

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT
COMMITTEE HELD AT FOLLATON HOUSE, TOTNES, ON WEDNESDAY,
2 SEPTEMBER 2015**

Members in attendance			
* Denotes attendance		∅ Denotes apology for absence	
*	Cllr I Bramble	*	Cllr J M Hodgson
∅	Cllr J Brazil	*	Cllr T R Holway
∅	Cllr B F Cane	*	Cllr J A Pearce
*	Cllr P K Cuthbert	*	Cllr R Rowe
∅	Cllr R J Foss (Vice Chairman)	*	Cllr R C Steer (Chairman)
*	Cllr P W Hitchins	*	Cllr R J Vint

Other Members in attendance
Cllrs Tucker and Ward

Item No	Minute Ref or App. No. below refers	Officers in attendance and participating
All agenda items		Planning Officers, Legal Officer and Senior Case Manager

DM.21/15 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 29 July 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

DM.22/15 URGENT BUSINESS

The Chairman advised that application **27/1159/15/F** Change of use of redundant barn to 2no dwellings, erection of garages, additional access and associated alterations Proposed development site at SX 624 562, Woodland Barn, Woodland Farm, Ivybridge, PL21 9HG had been deferred prior to the start of this meeting.

DM.23/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

DM.24/15 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Chairman proceeded to announce that the following members of the public had registered their wish to speak at the meeting:-

- **05/1229/15/F:** Objector – Mr Norman Botton: Supporter – Mr Dan Lethbridge: Parish Council Representative – Cllr Bryan Carson: Demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings and erection of 2 No. replacement dwellings to include creation of new access (Resubmission of planning application 05/2922/14/F) – Seafront, Marine Drive, Bigbury on Sea.

DM.25/15 **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The Planning Case Officers submitted details of the planning applications as presented in the agenda papers.

During discussion of the planning applications, the following motions (which were in contradiction to the planning officer recommendation in the published agenda report), were **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED** and on being put to the vote were either **CARRIED** or **LOST**:-

- a) In respect of application **05/1229/15/F**: Demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings and erection of 2 No replacement dwellings to include creation of new access (Resubmission of planning application 05/2922/14/F) – Seafront, Marine Drive, Bigbury on Sea, Kingsbridge, the Case Officer introduced the application and advised Members of an update in relation to a correction and amendment to the condition relating to the erection of a glazed screen which would now state that details were to be agreed in writing prior to commencement. He also advised that the description of the application as presented was incorrect, and should in fact refer to ‘Resubmission of planning **APPLICATION** 05/2922/14/F (rather than planning **APPROVAL**).

The Case Officer continued his presentation with plans, elevations and photographs, and then took Members through the main issues of the application. He then concluded by advising that the application was recommended for conditional approval.

The Parish Council representative advised Members that there were a number of concerns locally with the application including the size of the proposal, the design, particularly in respect of the flat roof, and the disappointment that the architect did not listen to the views of local people. He concluded with an example of a development in a similar location where the views of local people had been taken into account and the outcome was a development that was deemed acceptable.

The Local Ward Member echoed these concerns and reminded Members of the considerable local feeling against the application.

During discussion, the Members noted the importance of the site, particularly in relation to Burgh Island and felt that the application would be a disaster in terms of views from Burgh Island. The proposal was considered to be out of scale and was not of high quality design. Also, Members were of the view that it did not meet a number of development policies.

It was then **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED** and on being put to the vote declared **CARRIED**:-

‘That the application be refused’

Reasons:

The proposal, by reason of its design, scale, mass and appearance would result in an incongruous development which would cause significant harm to the visual character and appearance of the area, which is within the South Devon AONB, including views from Burgh Island and the beach. The proposal would be contrary to Policies DP1 and DP2 of the Local Plan and guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

DM.26/15 PLANNING APPEALS UPDATE

The Lead Planning Officer updated Members on the detail of the listed appeals.

DM.27/15 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SCHEME

Following a twelve month trial, the Committee received a report that sought views on whether to formally revise the public participation scheme to enable town and parish council representatives to speak on relevant applications at Development Management Committee.

The Chairman asked Members for their views and the majority of Members stated that they wished to continue the current practice of allowing town and parish council representatives to speak at Development Management Committee meetings.

In response to a suggestion that town and parish council representatives should be allowed to participate either at one of the Development Management Committee, or at site inspections, but not both, the majority of Members again agreed with this view. However, Members did state that if the town and parish council representatives attended site inspections, one of those representatives should be able to ask questions of clarity of, and make specific points to, the Chairman.

Members then discussed the time allowed for registered speakers. It was not felt appropriate that town and parish council representatives should be restricted to a shorter time than registered objectors or supporters. However, to ensure applications were presented in a timely manner, it was suggested that, in the case of linked applications being presented to the Committee, that only one time slot be applied for each of the registered speakers. For example, an application that also included a linked Listed Building application had in the past been allowed double time as a time slot was applied to each application number. In future, it was recommended that only one time slot should be permitted.

It was then:

RECOMMENDED

That Council be **RECOMMENDED** to:

1. amend the Development Management Public Participation Scheme to enable the opportunity for town and parish council representatives to speak on planning applications within their own town or parish provided that they abide by the same rules as applied for objectors and supporters;
2. Amend the Site Inspection Protocol to state that town and parish councils are able attend site inspections but would no longer be invited to make presentations. There would be an opportunity for one spokesperson representing the town or parish council to ask questions of clarity or to make specific points based on local knowledge to the Chairman; and
3. Amend the Development Management Public Participation Scheme so that linked applications presented to Committee are only allowed one time slot per speaker.

(Meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and concluded at 3:10 pm)

Chairman

Voting Analysis for Planning Applications – DM Committee 29 July 2015

Application No:	Site Address	Vote	Councillors who Voted Yes	Councillors who Voted No	Councillors who Voted Abstain	Absent
05/1229/15/F	Seafront, Marine Drive, Bigbury on Sea	Refusal	Cllrs Vint, Bramble, Hodgson, Cuthbert, Hitchins, Pearce, Rowe, (7)	Cllr Steer (1)	Cllr Holway (1)	Cllr Brazil, Cane, Foss (3)
41/1294/15/CU	Bangwallop, 2 Island Square, Island Street, Salcombe	Conditional Approval	Cllrs Steer, Vint, Cuthbert, Holway, Hitchins, Bramble, Pearce, Rowe, Hodgson (9)			Cllr Brazil, Cane, Foss (3)

APPENDIX A

05/1229/15/F

Demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings and erection of 2No replacement dwellings to include creation of new access (Resubmission of planning approval 05/2922/14/F)

Parish or Town Council - Bigbury

Parish Council's Views – Objection

Officer Update – Revised balcony condition suggested by the Officer

Recommendation – Conditional Approval

Recommended Conditions –

1. Time limit for commencement
2. In accordance with plans
3. Samples of materials
4. Unexpected Contamination
5. Ecological mitigation to take place prior to demolition.
6. Erection of glazed screen at a height of 2.1m on the south eastern elevation of the balcony serving Plot 1
7. Permitted Development Restrictions

Committee Decision – Refusal

41/1294/15/CU

Change of use of premises to A2 (financial and professional services)

Parish or Town Council - Salcombe

Parish Council's Views – No Objection

Officer Update – n/a

Recommendation – Conditional Approval

Committee Decision – Conditional Approval

1. Time
2. Accord with plans
3. Removal of Change of Use Permitted Development Rights