

# West Devon Development Management and Licensing Committee



West Devon  
Borough  
Council

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Agenda</b>								
<b>Date:</b>	<b>Tuesday, 4th June, 2024</b>								
<b>Time:</b>	<b>10.00 am</b>								
<b>Venue:</b>	<b>Chamber - Kilworthy Park</b>								
<b>Full Members:</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Chairman</b> Cllr Cheadle <b>Vice Chairman</b> Cllr Southcott</p> <p><i>Members:</i></p> <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td>Cllr Cunningham</td> <td>Cllr Mann</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cllr Guthrie</td> <td>Cllr Moody</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cllr Jory</td> <td>Cllr Mott</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cllr Leech</td> <td>Cllr Wakeham</td> </tr> </table>	Cllr Cunningham	Cllr Mann	Cllr Guthrie	Cllr Moody	Cllr Jory	Cllr Mott	Cllr Leech	Cllr Wakeham
Cllr Cunningham	Cllr Mann								
Cllr Guthrie	Cllr Moody								
Cllr Jory	Cllr Mott								
Cllr Leech	Cllr Wakeham								
<b>Interests – Declaration and Restriction on Participation:</b>	Members are reminded of their responsibility to declare any disclosable pecuniary interest not entered in the Authority's register or local non pecuniary interest which they have in any item of business on the agenda (subject to the exception for sensitive information) and to leave the meeting prior to discussion and voting on an item in which they have a disclosable pecuniary interest.								
<b>Committee administrator:</b>	Kathy Hoare - Democratic Services Specialist								

**1. Apologies for Absence**

**2. Declarations of Interest**

In accordance with the Code of Conduct, Members are invited to declare any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests, Other Registerable Interests and Non-Registerable Interests including the nature and extent of such interests they may have in any items to be considered at this meeting;

**3. Items Requiring Urgent Attention**

To consider those items which, in the opinion of the Chairman, should be considered by the Meeting as matters of urgency (if any).

**4. Confirmation of Minutes**

**1 - 10**

Meeting held on 14 May 2024

**5. Planning Applications**

To see Letters of Representation and further supplementary information relating to any of the planning applications on the agenda, please select the following link and enter the relevant Reference number:

<https://apps.westdevon.gov.uk//PlanningSearchMVC/>

**(a) 0302/24/ARM**

**11 - 20**

**Application number:**

0302/24/ARC

**Location:**

Wooladon Farm, Liftondown PL16 0DD

**Proposal:**

Application for approval for reserved matters following outline approval reference 2531/21/OPA relating to access, appearance, landscaping, layout, scale for erection of a dwelling for a farm manager together with access drive, plus the discharge of Conditions 6 (BNG), 7 (CEMP) and 8 (LEMP) (resubmission of 2531/21/OPA)

**6. Planning Appeals Update**

**21 - 22**

**7. Update on Undetermined Major Applications**

**23 - 26**

# Agenda Item 4

Minutes of a meeting of the **WEST DEVON DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT & LICENSING COMMITTEE** held on **TUESDAY** the **14th** day of **MAY 2024** at **10.00am** in the **COUNCIL CHAMBER, KILWORTHY PARK**

**Present** Cllr T Southcott – Chairman  
Cllr U Mann – Vice-Chairman

Cllr A Cunningham	Cllr C Mott
Cllr M Ewings	Cllr M Renders
Cllr S Guthrie	Cllr P Vachon
Cllr N Jory	Cllr S Wakeham

**Other Members in attendance:**

Cllrs Edmonds and Leech (MS Teams)

**Officers in attendance:**

Head of Development Management (PW)  
Planning Case Officer (SS) via MS Teams  
Principal Planning Officer (CS)  
Senior Planning Officer, Heritage (GL)  
Monitoring Officer (DF)  
Senior Democratic Services Officer (KH)

**\*DM&L.57 APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN**

In the absence of the Committee Chairman, nominations were sought for the appointment of a Vice-Chairman for the duration of this meeting and it was then:

**RESOLVED**

That Cllr U Mann be appointed Vice-Chairman for the duration of this Committee meeting.

**\*DM&L.58 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were apologies received from Cllrs Cheadle, Leech and Moody. Cllr Vachon substituted for Cllr Cheadle, Cllr Renders substituted for Cllr Leech and Cllr Ewings substituted for Cllr Moody.

**\*DM&L.59 DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Cllr N Jory declared in relation to application 4004/22/FUL, that from 2002-2009 he was the bursar of Mount House School, which subsequently merged with Kelly College to form Mount Kelly. His three children had attended Mount House School and two had attended Kelly, however they had left the school many years ago. He had no further association with the College. He stated that, in regard to application 0107/22/OPA, which was inside his Ward, he would exercise his right to speak on the application and would withdraw from the Committee at that point.

Cllrs Renders stated that he had received an email from one of the Governors of Kelly College, as had others on the Committee responding to some points outlined in the committee report.

Cllr Mann declared a non-registerable interest in application 4004/22/FUL, in that her son attended Kelly College. Also, with her involvement with the Tavistock Neighbourhood Plan, talks had been had with the Applicant in regard to the development plan within Tavistock, green space designation and sports fields. She was not present at those talks. She also declared that in respect of Application 0107/22/OPA she had met with the current Neighbourhood Plan group in Lamerton purely to discuss the process of producing a Neighbourhood Plan.

Cllr Ewings declared an interest in application 0034/24/FUL due to her son-in-law's family owning the property mentioned in the report, known as Gatherly Farm, the land and the Grade Two Listed farmhouse. She confirmed she had no pecuniary or personal interest in the land or farm and remained in the meeting and took part in the debate and vote thereon.

**\*DM&L.60 URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business brought forward to this meeting for consideration.

**\*DM&L.61 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

The Minutes from the Development Management and Licencing Committee meeting held on 16 April 2024 were agreed as a true and correct record.

**\*DM&L.62 STATEMENT FROM THE MONITORING OFFICER**

Prior to the applications being heard, the Monitoring Officer made a statement setting out the legal framework for the determination of planning applications so that members of the public who might not be familiar with how planning applications were to be determined, could understand the approach that the Committee needed to follow. The following points needed to be taken into account;

- Regard was to be had to development plan policies and other material considerations;
- Material considerations were those about development or use of land;
- Decisions were to be taken in accordance with the development plan unless other material considerations suggested otherwise.
- The Committee would need to establish whether a development proposal complied with the development plan read as a whole
- Where policies conflicted, the Committee had to undertake a balancing exercise involving the use of its planning judgement; and
- Development plan policies must be read sensibly; with words having their ordinary and natural meaning.

**\*DM&L.63 PLANNING, LISTED BUILDING, TREE PRESERVATION ORDER AND ENFORCEMENT REPORTS**

The Committee proceeded to consider the reports and presentations that had been prepared by the relevant Planning Officer on the following applications and considered the comments of the local town and parish

councils together with other representations received, which were listed within the presented agenda report and summarised below:

**(a) Application No. 4004/21/FUL                      Ward: Tavistock North**

**Site Address: Former Hazeldon Preparatory School, Parkwood Road, Tavistock PL19 0JS**

**Development: Refurbishment of Hazeldon House to form single dwelling (including demolition of non-listed structures), demolition of all other structures (including former classrooms blocks) on site, the erection of 10 open market dwellings, reinstatement of the original access, restoration of parkland, associated infrastructure (including drainage and retaining structures), landscaping, open space, play space, removal of some trees, parking, and boundary treatments.**

**Recommendation: Refusal**

**Key issues for Committee consideration:**

**Principle of Development/Connectivity, Housing mix, Heritage, Design; Trees; Landscape Character and Appearance  
Affordable Housing, Loss of Playing Fields, Previously Developed Land, Residential Amenity, Highways,  
Flood Risk and Drainage, Ecology and Biodiversity,  
Energy Efficiency and Climate Change,  
Planning Balance and Conclusion**

**Case Officer Introduction:**

The Planning Case Officer presented his report to the Committee. By way of an update to his report, the Officer stated that a letter had been received from the applicant dated 10 May 2024 challenging the planning judgement but in Officers' views, it did not raise any substantive issues. As part of his presentation, the Officer referred to the key issue being the sustainability of the location. In summary, the Officer informed the Committee that this application was a finely balanced one but recommended that the application be refused for the reasons set out in report.

A Member asked how the development could be deemed 'isolated' given it was on the A386. The Planning Case Officer said in the report that he referred to case law that had settled the approach to be followed to determine whether proposals were isolated from a settlement but that in policy terms this was a different question in to whether or not a site was well-connected in terms of access to services and facilities.

In response to a Member's question regarding the use of the parkland and whether it would be available for the public, the Conservation Officer stated it would be determined by a management company of a prospective developer connected to Hazeldon House.

**Public Speakers:** Page 3

Supporter – Mr Hollinshead

During his presentation, Mr Hollinshead stated that some of the policy decisions remained in dispute. The site sits within the gateway to the town of Tavistock. The scheme for 10 houses would ensure the preservation of Hazeldon House. Mount Kelly was an educational charity and risked being in breach of that status if any funding was to be used to restore the rapidly deteriorating listed building. The listing was applied for by West Devon Borough Council without prior warning or consultation.

Local Ward Member – Cllr U Mann

She stated that, when she had spoken to people around the town, the feedback was positive that they would like to live there.

**Committee Debate:**

In the ensuing debate, the Committee made particular reference to:

- Protecting the local area and improvements to Hazeldon House (although accepting that the proposal was not enabling development);
- The housing mix and size of the proposed housing;
- Economic benefits and sustainable economy, policies SPT 1 and SPT 2 were felt to be supporting the application.
- It was felt that the development would be a positive mark to the gateway to the town.
- Policy DEV23 protecting the landscape character was felt to be supportive of the development.
- Overlooking from the proposed Cottage; and
- Another Member felt that there was no economic gain to the site.

The Head of Development Management reminded Members that the application was contrary to the Development Plan policies that Members had adopted. He said that he had not heard anything to explain why Members thought the site was a sustainable location for development in policy terms. With respect to the use of the proceeds from the development, the officer reminded Members that there was a specific process for the assessment of enabling development, and this application had not followed that process.

In respect of the references to contribution made to the Town by the Applicant and the Applicant's financial position, the Monitoring Officer advised that personal circumstances of an applicant were not a material planning consideration. He also said that, having listened to the debate, he had heard Members choosing to be selective in their approach to development policies rather than reading the development plan policies as a whole.

The Planning Case Officer's recommendation for refusal was proposed and seconded. On the Chairman's casting vote, the Application was declared refused for the reasons set out in the Officer's report.

**Committee Decision: Refusal**

**(b) Application No. 0107/22/OPA**

**Ward: Milton Ford**

**Site Address: Land north of Green Hill, Lamerton**

**Development: Outline application for proposed development of 19 dwellings with access and external works, with all matters reserved other than the access.**

**Recommendation: Conditional approval (subject to S106)**

**Key issues for Committee consideration:**

**Principle of Development/Affordable Housing and Policy TTV27, Landscape Character and Appearance; Trees Heritage, Highways, Residential Amenity, Flood Risk and Drainage, Ecology and Biodiversity, Energy Efficiency and Climate Change, Planning Obligations and Infrastructure, Planning Balance and Conclusion.**

**Case Officer introduction:**

The Planning Case Officer presented his report to the Committee. By way of an update to his report, the Officer stated a letter had been received from an objector but, in Officers' views, it did not raise any substantive issues that had not already been addressed in the report.

The officer also verbally updated the recommendation to remain as published but with the inclusion of an additional condition requiring the submission of existing and proposed site levels, and proposed finished floor levels, as part of the reserved matters.

In questions, it was confirmed that land retained for biodiversity net gain must be maintained for a minimum period of 30 years; this would be secured by S106 obligation where it was noted that the land in question was outside of the red-lined boundary for the development. The Housing Officer clarified more information on affordable housing would be provided in the S106 agreement, such as the type, tenure, size and nomination and allocation process.

It was clarified that if Committee voted to accept the Planning Case Officers' recommendation, then permission could not be granted until the necessary S106 legal agreement had been completed to the satisfaction of officers under legal advice. The Heads of Terms for the S106 legal agreement were explained.

**Public Speakers:**

Objector – Mr Elkington

In his presentation, Mr Elkington voiced his concern for the scale and mix of houses in the proposed development. He felt there was conflict with policies S09, SPT 2.4 and 2.5, TTV25, TTV27 and DEV8. Lamerton's Neighbourhood Plan was published in 2022 and was valid for 5 years. In his opinion, there was a huge disparity between need and what was proposed. There was no evidence for self-builds and market value homes.

Supporter – Mr Edgar

In his presentation, Mr Edgar stated that he was a past Chairman of Lamerton Parish Council and co-creator of the Lamerton Neighbourhood Plan which reached approval by West Devon Officers to Regulation 15 in 2020. It supported the development in Green Hill. Affordable homes were needed for the sustainability of the school, village hall, church and playing field. The Parish Council's objection to the development was not unanimous.

Lamerton Parish Council – Cllr Deeks

In his presentation, Cllr Deeks stated that the application did not meet proven local need. He said that, if approved, the development would add 13 more three and four bedroom homes to the village. He claimed it was a challenging site with serious drainage problems. He said it was not compliant with Policy TTV27.

Local Ward Member: Cllr Jory

Cllr Jory stated that there were conflicting views on the size and scale of the proposed development. People recognised the need to provide affordable housing within the village. He was mindful that the Parish Council and a number of residents had objected to the development. As an exception site it was imperative that the proposal met policy TTV27.

### **Committee Debate:**

In the ensuing debate, the Committee made particular reference to:

- A Member expressed their concerns over the viability of the proposed development. It was confirmed by officers that the viability case has been independently assessed by an external consultant. It was also confirmed that the delivery of affordable housing would be controlled by legal agreement and could not be automatically set aside should the viability of the development change in the future.
- Another Member could see the divide within the village but felt that it was a good development to support because it was meeting identified housing needs.
- Two self-build plots would be 20% below market value.
- Local government guidelines would be used when allocating affordable housing.



The Planning Case Officer's recommendation was proposed and seconded. On the vote, it was resolved to grant planning permission in accordance with the recommendation of the published agenda report and subject to inclusion of the additional levels condition set out by the officer in his introduction.

**Committee Decision: Conditional Consent**

**(c) Application Number: 0034/24/FUL                      Ward: Tamarside**

**Site Address: Land at SX 373 834, Lifton**

**Development: READVERTISEMENT (additional/revised information received) Construction & operation of water abstraction & pumping facility with associated access arrangements, landscaping planting & other ancillary works.**

**Recommendation: Conditional Approval**

**Key Issues**

**Principle of development – landscape character – Biodiversity and Biodiversity Net Gain – Environmental impacts – Trees – Scheme Benefits - Planning balance and conclusions.**

**Case Officer introduction:**

The Officer updated the Committee of two late letters of representation received. Neither raised any new material issues to the determination of the application. The officer also asked that Proposed Conditions 9 & 10 in the agenda report be amended to delete the wording 'pre-commencement conditions'.

**Condition 9:**

*Notwithstanding the submitted details prior to the commencement of development, no works shall commence on site outside of the Proposed Construction Corridor/Working Area and Proposed Access Road as defined by drawing 20034028-STN-02-RW-D-L-00001 P03 until a revised Landscape Strategy Plan has been submitted to and agreed to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The revised Landscape Strategy Plan shall include revised waxcap turf translocation and grassland management. In any event, the revised Landscape Strategy Plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority no later than 6 months from the start of any works on site. The development shall therefore be carried out in accordance with the approved Landscape Strategy Plan. The reason being; In the interest of the protection of a regionally important habitat and in accordance with JLP Policy DEV26. For the avoidance of doubt, a condition is considered necessary to ensure protection of the waxcap Grassland Rare/Important Species habitat area which could otherwise be adversely affected by the terrestrial element of the development.*

*The applicant is the water undertaker, with a duty to ensure that the public have safe drinking water. In the context of a climate emergency they need to adapt to change and better manage water supply for the area. This would not normally be an area of development.*

#### Condition 10

*Prior to the commencement of any development within the Waxcap Grassland Rare/Important Species Area, as defined by drawing 20034028-STN-02-RW-D-L-00001 P03, hereby approved, and notwithstanding the details of the submitted Landscape and Ecological Management Plan Project Ref: 330202118 Rev: 1 Date: February 2024, a revised Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The revised LEMP shall include details of the waxcap grassland monitoring and reporting. In any event, the revised LEMP shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority no later than 6 months from the start of any works on site. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved LEMP. The reason being: In order to protect and enhance biodiversity, including protected species and to ensure that appropriate landscaping is provided to integrate the site into the local area. This condition is imposed in accordance with DEV23, DEV26 and DEV28 of the Joint Local Plan. For the avoidance of doubt, a condition is considered necessary to ensure the appropriate protection of the Waxcap Grassland Rare/Important Species habitat area, which could otherwise be adversely affected by the terrestrial element of the development.*

The Case Officer presented their report to Committee. The Applicant was the water undertaker with a statutory duty to ensure that the public had safe drinking water. In the context of a climate emergency they needed to adapt to change and better manage water supply for the area. This would not normally be an area of development other than that reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture, however the particular circumstances of the case were considered to provide 'exceptional' circumstances when considering the JLP as a whole.

#### **Public Speakers:**

Objector – Mr Perry

In his presentation Mr Perry stated that there had been 100 spills into the River Tamar in the last year. He felt that the abstraction area was too high up the river.

In response to a Member question he confirmed the sewerage spills were coming from a mile up river, at Launceston. He felt that the River Lyd was a better option, with water coming straight off of Dartmoor.

Supporter – Mr Shenton (South West Water (SWW))

In his presentation, he said that SWW had been working closely with the Environment Agency (EA) to ensure the location was the best for this operation. This was critical regional infrastructure.

During questions he confirmed that there was sufficient water to abstract. There would be a 28-day commissioning licence from the EA to monitor the effectiveness of the water system. He responded to a question into regard of the life of a building such as the one being proposed. He said it would be around 100 years with refurbishment required every 20 years.

Lifton Parish Council – Mr Measey

Mr Measey stated that the parish council had voted unanimously in support of the application.

Local Ward Member – Cllr Edmonds

In his presentation, Cllr Edmonds felt it important for the Committee to focus on the application before them for the infrastructure development and not SWW policy and performance in other areas of operation.

**Committee Debate:**

A Member stated they were happy to hear of the recommended condition to compensate and manage the watercourse habitat.

The Head of Development Management said that it was not possible to impose a condition to ask for the removal of the building once it was past its life span.

The Planning Case Officer's recommendation was proposed and seconded. On the vote, it was resolved to grant planning permission in accordance with the case officer recommendation and subject to inclusion of the amended Conditions 9 and 10.

**Committee Decision: Conditional Consent**

**\*DM&L.63 PLANNING APPEALS UPDATE**

The Head of Development Management took the Committee through one of the planning appeal case listed in the published agenda papers and Members proceeded to note the content of the update.

**\*DM&L.64 UPDATE ON UNDETERMINED MAJOR APPLICATIONS**

The Committee received an update from the Head of Development Management on the Undetermined Major Planning Applications that were listed in the published agenda papers and proceeded to note the contents of the update given.

(The Meeting ended at 3.30pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

## OFFICER'S REPORT

<b>Case Officer:</b>	Bryony Hanlon		
<b>Parish:</b>	Lifton	<b>Ward:</b>	Tamarside
<b>Application No:</b>	0302/24/ARM		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr & Mrs A Mounce Wooladon Farm Liftdown Lifton Devon PL16 0DD	<b>Agent:</b>	Mr Peter Wonnacott Rodds Bridge Farm Lower Upton Bude EX23 0LS
<b>Site Address:</b>	Wooladon Farm Liftdown PL16 0DD		
<b>Development:</b>	Application for approval for reserved matters following outline approval reference 2531/21/OPA relating to access, appearance, landscaping, layout, scale for erection of a dwelling for a farm manager together with access drive, plus the discharge of Conditions 6 (BNG), 7 (CEMP) and 8 (LEMP) (resubmission of 2531/21/OPA).		



## **Recommendation: Refusal**

### **Reasons for refusal:**

1. The quantum of both farm related and residential floor space proposed has not been supported by an essential agricultural need in this specific location and is unlikely to remain affordable for an agricultural farm manager in perpetuity, contrary to the provisions of SPT1, SPT2, TTV1, TTV2 and TTV26 (1i), in the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan.
2. The dwelling would read as an incongruous addition to the local landscape by virtue of its size and massing, accented by large areas of glazing, to the detriment of local landscape character and tranquillity, contrary to the provisions of DEV20 (2, 4) and DEV23 (1, 2, 3, 4, 7), in the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan
3. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the development will be served by a suitable surface water drainage scheme contrary to the provisions of DEV35 (4) in the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan
4. Insufficient information has been provided to discharge Conditions 6, 9, 10 and 11 and the proposal is considered contrary to the provisions of DEV26 in the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan.

### **Key issues for consideration:**

Scale, massing and design, landscape, biodiversity, drainage, appropriateness of the dwelling for an agricultural farm manager in perpetuity.

**Reason for call-in:** Cllr Edmonds has called the application to Committee on the basis that the JLP does not contain a specific policy for the scale and size of agricultural dwellings.

---

### **1.0 Site Description:**

1.1 The site is located within the open countryside, c. 1km south west of the village of Lifton and c. 0.4km south of the Strawberry Fields Farm Shop and Restaurant. The site is accessed from the north via the Class C road from the A30 in the west to Lifton in the east; the application itself includes connection to the highway via a new track through the adjacent field to the north. The application site comprises a relatively level, rectangular field, partly enclosed by trees to the north and west, with a hedge bank to the southern boundary and an unmetalled farm track to the eastern boundary. The site occupies an elevation position relative to the land to the south, offering panoramic views of the open countryside beyond. The site is not covered by any protective designations and lies within Flood Zone 1.

### **2.0 The Proposal:**

2.1 The site benefits from an extant outline consent for a farm manager's dwelling with access drive under 2531/21/OPA. This application provides the details required (under a reserved matters application) for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for erection of a dwelling for a farm manager together with access drive, plus the discharge of Conditions 6 (BNG), 7 (CEMP) and 8 (LEMP).

2.2 The application includes full details of the dwelling; it is designed in a contemporary style, with a rectangular plan form and a paired gable design on both the north and south elevations. The dwelling is finished with both standard height casement windows and full height glazing (finished in treated glass to reduce light transmission); fenestration comprises

a mix of aluminium and timber framed units. The walls comprise natural stone, set under a natural slate roof, with cast iron effect aluminium rainwater goods. The dwelling includes a two storey element for the farm manager; with a utility/boot room and shower room at ground level and an office at first floor with space for two desks. The floors are connected by an internal staircase; this element is separated from the residential accommodation at first floor level but is connected by an internal door at ground floor level. At ground floor, the dwelling provides for a “farm and estate managers’ conference room”, a further office for the “holiday accommodation and wedding venue estate manager’s office”, WC, a double height entrance hall and stairwell, an open plan kitchen/dining/living area and separate domestic utility room. At first floor level, the western end of the building provides for a main bedroom, with en-suite, dressing room and first floor balcony, and three further bedrooms, one with en-suite, plus a further bathroom. The dwelling is also provided with a single storey garage for two cars, a large parking and turning area, plus a garden to the east and a patio area at ground floor level on the south elevation.

### 3.0 Consultations:

- |                         |                          |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| • Lifton Parish Council | Support                  |
| • DCC Ecology           | Objection                |
| • Environmental Health  | No objection             |
| • Drainage (Internal)   | Objection                |
| • DCC Highways          | No highways implications |

### 4.0 Representations:

None received.

### 5.0 Relevant Planning History

- 0753/23/ARM Application for approval of reserved matters following outline approval 2531/21/OPA (for erection of a dwelling for a farm manager with access drive). Withdrawn
- 1547/20/FUL Formation of new vehicular access to land south of Lifton Farm Shop entrance together with formation of new private access road to link existing farm access tracks. Approved
- 2479/20/ARC Application for approval of details reserved by condition 3 of planning consent 1547/20/FUL. Approved
- 2531/21/OPA Outline application with some matters reserved for erection of a dwelling for a farm manager together with access drive. Approved

## ANALYSIS

### 6.0 Principle of Development/Sustainability

6.1 The site benefits from an extant outline consent for a farm manager’s dwelling under 2531/21/OPA (expiry 03 May 2025); the principle of development is therefore established. It is noted that the Parish Council have supported the scheme.

6.2 The Council’s Agricultural Agent has reviewed the previous reserved matters application and objected based on the grounds below; as the proposed dwelling remains broadly the same under the current application, the comments are still applicable;  
*“I have not been to site, although I have attended site and met the applicants on the previous application (reference 2531/21/OPA).*

6.3 You are no doubt aware of the background to the present application which is a reserved matters application following the conditional approval of application reference 2531/21/OPA.

6.4 It is my understanding that I am being asked to comment on the scale and size of the proposed dwelling. The size of an agricultural/rural workers dwelling, in this case a farm manager, is a very subjective assessment which is sometimes aided by specific local plan policies or supplementary planning documents but in the case of your Joint Local Plan there are no specific guidelines. Whenever consulted specifically on the size of a proposed workers dwelling, I try to refer to previous policy guidance, comparables of other LPAs where they do have set guidelines on size and also any relevant planning appeal decisions.

6.5 Turning to previous policy guidance, if we look at the now defunct PPS7 Annex A, and in particular paragraph 9, the sentiments of which I believe still carry some weight today. It states;

"Agricultural dwellings should be of a size commensurate with the established functional requirements. Dwellings which are unusually large in relation to the agricultural needs of the unit or unusually expensive to construct in relation to the income it can sustain in the long term should not be permitted. It is the requirement of the enterprise, rather than those of the owner or occupier, that are relevant in determining the size of the dwelling that is appropriate to the particular holding. "

6.6 In terms of comparisons with other LPAs, then several fall back on the old PPS7 Annex A paragraph 9. But in the case of the adopted South Somerset District Council Local Plan 2006-2008, policy HG9, it states:

"it is considered that an indicative guideline to the floor area of proposed dwellings of approximately 175m<sup>2</sup> would adequately serve most holdings (based upon national statistics, which show the average floor area of a detached three bedroom property is 143m<sup>2</sup>).

6.7 The supplementary planning document of Torridge District Council adopted in January 2020 states:

"dwellings should be designed to meet the functional needs of the enterprise they serve and relate to the financial viability of the enterprise that supports it. Dwellings that are unusually large in relation to the rural enterprise, or unusually expensive to construct in relation to the income it can sustain in the long term will not be permitted..... Normally a three-bed dwelling would extend to about 102m<sup>2</sup> and a four-bedroom dwelling to 124m<sup>2</sup> (gross internal area), which are considered to be adequately sized dwellings. It is however recognised that housing for an agricultural worker may include additional space requirements such as a boot room, utility and ground floor shower room; and only in respect of the principal dwelling on a holding further space may be required to accommodate an office. It is anticipated that such needs could be accommodated within a 15% uplift to either 117m<sup>2</sup> (3 bed dwelling) or 142m<sup>2</sup> (4 bed dwelling). Any uplift to property size beyond the standard must be justified, on a business basis, clearly in respect of supporting the operational needs of the related enterprise and importantly demonstrate that it must be able to be financially sustained by the enterprise and in the long term continue to be financially accessible as a rural worker dwelling. For the avoidance of doubt, any uplift from the floor space standards (102m<sup>2</sup> and 124m<sup>2</sup>) would not be supported, if proposed simply to provide additional living accommodation".

6.8 Further evidence can be seen in two appeal decisions reference APP/NI 215/A/14/2225549 and appeal reference APP/NI 215/A/13/2200385. I have already sent these decisions in a previous email, but in summary, the Inspectors' decisions were along



*the lines that 140m was adequate for a worker's dwelling and they made a point of the dwelling needing to be affordable for a farm/rural worker in the future.*

*6.9 So, taking into consideration these three methods of assessment which set a "tone of the list", I can then use them to assess the present application. From the architect's submitted drawings, you have advised the ground floor of the main house is 200m<sup>2</sup>, the first floor is 164m<sup>2</sup> (excluding the balcony) which totals 364m<sup>2</sup>, plus a garage of 48m<sup>2</sup>.*

*6.10 Mindful of the examples I have given above, I therefore consider the proposed size of the dwelling sits well outside of the guidelines I have referred to above and therefore I cannot support the application for this reason alone. I think the applicant needs to show why there are special circumstances and specific requirements of their enterprise that mean the dwelling should be over 2 1/2 times larger than is generally acceptable."*

*6.11 The dwelling as now proposed includes dedicated farm work space, with four bedrooms provided within the residential section of the dwelling. The dwelling provides 112 m<sup>2</sup> of floor space at ground floor level, 136m<sup>2</sup> of residential floor space at first floor (248 m<sup>2</sup> in total) and at total of 96m<sup>2</sup> of farm workspace. The farm workspace is laid out as follows; a utility and bathroom at ground floor level (25 m<sup>2</sup>), with office and file room above at first floor level (25m<sup>2</sup>), plus a further office and separate conference room at ground floor level (46m<sup>2</sup>).*

*6.12 As the dwelling is conditioned specifically for agricultural use only, the number of bedrooms provided (four) is not determinative in this instance but for context, Officers would note that the Nationally Described Space Standard for a six bedroomed dwelling is 123m<sup>2</sup> for a two storey dwelling. However, the provision of 248m<sup>2</sup> of residential floor space has not been agriculturally justified.*

6.13 The applicant has advised that the proposal is for a farm manager, not an agricultural worker, with the implication that additional space should be granted on this basis. However, there is no distinction between an agricultural worker and farm manager in the SPD guidance (paragraph 11.52) to support policy TTV26 1(i); the policy simply requires a locationally specific agricultural need and that the worker will be able to maintain that role for the development in perpetuity. As such, while the requirement for a boot room, shower and office for farm use can reasonably be justified, Officers do not consider that there is a functional agricultural need for the quantum of residential floor space provided.

6.14 Whilst Officers recognise the size of the commercial enterprise, the principle of a dwelling was accepted on the basis that the proposal was centrally located and would provide the farm manager the opportunity to live in close proximity to livestock and crops. The applicant has now proposed a substantial dwelling on the basis that the applicant owns a substantial business portfolio, including farming, holiday lets. While any agricultural dwelling must be of a scale that can be financially supported by the associated holding, a larger holding does not in its own right justify a larger dwelling. Officers would note that other elements of the business are currently managed from elsewhere; no detail has been provided to justify why these elements must be relocated or how this would translate into a need for a significant quantum of residential floor space. Planning policy allows for and the extant outline application approves the principal of an agricultural worker, but not the other businesses undertaken by the applicant.

6.15 Officers are also concerned that the design demonstrates an inefficient use of space solely for aesthetic reasons, most notably the double height glazed entrance and stairwell. As such, the quantum of both farm related and residential floor space proposed has not

been supported by an essential agricultural need in this specific location and is unlikely to remain affordable for an agricultural farm manager in perpetuity, contrary to the provisions of SPT1, SPT2, TTV1, TTV2 and TTV26 (1i).

## 7.0 Design/Landscape

7.1 Policy DEV20 requires developments to achieve high standards of design that contribute to townscape and landscape by protecting and improving the quality of the built environment. It also requires new development to be appropriate in its context. Policy DEV23 seeks to conserve and enhance the landscape and scenic and visual quality of development, avoiding significant and adverse landscape or visual impacts. Proposals should be located and designed to respect scenic quality and maintain an area's distinctive sense of place and reinforce local distinctiveness. DEV23 also requires a high architectural and landscape design quality appropriate to its landscape context. The site is located within the open countryside of landscape character type 3B, characterised by gently rolling landform, woodland, copses, shrubs and tree belts, small to medium scale fields and a sparse pattern of development. It is recognised that pressure for development is impacting on the settlement pattern and that development that is "uncharacteristic and visually intrusive over wide areas" should be resisted (p. 132, LCA, 2017). The site occupies a small plateau within the local landscape, offering elevated views over land to the south; any dwelling would need to be sensitively designed to minimise its visual prominence within the local landscape setting.

7.2 Officers do recognise that the applicant has incorporated natural stone, slate and timber within the design of the new dwelling and that the design draws on some traditional elements. However, the sheer scale and mass of the building (the building and garage total c. 32m wide and the ridge height of the dwelling is c. 8.5m above ground level) represent a significant quantum of urban form to be introduced into the rural landscape. The scheme of fenestration mixes both traditional and starkly contemporary patterns of glazing, with parts of both the northern and southern elevation of the building finished in full height glazing, most notably on the south western gable, which incorporates a first floor balcony set under a projecting canopy. The quantity of the glazing used, most notably on the south elevation, with strong horizontal and vertical elements would accent the size of the building, appearing as a reflective surface during the day and as a source of artificial light during the evenings and winter months. The applicant has confirmed that the glazing will be treated in order to reduce night light glare, however, the efficacy of any such treatment would be undermined by the expanse of glazing proposed.

7.3 The dwelling would read as an incongruous addition to the local landscape by virtue of its size and massing, accented by large areas of glazing, to the detriment of local landscape character, contrary to the provisions of DEV20 (2, 4) and DEV23 (1, 2, 3, 4, 7).

## 8.0 Highways/Access

8.1 The access route was consented at outline stage; the Devon County Council Highways Engineer has confirmed that there are no concerns with regards to highway safety.

8.2 The proposal includes a garage and off-road parking and turning area. The garage provides for two cars and an electric vehicle charging point, with additional parking to the rear of the dwelling. Officers note the guidance contained within paragraphs 8.5 and 8.7 of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), setting out the recommended size and number of parking spaces to serve residential development and consider that the proposal complies with the guidance. Were the development as a whole otherwise acceptable, it would have been necessary to restrict the use of the garage to purposes incidental to the

dwelling only, as the development is considered acceptable for the use proposed in a countryside location and is permitted on the basis of an established agricultural need without which permission would not have been granted. On this basis, the proposal is considered to accord with the provisions of DEV29 and the guidance contained within the SPD.

### 9.0 Foul Drainage

9.1 The applicant has proposed to dispose of foul drainage via a new package treatment plant. This approach is considered acceptable by the WDBC Environmental Health Officer; were the development as a whole considered acceptable, the details would be secured by condition, to ensure a satisfactory and sustainable foul water drainage system is provided, retained and maintained to serve the development. On this basis, the proposal is considered to accord with the provisions of DEV35.

### 10.0 Surface Water Drainage

10.1 The applicant has proposed the use of a soakaway to dispose of surface water from the proposed scheme. The WDBC Drainage Engineer has reviewed the proposal and has objected on the grounds of insufficient information.

*10.2 While additional information cannot be considered during the life of this application, the applicant will be required to submit a response the following as part of any future resubmission:*

- J2634 Rev A Foul and Surface water drainage layout shows soakaways outside of the approved red line boundary, there appears to be miles of infiltration trench along the main road but no infiltration testing for it, also infiltration trench is within 5m of the highway and will need further justification for suitability.*
- There appears to be to be 2 x MFD22-12.10 Proposed Site, Block and Location Plans, the first one is submitted in the drainage assessment and shows a doctored proposed red line boundary around the proposed soakaways which are still outside of the originally approved red line and then the second copy which has been submitted as a document on its own which shows the soakaway for the building within the curtilage of the garden and inside the original red line.*
- The testing itself is incomplete and shows variable infiltration across the site which means additional testing at the proposed locations of the soakaway and will need to be in strict accordance with BRE DG 365, also no contours on the site layout plan to confirm the gradient of the site so not certain that soakaways will be suitable. The calculations show high infiltration rate which means factor of safety will need to be increased. We need one single consistent drainage plan, complete infiltration testing and calculations to support the use of soakaways which will all need to be located within the approved red line boundary.*

10.3 On this basis, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the development will be served by a suitable surface water drainage scheme contrary to the provisions of DEV35 (4).

### 11.0 Low Carbon

11.1 Policy DEV32 requires that all developments respond to “the need to deliver a low carbon future for Plymouth and South West Devon should be considered in the design and implementation of all developments, in support of a Plan Area target to halve 2005 levels of carbon emissions by 2034 and to increase the use and production of decentralised energy”. This requirement is strengthened in the Climate Emergency Planning Statement (CEPS), which was adopted by the Council in November 2022, after the outline consent was issued. The CEPS sets out that; “for major and minor planning applications, adopted JLP policy

DEV32.5 will apply in order to secure an equivalent 20% carbon saving through onsite renewable energy generation". While some renewable energy technology has been considered for inclusion at a later stage in the process, it is noted that Permitted Development rights for the dwelling are intact and as such, further measures, such as solar panels could be easily installed without planning permission. As such, were the development otherwise acceptable it would have been necessary to secure full details of measures necessary to demonstrate compliance with Building Regulations to comply with policy DEV32 and the provisions of the Climate Emergency Planning Statement and this does not form a substantive reason for refusal.

## 12.0 Biodiversity

12.1 With regards to the ecological conditions, the Devon County Council Ecologist has confirmed that insufficient information has been submitted in order to discharge the conditions relating to Biodiversity Net Gain (6) , installation of bird nesting and bat roosting boxes (11) and badger surveys (9) but that save for some administrative updates, the conditions relating to the CEMP (7), LEMP (8) and timing of works (12) can be discharged.

12.2 With regards to Condition 10 (lighting), the applicant has clarified that no lighting will be required during the construction period and has advised that they consider that the internal lighting detail is not required to be submitted to the LPA. The DCC Ecologist has advised that the requirement for a detailed Lighting Strategy is still outstanding. The condition requires that "the strategy will minimise indirect impacts from lighting associated with the preconstruction, during construction and operational activities, and demonstrate how the best practice (BCT/ILP, 2018) guidance has been implemented. This will include details such as the following: artificial lighting associated with public realm lighting, car headlights associated with traffic movements through the development and internal and external lighting associated with private residence".

12.3 As such, insufficient information has been provided to discharge Conditions 6, 9, 10 and 11 and the proposal is considered contrary to the provisions of DEV26.

## 13.0 Conclusion

13.1 Whilst the principle of an agricultural dwelling has been established on this site under the parent consent, the quantum of residential / and other floor space proposed has not been supported by an essential agricultural need and is unlikely to remain affordable for an agricultural farm manager in perpetuity, contrary to the provisions of SPT1, SPT2, TTV1, TTV2 and TTV26 (1i). As a consequence, the dwelling would read as an incongruous addition to the local landscape by virtue of its size and massing, accented by large areas of glazing, to the detriment of local landscape character and tranquillity, contrary to the provisions of DEV20 (2, 4) and DEV23 (1, 2, 3, 4, 7). Finally, insufficient information has been provided to discharge Conditions 6, 9, 10 and 11, contrary to the provisions of DEV26 and insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the development will be served by a suitable surface water drainage scheme contrary to the provisions of DEV35 (4). It is therefore recommended that the application be refused.

***This application has been considered in accordance with Section 38 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.***

## **Planning Policy**

### Relevant policy framework

Section 70 of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act requires that regard be had to the development plan, any local finance and any other material considerations. Section 38(6) of the 2004 Planning and Compensation Act requires that applications are to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. For the purposes of decision making, as of 26 March 2019, the Plymouth & South West Devon Joint Local Plan 2014 - 2034 is now part of the development plan for Plymouth City Council, South Hams District Council and West Devon Borough Council (other than parts of South Hams and West Devon within Dartmoor National Park).

On 26 March 2019 of the Plymouth & South West Devon Joint Local Plan was adopted by all three of the component authorities. Following adoption, the three authorities jointly notified the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG)\* of their choice to monitor the Housing Requirement at the whole plan level. This is for the purposes of the Housing Delivery Test (HDT) and the 5 Year Housing Land Supply assessment. A letter from MHCLG to the Authorities was received on 13 May 2019 confirming the change.

On 19 December 2023 the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities published the HDT 2022 measurement. This confirmed the Plymouth, South Hams and West Devon's joint measurement as 121% and the policy consequences are "None".

Therefore no buffer is required to be applied for the purposes of calculating a 5 year housing land supply at the whole plan level. The combined authorities can demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply of 5.84 years at end of March 2023 (the 2023 Monitoring Point). This is set out in the Plymouth, South Hams & West Devon Local Planning Authorities' Housing Position Statement 2023 (published 26 February 2024).

[\*now known as Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities]

The relevant development plan policies are set out below:

**The Plymouth & South West Devon Joint Local Plan was adopted by South Hams District Council on 21 March 2019 and West Devon Borough Council on 26 March 2019.**

SPT1 Delivering sustainable development

SPT2 Sustainable linked neighbourhoods and sustainable rural communities

SPT3 Provision for new homes

SPT9 Strategic principles for transport planning and strategy

SPT10 Balanced transport strategy for growth and healthy and sustainable communities

SPT12 Strategic approach to the natural environment

TTV1 Prioritising growth through a hierarchy of sustainable settlements

TTV2 Delivering sustainable development in the Thriving Towns and Villages Policy Area

TTV26 Development in the Countryside

DEV1 Protecting health and amenity

DEV2 Air, water, soil, noise, land and light

DEV8 Meeting local housing need in the Thriving Towns and Villages Policy Area

DEV10 Delivering high quality housing

DEV20 Place shaping and the quality of the built environment

DEV21 Development affecting the historic environment

DEV23 Landscape character

DEV26 Protecting and enhancing biodiversity and geological conservation

DEV28 Trees, woodlands and hedgerows

DEV29 Specific provisions relating to transport  
DEV31 Waste management  
DEV32 Delivering low carbon development  
DEV35 Managing flood risk and Water Quality Impacts

### **Neighbourhood Plan**

A Neighbourhood Plan is currently under preparation for the Parish of Lifton but it has not yet reached a stage where it can be considered material to the decision making process.

Other material considerations include the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and guidance within the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Additionally, the following planning documents are also material considerations in the determination of the application:

Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document (2020)  
Plymouth and South West Devon Climate Emergency Planning Statement (2022)  
A Landscape Character Assessment for South Hams and West Devon (2017)

### **Considerations under Human Rights Act 1998 and Equalities Act 2010**

The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 and Equalities Act 2010 have been taken into account in reaching the recommendation contained in this report.

# West Devon Borough Council Agenda Item 6

## Planning and Licensing Committee 04 Jun 2024

Appeals update for 25 Apr 2024 to 16 May 2024

<b>Ward:</b>	<b>Exbourne</b>
--------------	-----------------

<b>4439/22/FUL</b>	<b>PINS Ref: APP/Q1153/W/23/3330619</b>	
<b>Original Decision:</b>	Refusal	<b>Appeal Status:</b> Appeal Refused
<b>Appellant Name:</b>	Mr And Mrs C Richards	<b>Appeal Start Date:</b> 18 Dec 2023
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land At Ss 673 037, Bondleigh	<b>Appeal Decision:</b> Dismissed (Refusal)
<b>Proposal:</b>	Proposal for removal of previously agreed Class Q barns that allowed three, three-bedroom dwellings. Replacement dwellings are sought comprising three new-build homes	<b>Appeal Decision Date:</b> 30 Apr 2024

<b>Ward:</b>	<b>Tavistock North</b>
--------------	------------------------

<b>1665/23/FUL</b>	<b>PINS Ref: APP/Q1153/W/24/3339306</b>	
<b>Original Decision:</b>	Refusal	<b>Appeal Status:</b> Start Letter Received
<b>Appellant Name:</b>	Ms I Chambers	<b>Appeal Start Date:</b> 25 Apr 2024
<b>Site Address:</b>	The Milking Parlour, Higher Wilminstone Farm, Wilminstone, PL19 0JT	<b>Appeal Decision:</b>
<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of a replacement dwelling	<b>Appeal Decision Date:</b>

<b>0400/23/TPO</b>	<b>PINS Ref: APP/TPO/Q1153/9655</b>	
<b>Original Decision:</b>	Refusal	<b>Appeal Status:</b> Appeal Withdrawn
<b>Appellant Name:</b>	Mr Paul Benny	<b>Appeal Start Date:</b> 1 May 2024
<b>Site Address:</b>	Hillbrook, 11, Cole Moore Meadow, Tavistock, PL19 0ES	<b>Appeal Decision:</b> Appeal Withdrawn
<b>Proposal:</b>	T2: Ash – Removal of lower branches by 5 metres overhanging Wyatt's Lane including overhang to property, T3, T4 & T5 Sycamore - Crown thin by 20%, remove dead crossing branches (deadwood exempt) & lower selected minor branches overhanging garden and Wyatt's Lane, T3, T4 & T5 required work to increase light levels, reduce wind resistance & reduce major over-hang to Public road Wyatt's Lane and property garden	<b>Appeal Decision Date:</b> 2 May 2024

This page is intentionally left blank





West Devon  
Borough  
Council

# Agenda Item 7

## West Devon Borough Council

### Undetermined Major Applications

as at 16 May 2024

2915/19/FUL			
<b>Officer:</b>	Steven Stroud	<b>Valid Date:</b> 18 Dec 2019	<b>Expiry Date:</b> 18 Mar 2020
<b>Location:</b>	Wool Grading Centre, Fore Street, North Tawton		<b>Extension Date:</b> 30 Jun 2024
<b>Proposal:</b>	READVERTISEMENT (Revised plans received) Conversion of existing Grade II listed mill buildings (Building A) into 6 open market townhouses & redevelopment for Class E office use. Conversion/re-erection of Building B into 3 open market dwellings.		
<b>Officer Comments:</b>	A substantially revised scheme has been received. The applicant has been advised that this will be subject to one final round of consultation and then a decision needs to be made. Whilst consultee views of the latest scheme are not yet known, the applicant has been advised that withdrawal in favour of collaborative pre-application engagement is preferable.		
2441/21/FUL			
<b>Officer:</b>	Steven Stroud	<b>Valid Date:</b> 13 Sep 2022	<b>Expiry Date:</b> 13 Dec 2022
<b>Location:</b>	The Old Woollen Mill, Fore Street, North Tawton		<b>Extension Date:</b> 30 Jun 2024
<b>Proposal:</b>	READVERTISEMENT (revised plans) Hybrid application for full planning for 20 dwellings, office unit (class E), and 14 dwellings as outline permission (Self Build Plots).		
<b>Officer Comments:</b>	A substantially revised scheme has been received. The applicant has been advised that this will be subject to one final round of consultation and then a decision needs to be made. Whilst consultee views of the latest scheme are not yet known, the applicant has been advised that withdrawal in favour of collaborative pre-application engagement is preferable.		
4113/21/OPA			
<b>Officer:</b>	Steven Stroud	<b>Valid Date:</b> 16 Nov 2021	<b>Expiry Date:</b> 15 Feb 2022
<b>Location:</b>	Rondor And Gunns Yard, North Street, Okehampton		<b>Extension Date:</b> 31 Mar 2024
<b>Proposal:</b>	Outline application with some matters reserved for the development of 19 No. dwellings with new private access road, parking and external works		
<b>Officer Comments:</b>	Delegated approval granted. Awaiting completion of S106. Awaiting signature by applicant.		
3198/22/ARM			
<b>Officer:</b>	Adrian Noon	<b>Valid Date:</b> 27 Jan 2023	<b>Expiry Date:</b> 28 Apr 2023
<b>Location:</b>	Land Adjacent To Lifton Strawberry Field, Lifton		<b>Extension Date:</b> 31 May 2024
<b>Proposal:</b>	Application for approval of reserved matters following outline approval 1408/20/OPA for access & adoptable road layout		
<b>Officer Comments:</b>	Further details submitted by agent, awaiting further drainage information. EOT agreed		

<b>4440/22/OPA</b>			
<b>Officer:</b>	Peter Whitehead	<b>Valid Date:</b> 23 Jan 2023	<b>Expiry Date:</b> 24 Apr 2023
<b>Location:</b>	Land Adjacent To Baldwin Drive, Radford Way, Okehampton		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Outline planning permission with some matters reserved (access) for amix of around 60 1 to 4 bedroom residential dwellings & associated infrastructure		
<b>Officer Comments:</b>	Appeal lodged against non-determination. Now under consideration by PINS.		
<b>3374/23/ARM</b>			
<b>Officer:</b>	Adrian Noon	<b>Valid Date:</b> 20 Oct 2023	<b>Expiry Date:</b> 19 Jan 2024
<b>Location:</b>	Land to the North and West of Lifton Strawberry Fields, Lifton, PL16 0DE		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Application for approval of reserved matters following outline approval reference 1408/20/OPA for the erection of an industrial building & associated works		
<b>Officer Comments:</b>	Same site as other Strawberry Fields application – need to be considered alongside each other. Awaiting additional information from applicant. Application also seeks to discharge a number of conditions on the outline. Consultee comments sought on DOC matters which overlap with the RM. Further details awaited (EOT agreed)		
<b>3647/23/ARM</b>			
<b>Officer:</b>	Clare Stewart	<b>Valid Date:</b> 14 Nov 2023	<b>Expiry Date:</b> 13 Feb 2024
<b>Location:</b>	Land At Sx 455 868 (Cross Roads Farm), Cross Roads, Lewdown		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Application for approval of reserved matters following outline approval 2808/21/VAR for access, layout, appearance, landscape & scale		
<b>Officer Comments:</b>	Awaiting final drainage comments from consultees.		
<b>4165/23/FUL</b>			
<b>Officer:</b>	Clare Stewart	<b>Valid Date:</b> 18 Dec 2023	<b>Expiry Date:</b> 18 Mar 2024
<b>Location:</b>	Tavistock Woodlands, Gulworthy	<b>Extension Date:</b> 28 Jun 2024	
<b>Proposal:</b>	Installation of platforms, masts and suspended track to accommodate a safety rail attraction; heritage visitor interpretation provision; open space, landscaping and additional parking.		
<b>Officer Comments:</b>	Awaiting additional information from the applicant. Significant number of objections.		
<b>4164/23/OPA</b>			
<b>Officer:</b>	Adrian Noon	<b>Valid Date:</b> 07 Mar 2024	<b>Expiry Date:</b> 06 Jun 2024
<b>Location:</b>	Land at SX 458 868 Lewdown		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Proposed development of 13 No light industrial units with new access road, parking and external works		
<b>Officer Comments:</b>	Under consideration. Significant number of objections. No supportable as submitted. Agent advised to withdraw and put through pre-app. Fundamental changes likely to be needed. Have seen a suggested revision that perhaps offers a way forward, will need to be a fresh application and/or formal preapp		

<b>0440/24/OPA</b>			
<b>Officer:</b>	Clare Stewart	<b>Valid Date:</b> 24 Jan 2024	<b>Expiry Date:</b> 24 Apr 2024
<b>Location:</b>	Development Site at SX 502 991 Crowden Northlew		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Outline residential application with all matters reserved except access for up to 20 dwellings including 30% affordable dwellings (resubmission of 4083/21/OPA)		
<b>Officer Comments:</b>	Awaiting additional technical information (BNG and highways). Extension of time being agreed.		
<b>0255/24/ARM</b>			
<b>Officer:</b>	Lucy Hall	<b>Valid Date:</b> 29 Jan 2024	<b>Expiry Date:</b> 29 Apr 2024
<b>Location:</b>	Jethros Coach House Lewdown EX20 4DS		<b>Extension Date:</b> 29 May 2024
<b>Proposal:</b>	Application for reserved matters submission in respect of appearance, landscaping, layout & scale following outline consent 1666/20/OPA for the erection of 30 dwellings		
<b>Officer Comments:</b>	Extension of time agreed to work through some of the consultee responses requesting additional information. NB pre-app for further residential now submitted on front part of site.		
<b>0379/24/VAR</b>			
<b>Officer:</b>	Clare Stewart	<b>Valid Date:</b> 31 Jan 2024	<b>Expiry Date:</b> 01 May 2024
<b>Location:</b>	Hatherleigh Market, Hatherleigh EX20 3HT		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Application for variation of condition 1 (approved drawings) of planning consent 4416/21/VAR.		
<b>Officer Comments:</b>	Reviewing conditions and S106.		
<b>1203/24/OPA</b>			
<b>Officer:</b>	Adrian Noon	<b>Valid Date:</b> 07 May 2024	<b>Expiry Date:</b> 06 Aug 2024
<b>Location:</b>	Development Site At Sx 482 725 Tavistock		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Hybrid planning application, comprising a full application for the erection of 124 residential dwellings, including formation of access, associated infrastructure, drainage & landscaping; and an outline planning application for up to 126 residential dwellings & 2 hectares of Class E use (Commercial, Business & Service), including details of access with all other matters reserved		
<b>Officer Comments:</b>	Under consultation. Allocated site that has previously been approved. Not expecting anything startling from consultees		
<b>1448/24/NMM</b>			
<b>Officer:</b>	Peter Whitehead	<b>Valid Date:</b> 02 May 2024	<b>Expiry Date:</b> 30 May 2024
<b>Location:</b>	Land at SX 603 953, Exeter Road, Okehampton		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Non material minor amendment to planning consent 0136/21/ARM for movement of hedgerow further South within POS area		
<b>Officer Comments:</b>			

