

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE **PLANNING COMMITTEE** HELD ONLINE ON **TUESDAY 13th OCTOBER 2020** AT 2.00 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillors D Howe (Chairman) Presiding
M Joyce (Vice Chairman)

Councillors Mrs C Bunday Mrs A Jones
Mrs K Crout C N Parker
R Hayes M E Ryan
M Hocking Mrs L Sheffield

By Invitation: Mrs Emily Farrell – Planning Consultant

Officers in attendance: Phil Rowe - Town Clerk
Sally Henley – Town Development Manager
Alex Robinson – Principal Administrator

569. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors Richard Jenks (Mayor) and Mike Pilkington.

570. **INTERESTS**

None.

571. **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 17th March 2020 were received and signed as a correct record.

572. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

None.

573. **PRESENTATION – PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE**

The Chairman welcomed Mrs Emily Farrell, Planning Consultant and on behalf of all Members, expressed his appreciation for the thorough and informative summary document as prepared for the Council (previously circulated). The Chairman invited Mrs Farrell, to update Members on the Government White Paper – Planning for the Future.

Mrs Farrell referred to her consultation paper, which provided a summary of the Government proposals and areas for consideration by the Town Council and highlighted the following key points:

- Changes to the Planning Process were inevitable;
- Approach to designate zones for development through the reforms;
- Intention for it to be a ‘faster’ more streamlined approach but this raised concerns about sufficient scrutiny;
- Local emphasis on design guides were needed;
- Strong emphasis on digitalisation of the planning process but concerns about accessibility for all;
- Neighbourhood Plans still had an important role;
- What constitutes ‘Beautiful’ Design;
- National levy to replace the existing Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy;

- Who would provide the necessary infrastructure and the timing of it, ideally in advance or alongside development;
- Housing numbers apportioned to zones and regions;
- Maintaining Conservation areas;
- Continued value of Community Engagement and the use of Levy receipts;
- Meeting housing needs such as affordable, sustainable and housing for an aging population; and in conclusion
- The timescales for implementation were at best unrealistic.

The Chairman thanked Mrs Farrell for her summary and invited questions and comments from Councillors on the Government White Paper and specifically the 26 questions which formed the draft response as prepared on behalf of the Council, to be returned by 15th October 2020. Councillors raised the following key comments:

- Permitted Development Rights;
- Local Plan;
- Levy payable at the conclusion of a development and the risks associated with its estimated value and the financial security and assurances of the developer to deliver at the end of the term;
- Centrally led Government policy rather than local input reflecting the economic demographics of the town and region;
- The current system does not always offer value for money or in a timely manner;
- The Town Council as a statutory consultee for the principal authority;
- NATC engagement with Developers on local development issues;
- Retention of Public Planning Notices on 'lamp posts';
- Affordable and rental properties available for all age groups;
- Opportunity to define and ensure sustainable property development to meet Climate Emergency standards and more affordable for occupants who benefit from cost-saving measures;
- Cost of implementation of sustainable enhancements to affordable housing;
- Viability of developments, margin available to developer offset by proportion of affordable housing;
- Provision of housing to meet all sections of society;
- Uniform policy and standards alongside local variations;
- Concern at proposals that would weaken the examination process;
- Master Plans which offer development to more than one provider needed a robust structure to deliver to the plan;
- Local design more suited to the region rather than national designs;
- Explanation of 'Beautiful' Design;
- Location of property type, example was siting of flats on gateway to Hele Park which lessened the quality of the street scene despite advance recommendations from the Planning Committee to relocate to within the development site;
- Provision for sufficient parking and future needs to include electrical vehicle charging points;
- Cost of providing 300,000 properties diminishes the quality and standard;
- Explanation needed as to the distribution of the National Levy and measures to protect recipients of Levy; and
- Scope for spending the Levy needed clarification of parameters for expenditure.

The Planning Committee thanked Mrs Farrell sincerely for her excellent piece of work in response to the Government White Paper – Planning for the Future. The Town Clerk reported that Mrs Farrell would make the suggested amendments to be incorporated into the Council's response by 15th October 2020 as per the Council's delegation on 23rd September 2020. The Chairman thanked Mrs Farrell, where upon she was invited to leave the meeting.

574. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The Chairman introduced the Planning Applications by noting that the Principal Authority was increasingly omitting the name of the Case Officer and the information was often unavailable even at the time that the Planning Committee Agenda was despatched. Councillor Howe further suggested that those applications assigned to the 'Central Team' were considered by Teignbridge District Council to be more straight forward and were often decided upon inside the statutory 21 day period which meant that the Planning Committee were not given the opportunity to make recommendations in time. Councillors recorded their concern at the lack of consultation and requested that a letter be sent to Teignbridge District Council to remind the Principal Authority of their duty to allow consultees sufficient time in which to comment, accordingly it was;

RESOLVED that the Town Clerk write to Teignbridge District Council, Planning Officer, on behalf of the Planning Committee to express concern at the process by which applications were decided upon without due consideration from the statutory consultees.

BRADLEY

1. 20/01641/FUL Jennifer Joule
BRADLEY - Mainbow Nurseries, Forches Cross Road, Newton Abbot
Extension to existing building for storage and distribution (B8)
NO OBJECTION

2. 20/01759/VAR None Stated
BRADLEY - 11 Western Drive, Newton Abbot
Variation of Condition 2 on planning permission 19/01517/FUL (Retention of retaining walls and off road parking and construction of garage) to increase the height of garage roof
THE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED REFUSAL ON THE GROUNDS OF THE NEGATIVE AFFECT ON THE STREET SCENE

BRUNEL

Nil.

BUCKLAND & MILBER

3. 20/01653/HOU Central Team
BUCKLAND & MILBER - 66 Aller Brake Road, Newton Abbot
New dormer
NO OBJECTION

4. 20/01600/HOU Central Team
BUCKLAND & MILBER - 14 Ash Way, Newton Abbot
Extension
NO OBJECTION

5. 20/01658HOU Chris Mitchell
BUCKLAND & MILBER - 79 Hockmore Drive, Newton Abbot
Erection of single storey outbuilding to rear
NO OBJECTION SUBJECT TO ANCILLARY USE ONLY (MODEL RAILWAY)

6. 20/01663/HOU Central Team
BUCKLAND & MILBER - 33 Moorland View, Newton Abbot

Hardstanding/off-street parking to front, timber boundary fence, reduce ground level and construction of retaining wall to rear
THE COMMITTEE NOTED THAT THIS WAS A RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION AND REFERRED TO THE CASE OFFICER FOR DECISION

TREE

7. 20/01677/TPO Mark Waddams
BUCKLAND & MILBER - 39 Fern Road, Newton Abbot
Fell two oak trees
NO OBJECTION SUBJECT TO THE VIEW OF THE ARBORICULTURAL OFFICER

8. 20/01684/LBC Gary Crawford
BUCKLAND & MILBER - 4 Courtenay Park, Newton Abbot
Replacement of existing 1st floor sash window, facing to rear
NO OBJECTION

9. 20/01729/OUT None Stated
BUCKLAND & MILBER - 75 Oakland Road, Newton Abbot
Outline for two dwellings (all matters reserved)
THE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED REFUSAL ON THE GROUNDS OF OVERDEVELOPMENT AND ACCESS

BUSHELL

Appeal Received
10.20/00044REF - Written Representations Gary Crawford
BUSHELL - 86 Queen Street, Newton Abbot
Appeal against the refusal of planning application 20/00314/FUL – Installation of additional door
NOTED

Appeal Received
11.20/00045/REF - Written Representations Gary Crawford
BUSHELL - 86 Queen Street, Newton Abbot
Appeal against refusal of planning application 20/00440/LBC – Installation of additional door and internal wall
NOTED

12.20/01726/HOU Central Team
BUSHELL - 12 Paynsford Road, Newton Abbot
Single storey extension and two storey extension
THE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED REFUSAL ON THE GROUNDS OF OVERDEVELOPMENT AND OVERLOOKING

Tree
13.20/01777/TPO Mark Waddams
BUSHELL - 5 Orleigh Avenue, Newton Abbot
Crown reduce one hornbeam (T39) by 50% where overhanging
NO OBJECTION SUBJECT TO THE VIEW OF THE ARBORICULTURAL OFFICER

COLLEGE

Tree
14.20/01785/CAN Mark Waddams
COLLEGE - 21 College Road Newton Abbot
Fell one Monterey pine
THE COMMITTEE NOTED THE PLANTING OF A REPLACEMENT AND RAISED NO OBJECTION

575. NAMING OF STREETS AND NUMBERING OF HOUSES

The Chairman referred to the site of the Former Wolborough Hospital and noted that the Committee had made recommendations for the naming of the new development. Councillor Howe advised that the names had been considered alongside similar or duplicate names elsewhere within the town and therefore the site would most likely be named 'The Pinnacle' that being the name of the rare orchid found on the grounds.

576. TEIGNBRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL

None.

577. DEVON COUNTY COUNCIL

None

578. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AT VARIANCE WITH TOWN COUNCIL'S OBSERVATIONS

None.

579. TREE PRESERVATION ORDER

Referred to under Minute 574 (7) and (13) above.

580. LATE CORRESPONDENCE

The Chairman invited the Principal Administrator to report on the Local Validation List Consultation by Teignbridge District Council. Mrs Robinson informed Members that the consultation period had been opened on 5th October 2020, the documents for both the Planning Validation Guidance and the Householder Planning Application Validation Guidance had been previously circulated, however she noted that these were substantial documents which required some attention. Mrs Robinson expressed her concern at the short consultation period of four weeks (ending noon on 2nd November 2020) and at a time when the Government White Paper was also under consideration. Therefore, the Chairman advised Members that given the short consultation period of four weeks, that Members of the Planning Committee make individual comments on the Planning Validation Guidance and the Householder Planning Validation Guidance documents direct to Teignbridge District Council.

581. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

In view of the Government Advice to restrict the spread of Coronavirus (COVID-19) the date of the next meeting of the Planning Committee would be advised but in the meantime Members would continue to receive applications for consideration in accordance with the 21 day consultation period as provided by Teignbridge District Council.

The Chairman thanked members for their support and consideration in these exceptional circumstances and wished everyone well.

CHAIRMAN