

Minutes of a meeting of the **WEST DEVON DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT & LICENSING COMMITTEE** held on **TUESDAY** the **3rd** day of **October 2023** at **10.00am** in the **COUNCIL CHAMBER, KILWORTHY PARK**

Present Cllr T Southcott – Chairman

Cllr A Cunningham	Cllr T Leech
Cllr M Ewings	Cllr U Mann
Cllr S Guthrie	Cllr J Moody
Cllr N Jory	Cllr C Mott

Cllr S Wakeham

Head of Development Management (JH)
Senior Planning Officer (BH)
Monitoring Officer and Head of Legal Services (DF) (Via MS Teams)
Senior Democratic Services Officer (KH)

***DM&L.15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Cllr Ric Cheadle for who Cllr Mandy Ewings substituted.

***DM&L.16 DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Cllr Mott declared she had received an email from the applicant of application 1314/23/OPA. Some other Members had received the same email.

Cllr Ewings declared her daughter had married a person with the surname 'Kneebone' which was the same surname as the applicants for planning application 1314/23/OPA, but was not sure they were related.

***DM&L.17 URGENT BUSINESS**

There was no urgent business brought forward to this meeting.

***DM&L.18 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

The minutes from the Committee meeting held on 5 September 2023 were approved as a true and correct record.

***DM&L.19 PLANNING, LISTED BUILDING, TREE PRESERVATION ORDER AND ENFORCEMENT REPORTS**

The Committee proceeded to consider the reports that had been prepared by the relevant Planning Officer on the following applications and considered also the comments of the Town and Parish Councils together with other representations received, which were listed within the presented agenda report and summarised below:

(a) Application No. 1314/23/OPA Ward: Okehampton North

Site Address: Land at SX 567 996, Inwardleigh

Development: Outline planning application (with all matters reserved apart from access) for up to four holiday units and stable block

Recommendation: Refusal

Key issues for Committee consideration:

- **Principle of development**
- **Proven need for a countryside location**
- **Proven need for holiday accommodation**
- **Highways**
- **Biodiversity**
- **Drainage**
- **Low carbon**

Following the case officer's presentation of the application and her report, in response to a statement made by the applicant in the email that had been sent to members of the Committee, the Head of Development Management explained when a Planning Officer reviews any application, the higher level strategic policies within the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan are looked at first. In the case of this application those policies identified that the application site is in a rural and unsustainable location and therefore 'in principle' would fail to meet the SPT policies of the Plan. The Planning Officer would then look at the TTV policies, which allocate development to certain areas and identify where development should be located, followed the DEV policies which look at the more detailed aspects of the application.

The applicant then addressed the Committee. He stated he farmed in Devon and Cornwall and ran holiday lodge accommodation and a 60 day camp site. He stated that he worked with an equestrian centre in Launceston where a similar equestrian business is established. The centre approached the applicant as they are full to capacity and cannot expand on their site. Staff for the site would be sourced locally and he felt this application would benefit the local economy.

The applicant was asked when the site was last used for equestrian use and he stated it was used last year for certain events but not used for long term use for some years.

The Ward Member spoke on the application, stating that he felt the detailed policies were important and in a rural area diversification was an important consideration.

In debate, policy DEV 32 was queried. The Planning Officer clarified that the proposal was contrary to the aims of the policy rather than specific parts of the policy. It was argued by a Member that in rural areas public transport was limited. A member voiced concerns over broadband connectivity to the site and the access out on to the main road for vehicles leaving the site.

Committee Decision: Refusal

(b) Application No. 4490/22/HHO Ward: Tavistock South-West

Site Address: 58 Whitchurch Road, Tavistock PL19 9BD

**Development: Readvertisement (revised plans)
Householder application for proposed demolition of single story garden room and erection of two storey extension, over cladding of existing external envelope with insulation, slating and render systems and replacement windows and doors with thermally broken PPC aluminium and new porch to north east elevation**

Recommendation: Refusal

Key issues for consideration:

- **Design, scale and massing.**
- **Visual impact on the host dwelling and its setting.**

The use of zinc cladding was questioned as it was stated in the report as not in keeping with the area but a Member felt it was within the remit of being of low carbon material and acceptable within policy DEV 20 in the Joint Local Plan.

In debate the size of the proposed extension was raised and there was disagreement to the Officer recommendation of refusal due to size and impact as they felt it was not an issue and it would not be visible from the road.

Another member stating the wrap around extension was an attempt to bring a low carbon element to the property.

The Head of Development reminded the Committee that the size and scale of the extension was the reason for the proposed refusal.

**Committee decision: Conditional Consent.
Conditions to be agreed by the Head of
Development Management, in consultation with the Chairman
and Vice Chairman of the Development and Licensing
Committee**

***DM&L.20 PLANNING APPEALS UPDATE**

The Head of Development Management took Members through an application that was dismissed at Morwell ham Dam Bungalow, Morwellham, for a holiday let. The second appeal was at Brook Barn, Milton Combe for a householder application for an extension as a replacement for an existing conservatory. This was a split decision and the Inspector agreed the extension should be dismissed but allowed the slight increase in the size of the two accesses on the basis that it had a neutral effect on the conservation area and AONB.

***DM&L.21 UPDATE ON UNDETERMINED MAJOR APPLICATIONS**

There were no questions on this item.

(The Meeting ended at 11.30am)

Chairman