

# MINUTES

**Committee:** Planning Committee  
**Date:** Monday, 20 September 2021  
**Time:** 6:30pm  
**Venue:** Younghayes Centre, 169 Younghayes Road EX5 7DR

## Present

Cllr Ray Bloxham (Chair)  
Cllr Les Bayliss  
Cllr Colin Buchan  
Cllr Barry Rogers

## Also Present

Cllr Kim Bloxham, Cranbrook Town Council  
Tracy Simmons, Deputy Clerk, Cranbrook Town Council

## P/21/73 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Kevin Blakey.

## P/21/74 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Cllr Kim Bloxham declared a personal interest as a member of EDDC Planning Committee and reserved the right to revise any comments when all the information was known.

## P/21/75 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 9 August 2021 as a correct record.

## P/21/76 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There were no members of the public in attendance.

## P/21/77 PLANNING MONITORING REPORT

The Committee noted the planning monitoring report.

## P/21/78 Planning Application 21/2359/FUL

The Committee considered planning application 21/2359/FUL comprising a single storey rear extension and part conversion and first-floor extension of existing garage at 2 Barleycorn, Cranbrook Exeter Devon EX5 7AB.

The Committee noted that the single storey rear extension was in essence a sunroom which linked the existing house to the detached garage. The application also proposed the conversion of one of the two garages into two storey living accommodation.

Signed .....

The Committee commented that principle of development appeared to be acceptable. However, there were a number of planning considerations to regard, these included:

The application stated that there was no loss of parking. This appeared to be inaccurate as there was a 25% loss of available parking if approved through the conversion of one of the two garages. The site benefited from two off road spaces which were unaffected by the development and the resulting house would therefore still have three parking spaces.

The Committee noted that the creation of the ground floor extension to link the existing house and detached garage raised no areas of concern. However, the Committee questioned whether the design of the second-floor extension over the garage was acceptable. The rear elevation appeared to be out of keeping with the rest of the property and neighbouring properties. The flat roof design, whilst affording maximum ceiling height represented an unusual appearance that would be visible from neighbouring properties. Equally the use of vertical cladding on the rear elevation was not in keeping with the remainder of the property.

The Committee commented that the windows shown on the proposed garage extension appeared to be located at a comparatively high level, however, without detailed plans it was difficult for the Committee to comment on whether there would be any potential overlooking.

It was proposed by Cllr Les Bayliss, seconded by Cllr Barry Rogers and **resolved** to object to the application, whilst the principle of development of the site was acceptable the reasons for the objection were:

1. The design of the over garage extension, particularly the rear elevation, was incongruous and not in keeping with the design of the original property and immediate neighbours;
2. The use of vertical cladding on the rear elevation of the garage extension was out of keeping with the reminder of the property;
3. Clarity is sought as to whether the two rear windows in the garage extension would result in overlooking;

The Committee would also seek a correction of the application to show that there was a net loss of one parking space if approved - although this of itself would not be grounds for refusal the town council is concerned with overall loss of parking spaces within the town.

## **P/21/79 PLANNING APPLICATION 21/2236/MRES**

The Committee considered Reserved Matters Application 21/2236/MRES (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for construction of 146 dwellings including affordable housing, landscaping, associated site infrastructure and all other associated works. The proposal includes the discharge of conditions 6, 11, 14, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, 28 and 37 of outline planning permission 03/P1900. Environmental Statement submitted to the planning authority at Outline stage at the Ingrams Land, Cranbrook New Community.

The Committee noted that this was a reserved matters application with the principle of development of the site was established at outline by application 03/P1900.

It was noted that this was a key application for the Ingrams area of Cranbrook and it also triggered the progression of the application for the adjoining site which provide sports pitches and the proposed pavilion. The principal access road ran alongside the western boundary of the sports area and development of this site would determine the use of the Ingrams land and its suitability for specific sports as the town developed.

The Committee noted that there were a number of factors that needed to be considered, these included:

The quantum, density and housing type proposed. The Committee noted that for a long time, the Town Council has been raising the point that homes delivered in the town to date have focused on relatively small, low-cost properties with very few that could be described as "executive" properties for

Signed .....

professional purchasers. This has resulted in an unbalanced community to date and this application does nothing to alter that. Of the 146 homes proposed only 16 are detached.

The Committed noted that the proposal delivered 42 social housing properties (28.5%). These included:

- Six 1 bed properties;
- Fifteen 2 bed properties;
- Nineteen 3 bed properties;
- And Two 4 bed properties.

The floor area ranges from the smallest at 565 sq ft to the largest 4 bed at 1188 sq ft.

The Committee commented that nineteen parking bays were provided as “visitor parking” alongside the main access road, while parking for the adjacent properties was at the rear or in parking courts. The Committee commented that these visitor bays would undoubtedly be used as residential parking, as seen in other area in Cranbrook, therefore, in essence there was no tangible visitor parking proposed.

The Committee noted that very few of the proposed properties had a garage with most parking provided in parking bays or courts and many of the bays were not adjacent to the allocated property. Whilst the lack of garages was less of an issue, as experience has shown most residents in Cranbrook do not use the garage for vehicle parking, the apparent inconvenient location of many of the allocated spaces was. The town council has continuously commented on the poor parking provision, including the use of parking courts. Some of the properties proposed were quite a distance from the parking courts which leads to those residents being more likely to park on the frontages and not use the parking court.

The Committee observed that there would need to be clarity of which parcels of Public Open Space would be passed to the Town Council and this detail would need to be conditioned and agreed prior to commencement.

The Committee noted the s38 plans which were made available just prior to the meeting.

The Committee commented that there was no information in the application that provided any confidence that the developer intended to reduce the carbon footprint of the development either in terms of sourcing materials locally nor in the construction and provision of ecological features such as EV charging points and PV panels. The Committee felt that given the declared climate emergency this should be given greater weight.

It was proposed by Cllr Barry Rogers, seconded by Cllr Colin Buchan and **resolved** that although the Council acknowledges the principle of development has been established, the Committee would like to object to the application for the following reasons:

1. The Town Council remained disappointed that previous planning comments about the quantum, density and housing type remained unaddressed by the developer. This had, and continued to, lead to the delivery of an unbalanced community. Whilst smaller and more affordable properties no doubt sold easier, this was at the cost of the overall development of the town.
2. Whilst the provision of a small number of garage spaces was not of concern, the lack of tangible visitor bays, the continued use of rear parking courts and the remote location of many of the allocated bays was a concern and this would ultimately give rise to on-street and on-verge parking problems in the parcel.
3. Whilst the number of Affordable Homes was acceptable the size and scale of these properties was not.
4. If approved, conditions should be imposed to clarify the land that was proposed to pass to the town council with agreement reached prior to commencement of development. This was to prevent issues experienced hitherto where land intended for the Town Council was clearly not Public Open Space, has issues of access by contractors and also gives rise to issues of damage by its proximity to private parking areas.
5. There was no information in the application that provided any confidence that the developer intended to reduce the carbon footprint of the development either in terms of supply chain, sourcing materials locally nor in the construction and provision of ecological features such as EV

Signed .....

charging points and PV panels. The Committee felt that given the declared climate emergency this should be given greater weight.

**P/21/80 PLANNING APPLICATION 21/2409/FUL**

The Committee considered planning application 21/2409/FUL comprising the Construction of rear extension at 34 Long Culvering, Cranbrook Exeter EX5 7ES.

The Committee commented that given the alignment of the existing property as it relates to its immediate neighbours, there were no apparent issues of amenity impact on neighbouring properties, the design and materials were acceptable and there were no other planning considerations that would merit a refusal.

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

**The meeting closed at 6.59pm.**

Signed .....