

MINUTES of the **MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**
held in the **COUNCIL CHAMBER, FOLLATON HOUSE, TOTNES**, on **WEDNESDAY**,
9 November 2022

Members in attendance			
* Denotes attendance			
∅ Denotes apologies			
*	Cllr V Abbott	*	Cllr M Long
∅	Cllr J Brazil	∅	Cllr G Pannell
∅	Cllr D Brown	∅	Cllr K Pringle
*	Cllr R J Foss (Chairman) (for 6(b) and (c) only (Minute DM.40/22 refers)	*	Cllr H Reeve
*	Cllr J M Hodgson (for 6(a) and (b) only (Minute DM.40/22 refers)	*	Cllr R Rowe (Vice Chair)
∅	Cllr K Kemp	*	Cllr B Taylor
*	Cllr K Baldry (substituting for Cllr G Pannell)	*	Cllr B Spencer (substituting for Cllr D Brown)
*	Cllr D O'Callaghan (substituting for Cllr Brazil)	*	Cllr P Smerdon (substituting for Cllr K Pringle) (for 6(a) and (c) only (Minute DM.40/22 refers)

Other Members also in attendance and participating:

Cllr J Pearce

Officers in attendance and participating:

Item No:	Application No:	Officers:
All agenda items		Head of Development Management, Senior Specialists, Specialists and Senior Case Manager – Development Management; Monitoring Officer (via MS Teams); IT Specialists; and Democratic Services Officer

DM.37/22 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 5 October were confirmed as a correct record by the Committee.

DM.38/22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members and officers were invited to declare any interests in the items of business to be considered and the following were made:

Cllr B Taylor declared an Other Registerable Interest in application 6(a) (minutes DM.40/22 (a) below refer) because he is a member of South Devon AONB Partnership Committee. The Member remained in the meeting and took part in the debate and vote thereon.

Cllr Hodgson declared a personal interest in application 6(c) (minutes DM.40/22 (c) below refer) as the applicant is known to the Member. Cllr Hodgson left the meeting for this application and took no part in the debate nor vote thereon.

DM.39/22 **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

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.

DM.40/22 **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

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

**6a) 2735/22/HHO 10 The Plat, Strete
Parish - Strete**

Development: Householder application for replacement rear single storey sun room, first floor bedroom extension over garage, modifications to existing drive to provide additional on-site parking including resurfacing of existing for a new impermeable surface (Resubmission of 1175/22/HHO)

This application was Chaired by Councillor Rowe.

Case Officer Update: The Case Officer reported they had received the lighting plan and highlighted an error within the report that the additional parking for this application will be a 'permeable' surface and not 'impermeable' as stated in the report. The Case Officer explained that the lighting plan took into account all the measures and impact on all neighbouring properties. The Officer further added that the drainage proposal was not compliant within the SPD guidance but it could be agreed by condition. The Case Officer said that the proposed extensions were considered subservient additions to the existing dwelling and would not cause harm to the wider landscape. The development was not considered to have a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties

In response to questions raised, it was reported that:

- This application does not fall with the conservation area;
- The scale of the development would not require a construction management plan.

Speakers included: Objector – Nicola Cullen; Supporter – Peter Wells; Parish Councillor – Councillor G Campbell; Ward Member – Cllr R Foss.

In response to questions the objector reported that the shadow would engulf their property.

In response to questions the Parish Councillor reported that 5 residents objected, and 10-12 people objected at the parish council meeting.

The Ward Member raised the light impact on neighbouring properties. This application normally would not come to committee but decided to bring this to the committee for a decision.

In response to questions raised it was reported that the standard test was used to test the impact of overshadowing. The impact likely to be felt more in the spring and winter.

During the debate, Members discussed at length the lighting issue and the impact on neighbouring properties and whether neighbouring properties would be overshadowed by this application. Member felt that overshadowing of neighbouring properties was not an issue even though a number of objections were received Members said that they could not see any reason to refuse this application.

Recommendation: Conditional approval.

Committee decision: Conditional approval.

Conditions: Standard time limit
Adherence to plans
Materials to match
Adherence to ecological mitigation
Surface water drainage

6b) 2156/22/FUL "Higher Farleigh Meadow", Diptford Parish – Diptford

Development: Application to regularise and retain agricultural storage building (Retrospective).

Case Officer Update: The Case Officer reported that a letter of objection has been received and highlighted that the application did not provide sufficient justification to explain why a building of the scale proposed was required for such a small area of land.

In response to questions raised, it was reported that:

- Consultants were only used to assess larger applications;
- The fire vehicle and metal structure on the land forming the application site not part of the application.

Speakers included: Supporter – Amanda Burden; Parish Council – Councillor S Franklin; Ward Member – Cllr P Smerdon.

In response to questions, the supporter reported that the applicant will use the land to grow vegetables and hold small amount of livestock. The building will be used to store animal feed.

The Ward Member included Cllr Pannell's statement which referred to the scale of this agricultural building and whether it was appropriate for the size of the holding. Concerns were raised that fields capable of being divided into a number of one acre plots could easily be filled with such buildings which will then have a significant impact on the rural landscape. The Ward Member said that this application had been recommended for approval but officers had since changed their recommendation. The Ward Member explained that the Diptford Parish Council were concerned that the building too large with further concerns on the fire vehicle and shipping container on site.

In response to questions raised by Members, the Case Officer explained that when senior officers reviewed this application they had a different view and changed the recommendation to refusal.

During the debate, some Members felt that this application was a classic building for agricultural need and to give the applicant the benefit of doubt. Other Members questioned whether the building was applicable to the size of the land as well as being mindful of allowing a building of that size within an AONB. Members felt that this could then encourage larger buildings on small plots of land across the area.

Recommendation: Refusal

Committee decision: Refusal

**6c) 2453/22/HHO 36 Furze Road, Totnes
Parish – Berry Pomeroy**

Development: Householder application for proposed single storey front extension

Case Officer Update: The Case Officer highlighted that the applicant was a Councillor. The design of the current proposed development was considered to be an incongruous addition to the property and immediate street scene, and failed to have proper regard to the local pattern of development. As such the proposal failed in the Officer's view to comply with the requirements of policy DEV20.

In response to questions raised by Members, it was reported that an application made by a Member or employee automatically comes to the committee.

Speakers included: Supporter – Neil Warren

In response to questions to the supporter, the Supporter reported that there were a number of properties with front facing extensions within short distance of this application.

During the debate, Members felt that the application did respect the street scene and saw this as an improvement to the locality.

Recommendation: Refusal

Committee decision: Approval subject to the following conditions:

- Standard time limit and completion in accordance with plans
- recommendations within the ecology report to be followed
- Drainage

DM.41/22 **PLANNING APPEALS UPDATE**

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

DM.42/22 **UPDATE ON UNDETERMINED MAJOR APPLICATIONS**

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

(Meeting commenced at 10:00 am. Meeting concluded at 12:17 pm, with a break at 11.50 am)

Chairman

Voting Analysis for Planning Applications – DM Committee 9th November 2022

<i>Application No:</i>	<i>Site Address</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Councillors who Voted Yes</i>	<i>Councillors who Voted No</i>	<i>Councillors who Voted Abstain</i>	<i>Absent</i>
2735/22/HHO	10 The Plat, Strete	Conditional Approval	Cllrs Abbott, Baldry, Hodgson, Long, O'Callaghan, Reeve, Rowe, Smerdon, Spencer and Taylor (10)			Cllrs Foss and Kemp (2)
2156/22/FUL	2156/22/FUL - "Higher Farleigh Meadow", Diptford	Refusal	Cllrs Abbott, Baldry, Foss, Long, O'Callaghan, Reeve, Spencer and Taylor (8)	Cllr Hodgson (1)	Cllr Rowe (1)	Cllrs Kemp and Smerdon (2)
2453/22/HHO	36 Furze Road, Totnes	Approval	Cllrs Abbott, Baldry, Foss, Long, O'Callaghan, Reeve, Smerdon, Spencer and Taylor (9)		Cllr Rowe (1)	Cllrs Hodgson and Kemp (2)