

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**9 JULY 2012**

Present:

Councillor Clemens (Chairman)  
Councillor Smith (Vice Chairman)  
Councillors Austen, Brodie, Colclough, Connett, Corney-Walker, Cox, Dennis, Fusco, Goodey, Haines, Keeling, Klinkenberg, Lambert, Lonsdale, Matthews, Price, Prowse (for Lewis), Shantry, and Williams

Apologies: Councillor Lewis

Members in attendance: Councillors Bromell, Clarence, Christophers, Fry, Lake, Purser and Russell

Officers in attendance:

Service Manager, Development Management – Nick Davies  
Area Planning Officer – Tom Wilson  
Senior Planning Officers – Jeremy Ebdon, Ian Perry  
Principal Solicitor – Duncan Moors  
Democratic Services Officer – Trish Corns

### **1. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 June 2012 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **2. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman reminded Members that they should not vote on an application if they are not present at the meeting to hear the entire debate on that application. The Chairman also welcomed public speakers to the meeting.

The Council's Solicitor referred to the National Association of Local Councils' model Code of Conduct approved by Council on 29 June 2012. Members are no longer required to declare a personal interest by virtue of their membership of a Parish or Town Council, unless the Parish or Town Council is the Applicant or if the application is likely to affect the Parish or Town Council. Disclosable Pecuniary Interests, which are defined by regulations made under section 30(3) of the Localism Act 2011 and are set out in Appendix A of the adopted Code have to be declared at a meeting only if the interest has not been notified to the Monitoring Officer and already entered in the member's register of interests. Where a matter arises at a meeting which relates to Disclosable Pecuniary Interest the Member cannot speak or vote on the matter and must leave the meeting.

## PLANNING (09.07.12)

The Solicitor also referred Members to the notes under agenda item 7 which set the matters which members should consider when determining planning applications. He reminded members of the need to avoid non-planning related matters.

### **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members declared interests as detailed below.

### **4. APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION**

The Committee considered the report of the Service Manager – Development Management together with comments of public speakers and additional information.

#### **(i) NEWTON ABBOT 12/01523/FUL: NAM House, Bradley Lane – roof overclad with metal profile sheeting resulting in raising of roof by 300mm**

The Committee noted that an acceptable roofing sample has been received, and therefore condition 3 of the recommendation set out at agenda page 1 was no longer required.

It was proposed by Councillor Brodie and seconded by Councillor Corney-Walker that the application is approved as set out in the report circulated with the agenda.

Resolved

Permission granted subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard three years time limit for commencement.
2. Development in accordance with approved plans.

**(21 votes for and 0 against)**

#### **(ii) DAWLISH - 12/00977/FUL – Freetime Catering Ltd, The Boathouse, Dawlish Warren – alterations to storage compound/delivery bay**

The Committee noted a further consultation response from Natural England.

It was proposed by Councillor Price and seconded by Councillor Prowse that the application is approved as set out in the report circulated with the agenda.

Resolved

Permission granted subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard three years time limit for commencement.
2. Development in accordance with approved plans.
3. Surface water to be kept separate from foul drainage system.

**(21 votes for and 0 against)**

PLANNING (09.07.12)

**(iii) NEWTON ABBOT – 12/00301/MAJ – Land at Hele Park, Ashburton Road - Outline application for demolition of existing club buildings and development of a mixed use scheme comprising up to 650 dwellings**

*Councillor Fry declared a non-pecuniary interest by virtue of the proximity of her residence to the site.*

The Council's Solicitor reported on Counsel's advice from Peter Village QC which was submitted by the applicant. The advice was that the planning balance strongly favoured permission being granted and that the delivery of affordable housing at 25% is compliant with the Council's SPD policy, Therefore the Council is not entitled to seek more than 25% nor is it entitled to require a mechanism for reappraising the proportion of affordable housing to be included in the Section 106 Agreement. The Council's Solicitor advised members that he agreed with that advice. The offer is compliant with the SPD and the 1% p.a. incremental rise linked to the increase in the average house price in Devon has not yet occurred. The Solicitor advised that we have not included the 1% increase in any other planning obligations. He further advised that the provision in Section 8 of the SPD which requires reappraisal on larger schemes after each 50 is in his view only relevant where the offer of affordable housing fails to meet the targets set out earlier in the SPD.

In response to a question from the Committee the Service Manager – Development Management advised that although the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging scheme was not yet in place the regulations were and those regulations govern what planning obligations the Council may lawfully require. The Solicitor responded to further questions by advising that: the review of the development viability in terms of affordable housing delivery is relevant only when below 25%; the Applicant could appeal against non determination and a higher percentage of affordable housing could not be supported at an appeal.

The Senior Planning Officer reported updated information which was previously circulated to Members. This included Section 106 amendments to the recommendation set out in the report circulated with the agenda as follows:

- £10,000 dormouse habitat mitigation contribution.
- £100 of the travel voucher contribution is redistributed and is instead used for air quality improvements within the Town, following discussion between Environmental Health and the Highways Authority.
- A travel plan which will include £200 of sustainable travel vouchers per dwelling (£130,000 based on 650 dwellings);

The Senior Planning Officer referred to the amended officer recommendation which was also circulated at the meeting for ease of reference.

Further information was also noted as follows:

## PLANNING (09.07.12)

- The Cirl Bunting habitat mitigation contribution would be £184,500.00 and not £184,000.00 as set out at paragraph 3.25 of the report circulated with the agenda.
- An additional four letters of objection and one which was tabled at the meeting, copies of which were provided by the objector.

Public Speaker: Objector, Ms Conduit – Represented the Western Option Residents Group and Seale Hayne Area Residents Endeavour. Objected on the following grounds:

- The core Strategy and this application are linked. Residents' views and national policy appear not to be having an effect on the decision.
- Contrary to National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 155 and 158 – the application is being rushed and local opinion is not being considered. The Core Strategy housing numbers are due to be agreed the following day and the release of the final draft Core strategy within a few weeks.
- NPPF 17 community involvement - public consultation has taken place on the Core Strategy planning process and in relation to this application through workshops on 18 and 19 June. There is no evidence that the views of the public have been taken into account to defer the application until the Core Strategy figures are known, and that the site is too far from the town and therefore not sustainable.
- The application appears to be considered without local opinion, transparency and integrity. Documents not readily available and flaws throughout the planning process.
- Financial contributions are identified for the Albany doctors' surgery but this is too far from the site to be a sustainable facility.
- The Highway Agency's Article 25 Direction is outstanding.
- Loss of wildlife habitat.
- Increased flood risk.
- The application should be deferred or refused until housing numbers and the Core Strategy providing land allocations are agreed.
- New homes are still to be built in the vicinity from previous planning approvals and the housing market is depressed.

Public Speaker: Supporter, Mr Stacey

- The Applicant has extensively engaged with the public through workshops and other consultation.
- There is support for the principle of development subject to Section 106 terms. Further matters have been agreed since the deferral of the application at the last Planning meeting: a reduction in the time limit for submission of reserved matters and commencement of development; an additional £40,000 towards the new Albany doctors' surgery; £175,000 towards highway infrastructure including public transport; resulting in a total of £4.8 million financial contribution.
- Substantial social and economic benefits.
- Provision for employment, office and light industrial in accordance with national provision to develop economic growth and prosperity for people.
- The site is suitable and sustainable.

## PLANNING (09.07.12)

- No objections from consultees.
- The Core strategy supports this site for development and allows for further expansion in the future.

Comments raised by Members of the Committee included: the proposal is a departure from the Local Plan; it is premature pending the Core Strategy; it is not a sustainable site being over 2 miles from the town centre; it is contrary to policy; loss of agricultural land, part of the site is currently used for agricultural purposes; loss of public leisure facility; the land should be used as a leisure and green buffer between future development at the Seale Hayne site; additional traffic would exacerbate an already congested road network and there are no plans to ease this congestion and would result in damage to the viability of the town centre; the financial benefits are based on 650 dwellings but these may not all be developed; the application is being rushed through without proper weight given to public consultation responses and without proper regard to NPPF policies such as NPPF 69 and 155; the Applicant has given great weight to the financial contributions, however, other developments have paid proportionately higher NHS and education contributions; should the final number of houses be less than 650, would the reduced financial contribution towards education be sufficient to provide for the expected reduced number of children; the Core Strategy gains weight with approval at each stage of the adoption schedule; documents have not been readily available; the Article 25 Direction is still in place; and the proposal should be refused on the grounds of an unsustainable site.

In response to issues raised by the Committee it was confirmed that: the financial contributions were based on 650 dwellings. Should fewer dwellings be developed the number of potential residents would be fewer, the impact on community facilities less and therefore the contributions would be reduced; the Council must ensure the Section 106 financial contributions satisfy the CIL test and are sufficient to render the application acceptable; the financial request towards education would be based on several criteria; a refusal of the application on the grounds of insufficient education contribution was not recommended; the contribution towards education has been requested per dwelling and not an overall amount; it will be a while before the Core Strategy would be adopted; this was envisaged for April 2013 but the time scale has already been delayed; therefore the five year land supply would not be in place for a while; the site is sustainable in accordance with the NPPF; the Core Strategy does gain weight with approval at each stage of the adoption schedule but currently it carries less weight; taking all issues into account the Council would be vulnerable at an appeal; the costs of an appeal and possible costs awarded against the Council are difficult to assess and depend on the robustness of the reasons for refusal

In response to comments made by the public speakers, the Service Manager-Development Management advised that the Core Strategy would not be adopted for several months; the debate in relation to overall housing numbers was ongoing and any resulting reduction would be small and housing numbers would not be reduced to nil; affordable housing was required; the

## PLANNING (09.07.12)

site was included in the draft Core Strategy and unlikely to be removed; the Council has no five year land supply; and an appeal would be costly to defend.

Comments raised by Members of the Committee in support of the application included: 163 much needed affordable houses would be provided; employment land would provide jobs and enable small business to expand; £800,000 towards leisure facilities including cycling facilities, a growing leisure activity as opposed to declining golf activity; highway improvements including Drumbridges roundabout and highway links; and there is no robust reason to refuse the application.

It was proposed by Councillor Haines and seconded by Councillor Matthews that the application is approved as set out in the report circulated with the agenda and as amended as detailed above.

Resolved

Subject to the removal of the Highways Agency's Article 25 Direction and subject to the Applicant entering into a prior Section 106 Agreement by 3 August 2012 (or in accordance with an amended Planning Performance Agreement) to secure:

1. Delivery of affordable housing to meet local needs at 25% with a tenure mix of 70:30.
2. Open space contributions:
  - £605.31 per dwelling towards playing field enhancements (£393,453.36 based on 650 dwellings).
  - £620.66 per dwelling towards indoor leisure enhancements (£403,429 based on 650 dwellings).
  - Equipped play space to be provided on site in accordance with the quantum of provision shown on the revised masterplan.
  - Activity area for older children/teenagers to be provided on site in accordance with the quantum of provision shown on the revised masterplan.
  - Park space to be provided on site in accordance with the quantum of provision shown on the revised masterplan.
3. Education contribution:
  - £2,141.21 per dwelling towards primary education (£1,391,783.75 based on 650 dwellings).
4. Highway contributions to include:
  - A travel plan which will include £200 of sustainable travel vouchers per dwelling (£130,000 based on 650 dwellings).
  - A commitment to construct a spine road within the development to form a suitable route for a bus including the ability to enter and exit the development from the A383 in a forward gear.
  - Provision of a 20 minute bus service between the site and Newton Abbot Town Centre (a contribution of a maximum of £500,000).

## PLANNING (09.07.12)

- Financial contribution of £50,000 towards cycle and pedestrian improvements.
  - Provision of a cycle/pedestrian route along the northern side of the A383 linking to the cycle/pedestrian links provided by the Lemon Grove development.
  - Provision of pedestrian/cycle crossings as set out in the submitted plans; including a contribution of £31,200 specifically for the toucan crossing on the A383.
  - A financial contribution of £250,000 to provide capacity at Drumbridges.
  - A financial contribution of £1.4 million towards new highway links including: a new link road between the A383 and the A382, and Jetty Marsh Stage 2 link road connecting the previously constructed Stage 1 road to Whitehill Cross.
5. Cirl bunting habitat mitigation contribution of £184,500.
  6. Dormouse habitat mitigation contribution of £10,000.
  7. A financial contribution of £40,000 towards improving the new Albany Doctors' Surgery.
  8. A financial contribution of £100 per dwelling towards Air Quality improvements.
  9. Footway and cycleway links taken to boundaries with adjoining land to west and to consented development at Mile End to east.

Permission granted subject to the following conditions:

1. Submission of reserved matters (scale, appearance, landscaping and layout).
2. Reserved matters to be submitted within 2 years.
3. Development shall be begun before the expiry of 1 year from the date of approval of the final reserved matter.
4. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents.
5. Details of all means of enclosure and boundary treatments to be submitted for approval including buffers to existing and new hedging.
6. Full details of surface water drainage to be submitted for approval to comply with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA).
7. Travel Plan to be submitted for approval.
8. Unsuspected contamination to be dealt with appropriately.
9. Per Cent for Art scheme to be incorporated in the development.
10. Phasing Plan to be submitted for approval relating to the overall site and the delivery of employment land and the local centre.
11. Submission of a landscape parameters plan for the whole site with the first reserved matters submission.
12. Submission for approval of a landscape and ecology management plan.
13. Provision of 0.37 hectares of allotments.
14. Submission for approval of a lighting strategy for the site.
15. A suitable sewage system to be in place prior to the first occupation of any building.
16. Full junction details to be submitted and approved for each junction to the A383.

## PLANNING (09.07.12)

17. Construction Environmental Management Plan to be submitted (including management of construction traffic) for approval.
  18. Provision of bat and bird boxes within the development.
  19. Details of an air quality-monitoring scheme for protecting nearby residents from nuisance dust and fine particles (PM<sub>10</sub>) to be submitted for approval.
- (12 votes for, 8 against and 1 abstention)**

*Councillor Connett requested that his vote against the approval of this application be recorded.*

### **(iv) TEDBURN ST MARY – 12/00781/MAJ – Land south of Goldcross Hill - Solar Farm**

The Committee noted the following further information:

- An amendment to condition 4 at agenda page 29 to also include a “landscaping management plan.”
- Three objections raising issues such as the accuracy of the plans; and agreeing with the Landscape Officer’s comments.
- Two objections from Parish Council’s.

Public Speaker: Objector, Mr Hunt – Referred to the technological issues in relation to solar panels, sustainability and the storage and distribution of electricity. Objected on the grounds of the loss of arable land; the ability to farm the site for food in relation to sustainability; and referred the Committee to the DEFRA website and an e-mail he had circulated to members containing a video.

Public Speaker: Objector, Mr Leithgoe – Represented the Parish Council objecting on the grounds of: the site is prominent and visible from a number of public vantage points; the site is within an Area of Great Landscape Value; it is a finely balanced application; the site consists of good arable land and is inappropriate use of farmland; the Landscape Officer has objections; an application for a dwelling on the site was previously refused; land coverage of 50 acres of glass is as large as the village; glare from the panels; the Parish council has recently supported a similar scheme at a site elsewhere in the village; the Parish Council is not opposed to such schemes but at an appropriate site; the views of the Landscape Officer should be supported which are set out at agenda page 37.

Public Speaker: Supporter, Mr Homewood – The Teignbridge area currently has a renewable energy output of 3% of its total output. This project would double the District’s renewable energy providing a further 3%, resulting in a saving of 4,200 tonnes of carbon dioxide per year. Some 200 sites have been inspected in relation to renewable energy and the current site is one of the best in the south west for efficiency of renewable energy output because of its south facing direction and proximity to the national grid. It would produce energy for 2000 homes. 15 objections are very low compared with the benefits of the scheme which would also include £30,000 to the community for

## PLANNING (09.07.12)

renewable energy schemes. The solar panels are temporary structures and can be erected and dismantled in a short period of time. There is no long term decommissioning required. It is in accordance with the Devon Structure Plan which identifies the need for land based renewable energy. The Highway Agency has no objection. The panels are 98% absorbent and would not reflect light.

The Council's Solicitor referred Members to paragraph 3.21 at agenda page 33 which set out the relationship between the relevant Devon Structure Plan policy and NPPF advice in that it is considered that the NPPF is more up-to-date.

Comments raised by Members of the Committee included: fossil fuels are limited and alternative renewable energy is required; appropriate sites need to be located; only a few dwellings can be seen from the site; the site inspection indicated that the proposal would have limited impact on the landscape; the ground underneath the panels would need maintaining; the structures are temporary for 25 years and the land would be returned to agricultural use; the scheme could be superseded with advances in technology; and there is no objection from the Highway Agency.

Comments raised by Members of the Committee in objection to the proposal included: the Parish Council is opposed to the application at this site but not to the principle of the proposal; it is a finely balanced proposal and should be refused until a policy is adopted; the site is prominent; and it is an intrusion on the landscape and an unsuitable use of Grade 3 arable land.

In response to a question from the Committee, the Service Manager-Development Management confirmed the fine balanced nature of the application. The recommendation for approval is based on the considered opinion that the benefits of the scheme would outweigh the issues relating to the impact on the landscape.

It was proposed by Councillor Matthews and seconded by Councillor Shantry that the application is refused on the grounds of an adverse impact on the Area of Great Landscape Value.

Resolved

Permission refused for the following reason:

1. Adverse impact on Area of Great Landscape Value.

**(15 votes for and 5 against)**

*Councillor Corney-Walker requested that his vote against the refusal of this application be recorded.*

PLANNING (09.07.12)

- (v) **NEWTON ABBOT 08/01245/MAJ – Land at Mile End, Ashburton Road - Outline application for residential development (approval sought for means of access), including construction of two new junctions to the north and south of Ashburton Road; local centre (Use Classes A1/A2/A3/D1/D2), public open space, landscaping and associated works**

**Variation of Section 106 Agreement to allow a reduction in affordable housing from 40% to 30% and change to trigger point for financial contribution towards improvements to Baker's Park**

The Chairman reported that Councillor Fry, one of the Ward Members, who was unable to remain at the meeting, considered the affordable housing percentage was still too low.

On balance, the Committee considered that the increase in 5% to 30% affordable housing was an improvement on 25%.

It was proposed by Councillor Brodie and seconded by Councillor Shantry that the application is approved as set out in the report circulated with the agenda.

Resolved

The Section 106 Agreement is amended to allow:

1. A reduction in Affordable Housing provision across the development site from 40% to 30% on the basis of a 70:30 split between rented and intermediate.
2. The final payment of £100,000 towards Baker's Park is provided prior to occupation of the 300<sup>th</sup> dwelling rather than the 360<sup>th</sup>.

**(18 votes for, 1 against and 1 abstention)**

- (vi) **NEWTON ABBOT 12/01409/OUT – Land at NGR 285548 70886, Gothic Road - Outline application for 5 dwellings**

*Councillor Cox declared a pecuniary interest by virtue of his membership of a Charity Committee of which the Applicant is also a member.*

The Committee noted the following further information:

- Two additional letters of objection which raise issues already summarised in the report.
- The consultation response from English Heritage circulated to Members, which comments that the principle of development is likely to undermine the rural open character of the area, and an outline proposal is not ideal given the sensitivity of the site. However, it should be noted that the English Heritage Officer has not visited the site and in his recommendation also suggests that the application be determined in accordance with policy guidance and on the basis of the Council's specialist conservation advice.

## PLANNING (09.07.12)

- A further consultation response from the Council's Conservation Officer with regard to comments made about the route of the Bound Beaters. The Conservation Officer has commented as follows:

*"While I would of course advocate maintaining this ancient tradition of checking the Manorial boundary for encroachment, I am not aware that this issue on its own would hold enough weight to deny granting of outline planning permission, particularly as I understand that there is no public right of access available to the site at present."*

- A consultation response from the Council's Service Manager - Green Spaces and Active Leisure which makes requests for financial contributions towards open space, play and recreation facilities.

The Area Planning Officer advised that the Applicant has agreed to meet these requests and therefore the officer recommendation as set out in the report circulated with the agenda should be amended to read:

*Subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure:*

- £168 per dwelling towards improved teenage play facilities for the area;*
- £634.18 per dwelling towards improved active recreation facilities in the area;*
- £713 per dwelling to be pooled to provide new indoor sport facilities to serve the area; and*
- £1,714.86 per dwelling towards improvements in local parks or the provision of a minimum of 90m<sup>2</sup> of public open space in a location to be agreed.*

*Permission is granted subject to the conditions set out in the report circulated with the agenda.*

Public Speaker: Supporter, Mr Emery – Five new family dwellings are desirable, acceptable and would provide much needed housing; the site is sustainable and within the residential area; there would be no adverse impact on the area or landscape; the natural stone wall would be maintained; the design would use quality materials and would not be detrimental to the nearby listed Almshouses; two car parking spaces would be provided for each property; and the public right of way would not be effected.

Comments raised by Members of the Committee included: the road network to the site is very narrow; and the Conservation Officer has no objection to the proposal.

The Chairman reported on the views of the Ward Member, Councillor Bunday who was unable to attend the meeting. These included concern relating to the impact on the street scene and green lung of the area; impact on the narrow road network and exacerbation of the existing traffic congestion.

## PLANNING (09.07.12)

In response to Member questions it was confirmed that: there is no highway objection to the proposal and no public access to the site; and there is sufficient reason to request a site inspection if pertinent matters cannot be adequately assessed from the DVD footage.

It was proposed by Councillor Shantry and seconded by Councillor Fusco that consideration of the application be deferred pending a Member site inspection.

Resolved

Consideration deferred pending a Member site inspection.  
**(20 votes for and 0 against)**

**(vii) TEIGNMOUTH – 12/00377/FUL – 1a & 1b Mulberry Street - conversion of two dwellings into six flats including raising of roof**

It was proposed by Councillor Fusco and seconded by Councillor Cox that consideration of the application is deferred pending a Member site inspection.

The Service Manager – Development Management cautioned against the necessity for a site inspection when the only previous reason for refusal in relation to the bin storage had now been addressed. A site inspection would also unnecessarily delay a decision.

An amendment was proposed by Councillor Haines and seconded by Councillor Lambert that the application is approved as set out in the report circulated with the agenda. The amendment was carried.

Resolved

Permission granted subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard 3 years for commencement.
2. Development to accord with the approved plans.
3. Bin storage facilities to be provided prior to first occupation.
4. Prior to commencement a sample of natural slate to be submitted for approval.

**(18 votes for and 2 against)**

**(viii) TEIGNMOUTH – 12/00615/CON – 1a & 1b Mulberry Street – partial demolition of existing building**

It was proposed by Councillor Haines and seconded by Councillor Corney-Walker that the application be approved as set out in the report circulated with the agenda.

Resolved

Conservation area consent granted subject to the following conditions:

PLANNING (09.07.12)

1. Three year commencement.
2. No demolition until a contract is in place for the redevelopment of the site as approved by the Local Planning Authority.

**(17 votes for and 2 against)**

**(ix) NEWTON ABBOT – 12/01181/MAJ – Former Milber Abattoir, St Marychurch Road – Demolition of existing abattoir and erection of two-storey office building**

It was proposed by Councillor Haines and seconded by Councillor Lambert that the application be approved as set out in the report circulated with the agenda.

Resolved

Permission granted subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard 3 years for commencement.
2. Development to accord with the approved plans.
3. Details of materials to be submitted for approval.
4. Hard and soft landscape details to be submitted for approval.
5. Access and parking to be completed prior to occupation of the building.
6. Foul and surface water drainage details to be submitted for approval.
7. Travel Plan to be submitted for approval.
8. Hedgerows to be protected through translocation and/or replanting and to be carried out in accordance with the hedgerow assessment report.
9. Bat and dormouse surveys to be submitted for approval together with any necessary mitigating measures prior to commencement of development.
10. Programme of archaeological work to be submitted for approval prior to commencement of development.

**(18 votes for and 0 against)**

**(x) IDE – 12/01130/FUL – 82 High Street – Creation of roof terrace and loft conversion**

The Committee noted the following further information:

- The agent has submitted a letter in response to the comments made by the Conservation Officer which sets out that:
  - i. The proposal appears to be comfortable in scale and unobtrusive, marrying well with the existing dormer to the left.
  - ii. The high quality design and materials ensure that the dormer is a positive feature in the roofscape.
  - iii. The nature of Ide is one of varying scales, styles and materials. The only constant thread is the individual charm of the houses, not repetition theme and this proposal fits very well with this organic development history and as such is a positive contribution to the conservation area.

The Area Planning Officer advised that if the Committee is mindful to approve the application then the following conditions should be imposed:

1. Standard time limit;

## PLANNING (09.07.12)

2. In accordance with submitted details;
3. Privacy screen on terrace to be installed before terrace comes into use.

Public Speaker: Supporter, Mr Jordan – the quality design would be sympathetic to and contribute positively to the existing dwelling and the area; the Conservation Officer did not appear to have a clear view of the dwelling when assessing the proposal, in relation to the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Comments raised by Members of the Committee included: the design is sympathetic to the dwelling which is partially obscured when approached from the south; on balance the application was considered acceptable on the grounds that the proposal would not be visually harmful to either the dwelling or the Conservation Area.

It was proposed by Councillor Goodey and seconded by Councillor Connett that the application be approved subject to conditions as detailed above.

Resolved

Permission granted subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard three years time limit for commencement.
2. Development in accordance with submitted details.
3. Privacy screen on terrace to be installed before terrace comes into use.

**(18 votes for and 0 against)**

*Note: The approval of the application was contrary to the recommendation of the Service Manager - Development Manager. The Committee considered the application acceptable for reasons set out above.*

### **5. ENFORCEMENT ISSUES**

The Committee noted a report on enforcement issues dealt with under delegated powers since the last meeting of the Committee.

### **6. APPEAL DECISIONS**

The Committee noted a report on decisions made by the Planning Inspectorate on appeals against refusal of planning permission.

HUMPHREY CLEMENS  
Chairman