

MINUTES

Committee: Planning Committee
Date: Monday, 7 June 2021
Time: 6:30pm
Venue: Younghayes Centre, 169 Younghayes Road EX5 7DR

Present

Cllr Ray Bloxham (Chair)
Cllr Les Bayliss
Cllr Kevin Blakey
Cllr Colin Buchan
Cllr Phil Norgate
Cllr Barry Rogers

Also Present

Tracy Simmons, Deputy Clerk, Cranbrook Town Council

P/21/37 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

P/21/38 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Cllr Kim Bloxham declared a personal interest as a member of East Devon District Council's Planning Committee and reserved the right to revise any comments when all the information was known.

P/21/39 MINUTES

It was proposed by Cllr Les Bayliss, seconded by Cllr Colin Buchan and **resolved** to accept and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 24 May 2021 as a correct record.

Cllr Phill Norgate joined the meeting.

P/21/40 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There were no members of the public in attendance.

P/21/41 PLANNING COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE

It was proposed by Cllr Kevin Blakey, seconded by Cllr Barry Rogers and **resolved** to accept the Planning Committee Terms of Reference.

P/21/42 PLANNING APPLICATION 21/1285/RES

The Committee considered planning application 21/1285/RES proposing the layout, scale, appearance & landscaping for the erection of 9 dwellings, Discharge of conditions 4 (drainage), 6 (ground infrastructure), 8 (external lighting), 9 (landscaping), 10, (finished floor levels), 11 (ecological recommendations), 12 (refuse storage) and 13 (materials) in respect of subsequent outline application 18/2588/OUT at Southbrook Lane, Whimple.

Signed

The principle of development of the site was already established by the granting of Outline Planning Consent (18/2588/OUT). Cranbrook Town Council discussed this application on 4 December 2018, minute ref 18/297. The Town Council supported the outline planning application commenting that whilst the site was technically in the countryside and therefore contrary to Strategy 7 of the Local Plan, its proximity to surrounding urban development in Cranbrook meant that the site was sustainable in all respects with proximity to local facilities, jobs and transport. It was felt therefore that there were insufficient grounds to justify a refusal on the grounds of Strategy 7.

It was noted that the establishment of a management company to manage on-site provision was proposed.

The Committee discussed the amount of communal open space on the site that could quite easily be designed and demised to the nine plots.

The submitted detail of the surface water drainage and foul drainage was not acceptable. The proposals showed that both surface and foul water would be discharged into a shallow open ditch at the southern edge of the site. This was not acceptable, and the site should make provision for adoptable mains connections as part of the initial development. Given the surrounding proximity of urban development in Cranbrook, the development of the site should be timed to facilitate this. Furthermore, insufficient detail was provided with regards to flood risk associated with surface and foul water drainage.

Details of the package treatment plant proposed for land north of plot 9 were not available for comment by the Town Council. Detail of the proposed underground sustainable urban drainage was not available to the Town Council for comment.

The on-site lighting proposals would not be acceptable for highway adoption which means that the on-parcel roads would remain with the residents as a shared responsibility.

On-plot waste handling facilities were acceptable but the provision of a waste bin collection point at the entrance to the site was not. Previous experiences of bin collection points indicated that this can give rise to environmental health issues and bins should be collected from outside properties. The site layout has sufficient turning arrangements to allow for kerbside waste collection.

There appear to be no details about how the homes would be heated, and it was considered that a sustainable option should be presented. Other sustainability factors are not addressed such as solar energy and Electric Vehicle charging.

It was proposed by Cllr Kevin Blakey, seconded by Cllr Colin Buchan and **resolved** to object to this application. Whilst the principle of development of the site, the general design of the properties and layout is supported the application in its present form is not acceptable for the following reasons:

1. The appointment of a management company could be avoided by an improved design of the landscaping so that this is demised to the nine households.
2. Equally the need for a management company would be avoided by timing construction to allow for mains connection of surface and foul drainage as the surrounding town builds out.
3. The proposals to discharge both surface and foul drainage into a shallow ditch on the southern boundary are unacceptable and could lead to flooding.
4. The flood risk assessment detail is insufficient.
5. There were no submitted details of either the proposed sustainable urban drainage system or the proposed foul drainage package treatment plant.
6. The provision of a bin collection point at the access to the site was not supported. Domestic waste should be collected from kerbside outside properties.

Signed

7. There was no information about provision for sustainable heating and no information on other sustainability factors such as solar energy and Electric Vehicle charging points.

8. Lighting proposals were unacceptable in terms of highway adoption. This would mean that the site roads remain with the residents to maintain in perpetuity.

P/21/43 PLANNING APPLICATION 21/1394/FUL

The Committee considered planning application 21/1394/FUL proposing a two-storey side extension and the addition of 4 x rooflights at 24 Post Coach Way, Cranbrook, Exeter, Devon, EX5 7BS.

The proposed materials were in keeping with the street scene and are the same materials as the current property. The proposed windows and roof lights did not cause any privacy or amenity issues with neighbours.

As the proposed extension was next to a shared access road to the neighbouring properties parking area, there was no parking directly next to where the proposed garage wall would be, therefore no access issues would be caused by this extension. The property would retain up to four parking spaces, two in the garage and two directly in front of the garage.

It was discussed that the scale and mass of the proposed two storey extension was a considerable increase when viewed from the west and north elevations compared with the existing property. This had the potential to be dominant over the neighbouring property. This was mitigated by the fact that the extension remained subservient to the existing house and the fact that the repositioned garage (and extension over) had better alignment with the neighbouring property. Whilst this proposal had the potential to reduce light to the neighbouring property, it was not considered sufficient to support an objection.

It was proposed by Cllr Les Bayliss, seconded by Cllr Kevin Blakey and **resolved** to support this application.

P/21/44 PLANNING MONITORING REPORT

The Committee considered the planning monitoring report. The report would list all applications and comments made by the Committee or Council against decisions made by East Devon District Council. The Committee would be able to review applications and any variances between the comments made by the Town Council and East Devon District Council.

The proposal is to review the report at every Planning meeting for applications which had been decided by East Devon District Council.

The Committee questioned if it would be possible to include links to documents where appropriate for ease of reference.

It was clarified that the report would be highlighted where East Devon District Council comments were different to those made by the Town Council so it would be easy to identify these differences.

The Deputy Clerk and Chairman of the Committee would look into improving the report document to include the above comments.

The meeting closed at 6.39 pm.

Signed