

SOUTH HAMS DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE



Minutes of a meeting of the **South Hams Development Management Committee**
held on
Wednesday, 13th March, 2024 at 10.00 am at the **Council Chamber - Follaton
House**

Present: **Councillors:**

Chairman Cllr Long
Vice Chairman

Cllr Abbott
Cllr Carson
Cllr Hodgson
Cllr O'Callaghan
Cllr Rake

Cllr Allen
Cllr Edie (as Substitute)
Cllr Nix
Cllr Pannell
Cllr Steele (as Substitute)

In attendance:

Councillors:

Cllr Dennis

Cllr Thomas

Officers:

Head of Development Management
Principal Housing Officer
Senior Democratic Services Support Officer
Senior Planning Officers

56.

Minutes

DM.56/23

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 14 February 2024 were confirmed as a correct record by the Committee

57.

Declarations of Interest

DM.57/23

Members and officers were invited to declare any interests in the items of business to be considered and none were made

58. **Public Participation**

DM.58/23

The Chairman noted the list of members of the public, Town and Parish Council representatives, and Ward Members who had registered their wish to speak at the meeting

59. **Planning Applications**

DM.59/23

The Committee considered the details of the planning applications prepared by the relevant Case Officers as presented in the agenda papers, and considered the comments of Town and Parish Councils, together with other representations received, which were listed within the presented agenda reports, and **RESOLVED** that:

**6a) 3650/23/FUL Land At Sx 782 623, Symonds Drive, Dartington
Parish: Dartington Parish Council**

Development: Application for the erection of a single residential dwelling (Affordable Discount Market)

Case Officer Update: The Case Officer summarised the key issues, namely that:

- Discount to remain at 80% of open market rate.
- Additional information submitted to confirm trees and biodiversity enhancements.

The Officer reported that this was policy compliant and would not ask for a viability study because the site was 30% compliant. The open market value for this property was £450,000.

During the debate, one Member felt there was need to challenge large developers and £450K was not affordable and not meeting local housing needs. Also felt it was wrong to approve this and would see further applications coming forward on spare pieces of land. This was an ancient hamlet being flooded, over developed and not affordable. Another Member felt garden sizes being reduced were acceptable within the JLP and this was infill housing.

Recommendation: Conditional approval subject to completion of S106.

Committee decision: Conditional approval subject to completion of S106.

Conditions: Standard time limit
Accord with plans
No additional openings
Parking to be provided prior to occupation
Incidental use of garage

Adherence to submitted lighting strategy
Installation of EV charging point prior to occupation

6b) 3048/21/FUL Montgo, Maudlin Road, Totnes, TQ9 5TG
Town: Totnes

Development: Provision of single dwelling house
(resubmission of 1668/20/FUL)

Case Officer Update: The Case Officer summarised the key issues, namely that:

- Principle of development.
- Design/scale/landscape.
- Neighbour amenity.
- Highways and parking.
- Drainage.
- Land stability.
- Earlier refusal in 2020.

In response to questions raised, it was reported that:

- The Drainage Officer felt that the permeable paving was acceptable.
- They would be requesting oversight for a practical solution for land stability.
- The Totnes Town Council had been consulted on 4 occasions.

Having heard from speakers on behalf of the objector and the supporter, Members debated the application. During the debate, one Member raised concerns on the impact on neighbouring properties and felt that it was important to respect local distinctiveness and maintaining local identity. This site has the potential to be something wonderful and also felt that this was too big for the site, but they had dealt with the drainage and parking issues. Another Member felt this was not overbearing and the site was not being used and would now provide housing. It was also raised that the applicant had addressed the issues and therefore supported the officer's decision.

Recommendation: Conditional Approval

Committee decision: Conditional Approval to include a pre-commencement condition - a report on land stability to be approved by SHDC.

Conditions:

1. Time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Land stabilisation details
4. Site levels
5. Construction management plan
6. Construction environmental management plan
7. Access, parking and drainage

8. External materials
9. Boundary treatments
10. Landscaping scheme
11. EV charging point
12. Bin storage
13. Surface and foul water drainage
14. DEV32
15. Unidentified contamination
16. PD Removal

**6c) 3928/23/HHO Eldoret, Galmpton Cross, Galmpton, TQ7 3EH
Parish: South Huish**

Development: Householder application for demolition of outbuildings & single storey extension to East elevation. Creation of enclosed balcony to top of existing garage.

Case Officer Update: The Case Officer summarised the key issues, namely:

- Highly visible from the public realm due to countryside location, topography of landscape and lack of surrounding tree cover.
- Extension was overbearing at 74m² in footprint and 6.2m in height (300mm lower to ridge than previous two-storey proposal).
- Ridge higher the eaves of the two-storey host dwelling despite being single storey.
- Perception of a two-storey addition and rivals the primary of the parent dwelling.
- Inharmonious design which does not sit well with parent dwelling in terms of size, scale and fenestration.
- Excessive amount of glazing in this protected 'dark skies' landscape (approx. 50m² increase) risks the property becoming a 'beacon'.

In response to questions raised, it was reported that there was no formal way to measure light pollution however there was a need to take a pragmatic view because of the location and the impact on dark skies. The north elevation would be less impactive but would still create a glow.

Having heard from speakers on behalf of the supporter, statement from the Parish Council and Ward Member, Members debated the application. During the debate, one Member supported the officer's recommendation. Other Members felt that this breached a number of policies, over dominant and subservient to the main building and could have an extension that blends better with the original building. Another Member felt although visible it was also quite well hidden by the wooden area and hedge. Concerns were raised on the glazing and closeness to the undeveloped coast.

Recommendation: Refusal

Committee decision: Refusal

60. **Planning Appeals Update**

DM.60/23

Members noted the list of appeals as outlined in the presented agenda report.

61. **Update on Undetermined Major Applications**

DM.61/23

Members noted the update on undetermined major applications as outlined in the presented agenda report.

The Meeting concluded at 12.48 pm

Signed by:

Chairman
