene showed stone faced cottages which would make a visual contribution to the site. Members noted that there would be no extension to the main barns, these would be converted into 9 units and an additional 12 units would be built. With the conversion of the farmhouse this would equate to 22 units in total. Finally, in terms of ecology, there had been revisions to the scheme to allow for detailed mitigation. Hipped roof extensions had been proposed which were purposely built as a roost for bats. The new build dwellings had also been designed to allow access for bats. Natural England had confirmed that they accepted the mitigation measures.

During discussion, points raised included the following:

- The local Ward Member was concerned that the development would double the size of the hamlet of Dunstone and this did not constitute organic growth. He stated that the application was in contradiction to policy and whilst improvement to the existing buildings was needed, the additional new buildings made the proposal unacceptable;
- Members were concerned that no affordable housing was being provided on site, although an off site contribution was included. In response, officers advised that it was felt that the site was not appropriate for affordable housing in terms of the lack of facilities;
- A Member felt that the site was totally unsustainable in terms of access;

Members agreed that the site needed updating. The Area Planning Officer reminded Members that currently this was a Brownfield site and residential use was not within policy however lawful use of the site was a material consideration.

He also advised that conversion of the barns alone without the new build units would result in the proposal not being viable. The following motion was **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED** and on being put to the vote was declared **LOST**:-

‘That the application be conditionally approved.’

Members then discussed their reasons for voting against the previous motion and the following motion was **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED** and on being put to the vote was declared **CARRIED**:-

‘That the application be refused.’

Reasons for Refusal

Unsustainable location
New dwellings
Development in open countryside
Departure from Policy

- e) In respect of application 58/2002/09/F (Resubmission of 58/0981/09/F for erection of detached dwelling with integral garage in garden, south of existing dwelling – 44 Hawthorn Park Road, Wembury, PL9 0DB, the following motion was **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED** and on being put to the vote was declared **CARRIED**:-

‘That a site inspection be held.’

- f) In respect of applications 41/1894/09/F and 41/1893/09/CA ((i) Demolition of existing building (B2 use) and replacement with a live/work unit & (ii) Conservation Area Consent for demolition of existing building (B2 use) and replacement with a live/work unit) - The Bothy, Church Street, Salcombe TQ8 8DH, the Area Planning Officer showed plans and explained that the application was for residential use on the first floor and a work area, storage area and parking on the ground floor. Plans were used to show various elevations and photo's used to show access. The photographs also showed the proximity to neighbouring properties. He added that a condition would be included to ensure a privacy screen, (details to be confirmed) was used around the amenity area of the first floor to protect the privacy of neighbours and prevent overlooking.

A local Ward Member used photographs to show how the amenity area of the proposal would impact on neighbours and he felt unable to support the application without details relating to the privacy screen. A number of Members agreed that this was an important issue and they would be unable to make a decision without knowledge of the details of the privacy screen to be used. Therefore, the following motion was **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED** and on being put to the vote was declared **CARRIED**:-

'That the application be deferred, until more information had been submitted regarding the privacy screen'.

It was then:-

RESOLVED

That the planning applications considered at this meeting be determined as indicated in Appendix A to these minutes.

(Meeting commenced at 10.00 am and concluded at 4.30 pm).

Chairman

APPENDIX A

56/0928/09/O

Mixed use development comprising; up to 6,300 sq.m. marine and business centre and further offices; up to 11,000 sq.m. boat storage; a continuing care retirement community including up to 60 bed nursing home and up to 100 assisted living units and communal facilities; up to 250 dwellings comprising open market, affordable housing and live/work accommodation; up to 950sq.m. of cafe and restaurant uses; small scale retail, financial and professional services; public plaza; car parking; internal roads, cycleways and paths; formal and informal open recreation space; wetland area; riverside walkway; and electricity sub stations – Baltic Wharf Ltd, Baltic Wharf, Totnes, Devon, TQ9 5EW – Mrs S Mittler (on behalf of Baltic Wharf Ltd & TQ9 Ltd)

TOTNES

Town Council's Views - Objection

Officer Update – Parts of report corrected

Recommendation – Conditional Approval (subject to Section 106 Agreement)

Committee Decision – Refusal

Reasons for Refusal

- 1 - Non accordance with figures in Site Allocation DPD
- 2 - Overdevelopment
- 3 - Adverse impact on landscape character
- 4 - Highways/Inadequacy of St. Peters Quay approach road
- 5 - Affordable Housing

52/1442/09/F

Residential development comprising the erection of 50 houses and associated roads, parking and open space – Rows Farm, Aish Road, Stoke Gabriel, Devon, TQ9 6PX – Midas Homes

STOKE GABRIEL

Parish Council's Views –Objection contravenes AONB policy; conflicts with the findings of the Parish Plan of 2008; unacceptable increase in density of traffic using approach roads; and major visual impact on neighbouring properties.

Officer Update – Late third party representations reported. Updated comments from Fire Authority and SWW reported. Amended layout and design of Plot 18 shown to the Committee. Reference made to financial contribution towards a cemetery.

Recommendation – Conditional Approval (subject to Section 106 Agreement)

Committee Decision – Refusal

Reasons for Refusal

- 1 – Highways/Inadequate approach roads
 - 2 – Impact on visual landscape
 - 3 – Adverse effect on ecology
 - 4 – Adverse impact on residential amenity
-

62/0785/09/F

Construction and conversion to provide 21 residential units with associated works – National Shire Horse Centre, Dunstone, Yealmpton, Plymouth – London & West Country Estate Ltd

YEALMPTON

Yealmpton Parish Council's Views – No overall objection to the redevelopment of the site but prefers the original proposal with new houses on the north side of the barn conversions. The proposed allotments are considered unnecessary. Lack of garage provision will lead to future demand. In addition question the suitability of the footpath linking the development with Dunstone. Suggest that more consideration be given to a greater separation between the hamlet and the new development.

Officer Update – Corrected report, number of new build dwellings is **12** not 11

Recommendation – Conditional Approval

Committee Decision – Refusal

Reasons for Refusal

1. The proposed development would give rise to further development in the open countryside divorced from any established centre where community services and facilities are available. Such development is considered to be unsustainable and constitutes a departure from established planning policies. These policy considerations are not outweighed by the material considerations associated with the established use of the site. The proposed development is contrary to established County Structure Plan Policy ST1; South Hams Local Plan Policy SHDC3 and LDF Core Strategy Policy CS1.
-

49/1162/08/F

Erection of 65 dwellings (25% affordable housing), provision of site for future village hall and car park, open space, access, servicing and landscaping – Harris Way Development Site West, Lee Mill, Ivybridge – Cavanna Homes (South West) Ltd

[Erection of 65](#)

SPARKWELL

Parish Council's Views – None

Officer Update – None

Recommendation – Refusal

Committee Decision – Conditional Approval (subject to a Section 106 Agreement). All planning conditions subject to delegation to Head of Service, Chairman of DC Committee and Ward Member.

Conditions

- 1 – TIM3 (Standard time limit 3 years)
 - 2 – NH05 (Accord with Plans)
 - 3 – MAT8 (Roofing Natural Slate)
 - 4 - MAT30 (Full Details (ducts, flues, vents, etc))
 - 5 – MAT 23 (Timber Doors and Windows Reserve Details Vents)
 - 6 – MAT17 (Stonework Sample Panel)
 - 7 – MAT14 (Walls Render Details)
 - 8 – Non Standard
Facing Brick Detail
 - 9 – Non Standard
Landscaping
 - 10 – Non Standard
Hedgerows/Trees
 - 11 – Non Standard
Tree Protection
 - 12 – Non Standard
Existing Hedgerows/Trees
 - 13 – LAN 7 (Landscape Plan Management & Delivery)
 - 14 – LAN9 (Landscape Inspection : One Year)
 - 15 – RES16 (Completion of Roads)
 - 16 – RES19 (Details (external lighting))
 - 17 – RES20 (Refuse Storage)
 - 18 – RES44 (Garaging etc Completion)
 - 19 – Non Standard
Green Lane Crossing/Drainage
 - 20 - Non Standard
Surface Water Disposal
 - 21 – Non Standard
Ecology Mitigation Measures
 - 22 – LBC11 (Archaeological Investigation)
 - 23 – CONTAM13 (Contamination – added Jan 2010)
 - 24 – Non Standard
Means of Enclosure
 - 25 – Non Standard
Electricity Sub Station Details
 - 26 – Non Standard
Site Compound and Car Park
-

35/1772/09/F

Retrospective application for retention of agricultural equipment store with associated change of levels of land. Resubmission of 35/0479/09 – Gate Farm, Brownston, Ivybridge, PL21 OSQ – Mr D Neate

MODBURY

Parish Council's Views – Approval

Officer Update – Reported request for extra condition

Recommendation – Conditional Approval

Committee Decision – Conditional Approval

Conditions

1 - Non Standard

No livestock in building

2 - Non Standard

Stable doors to be replaced with undivided doors

3 - NH05 (Accord with Plans)

4 – Non Standard

Removal of building if agricultural use ceases

58/2002/09/F

Re-submission of 58/0981/09/F for erection of detached dwelling with integral garage in garden, south of existing dwelling – 44 Hawthorn Park Road, Wembury, Devon, PL9 ODB – Mr & Mrs R Freeman

WEMBURY

Parish Council's Views – Objection : pitch of roof not in keeping with neighbouring properties – neighbour has objected. Suggest site visit – Parish Councillors willing to attend.

Officer Update – Reported letter of representation and no observations from EHO and Drainage Engineer

Recommendation – Conditional Approval

Committee Decision – Site Inspection

27/1857/09/CU

Change of use from retail unit (A1) to Dental Surgery (D1) – 56 Fore Street, Ivybridge, Devon, PL21 9AE – Mr J Carter

IVYBRIDGE

Town Council's Views – Strongly object to the application and state concern that the retail character of Fore Street needs to be maintained in line with the Ivybridge shopping policy contained in the Deposit Local Plan Review that seeks to retain at least 65% of ground floor frontages within the Core Zone of the Central Shopping Area in A1 retail use. They also noted that a new dental practice had been approved at the lower end of Fore Street and there is an established dental practice in Victoria House at the lower end of Fore Street.

Officer Update – None

Recommendation – Conditional Approval

Committee Decision – Conditional Approval**Conditions**

1 – TIM3 (Standard time limit 3 years)

(i) 41/1894/09/F & (ii) 41/1893/09/CA

(i) Demolition of existing building (B2 use) and replacement with a live/work unit, and (ii) Conservation Area Consent for demolition of existing building (B2 Use) and replacement with a live/work unit – The Bothy, church Street, Salcombe, TQ8 8DH – Mrs A Johnstone

SALCOMBE

Town Council's Views – Objection : There was a query as to whether the boundaries are drawn correctly. As such the proposal for such residential use would overlook neighbours and the amenity proposed would definitely overlook neighbouring lower areas. The work area proposed really does not fit well for usage as a workshop as this has a single entrance and it is also felt that double roller shutter doors are inappropriate in the Conservation Area. There is also considerable concern that such a move from B2 to joint live/work would be a substantial loss of industrial use in this area. Town Council had further concerns that the live/work unit as integrally linked with stairs could become a second home with storage.

Officer Update – None

Recommendation – Conditional Approval (both applications)

Committee Decision – Deferred**27_57/2001/09/F**

Variation of condition 3 of planning permission 27_57/0753/09/F. Condition relates to restriction of use of floodlights and allow 6.00pm - 10.00pm and weekend 2.00pm - 6.00pm for adults, November - January inclusive – Erme Playing Fields, Ermington Road, Ivybridge, Devon – Mr B Howard

IVYBRIDGE

Town Council's Views – No objection

Ermington Parish Council's Views – support : due consideration to the effect on highways and light pollution

Officer Update – None

Recommendation – Conditional Approval

Committee Decision - Conditional Approval

Conditions

- 1 - TIM3 (Standard time limit 3 years)
 - 2 - NH05 (Accord with Plans)
 - 3 – Non Standard
Limited Lighting
-

(i) 34/2006/09/F & (ii) 34/2005/09/LB

(i) Householder application for removal of existing flat grass roof of car port and replacement with pitched slate tiled roof. Repair/upgrading of surface water drainage, and (ii) Listed Building Consent for removal of existing flat grass roof of car port and replacement with pitched slate tiled roof. Repair/upgrading of surface water drainage – The Retreat, 1 Higher Compton Barton, Compton, Marlton, Paignton, TQ3 1SA – Mrs S Oetegenn

MARLDON

Parish Council's Views – No objection

Officer Update – None

Recommendation - Conditional Approval (both applications)

Committee Decision – Conditional Approval

Conditions

(i) 34/2006/09/F

- 1 - TIM3 (Standard time limit 3 years)
- 2 - NH05 (Accord with Plans)
- 3 - MAT7 (Natural Slate Sample)

(ii) 34/2005/09/LB

- 1 – TIM4 (Listed Building time limit 3 years)
 - 2 – NH05 (Accord with Plans)
 - 3 – MAT7 (Natural Slate Sample)
-

