

Kingsbridge Town Council

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD REMOTELY VIA VIDEO CONFERENCING
AT 7.00 P.M. ON TUESDAY 16 FEBRUARY 2021**

Present: Cllr Chris Povey (Chairman)
Cllr Anne Balkwill
Cllr Dena Bex
Cllr Philip Cole
Cllr Martina Edmonds
Cllr Mike Jennings
Cllr Graham Price

In Attendance: Martin Johnson (Secretary)

20/115 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Cllr Peter Ralph.

Public Open Forum

None.

20/116 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Cllr Cole declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 20/118.1.

20/117 PLANNING DECISIONS, CORRESPONDENCE & REPORTS

DECISIONS

The following planning decisions were received from South Hams District Council (SHDC):

117.1	3206/20/ARC
Decision:	Discharge of condition Approved
Decision date:	25 January 2021
Case Officer:	Richard Gage
Applicant:	Mr R Prior
Proposal:	Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 5 and 6 of listed building consent 4038/19/LBC
Site:	18A Fore Street, Kingsbridge, TQ7 1NY
KTC:	Recommended Approval

117.2 **3406/20/ARC**
Decision: **Discharge of condition Approved**
Decision date: 26 January 2021
Case Officer: Cameron Whymer
Applicant: Mr T Biddle – Baker Estates Ltd
Proposal: Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 9, 10 and 12 of planning application 28/0508/15/O
Site: Allocated site K5 SX 7299 4407 and land directly west of allocated site Kingsbridge
KTC: Not consulted

117.3 **3955/20/ARC**
Decision: **Discharge of condition Approved**
Decision date: 25 January 2021
Case Officer: Cameron Whymer
Applicant: Mr T Biddle – Baker Estates Ltd
Proposal: Application for approval of details in part reserved by condition 12 (B) for planning application 28/0508/15/O
Site: Allocated site K5 SX 7299 4407 and land directly west of allocated site Kingsbridge
KTC: Not consulted

117.4 **4062/20/ARC**
Decision: **Discharge of condition Approved**
Decision date: 25 January 2021
Case Officer: Sarah Packham
Applicant: Mr J Scales
Proposal: Application for approval of details reserved in part by condition 10 of planning application 4039/19/VAR
Site: 26 Warren Road, Kingsbridge, TQ7 1LB
KTC: Not consulted

117.5 **4151/20/ARC**
Decision: **Discharge of condition Approved**
Decision date: 29 January 2021
Case Officer: Richard Nicholson
Applicant: Mr & Mrs P Wisniewska
Proposal: Application for approval of details reserved by condition 4 of planning application 2802/20/HHO
Site: 2 Henacre Road, Kingsbridge, TQ7 1DN
KTC: Not consulted

CORRESPONDENCE & REPORTS

The following correspondence was received:

117.6 **0335/21/ARC**
Case Officer: Planning Officer to be named
Applicant: Mr T Sly – Devonshire Homes
Proposal: Application for approval of details reserved by condition 5 of
 planning application 0787/19/ARM
Site: Land off Belle Hill, Kingsbridge

SHDC reported that there was no statutory requirement for the above application i.e. the application had been forwarded for information only

It was **RESOLVED** to note the above decisions and correspondence.

20/118 **TREE WORK DECISIONS, CORRESPONDENCE & APPLICATIONS**

DECISIONS

None.

APPLICATIONS

118.1 **0183/21/TCA**
Case Officer: Lee Marshall
Applicant: Mr P Sarjeant – St Thomas of Canterbury Church
Proposal: G1: Yew x 12 – Crown height reduction by 1.5m, lateral
 reduction by 0.5m on east and west sides encroaching on to
 footpath
 G3: Yew x 3 – Crown raise on west side to 2.5m from ground
 level and lateral reduction on west side by 2-3m. Tree
 overhanging gravestones
 T2: Lime – Crown raise to 3m from ground level, lateral
 reduction by 1-2m on east side, encroaching on church
Site: St Thomas of Canterbury Church, Church Street, Kingsbridge
**KTC: Recommend Approval and suggests that all Ivy be removed
 from the Yew trees during the tree surgery**

It was **RESOLVED** to forward the findings of the above tree works' consultation to SHDC Development Management.

20/119 **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The following planning applications were received from SHDC for consideration:

119.1 **0062/21/HHO**
Case Officer: Rachel Head
Applicant: Mr B Mately
Proposal: Householder application for renovations and alterations to existing bungalow including new windows, doors, external finishes, internal layout and services. New single storey extension to existing kitchen area with bi-folding external doors
Site: Top Acre, 12 Higher Warren Road, Kingsbridge, TQ7 1LG
KTC: **Recommend Approval**

119.2 **0124/21/HHO**
Case Officer: Rachel Head
Applicant: Mr P Stone
Proposal: Householder application for new utility extension, garage conversion an extension to workshop
Site: 14 Barton Close Kingsbridge, TQ7 1JU
KTC: **Recommend Refusal on the grounds of overdevelopment of the site and overshadowing/loss of sunlight to the detriment of the residential amenity for the adjacent property**

119.3 **4055/20/HHO**
Case Officer: Rachel Head
Applicant: Mrs H Lee
Proposal: Householder application for garage/bedroom extension, dormers to rear and alterations to existing dwelling with new terrace deck to rear
Site: Kingsmead, Kingsway Park, Kingsbridge, TQ7 1HJ
KTC: **Recommend Refusal on the grounds of overdevelopment of the site and visual appearance of the proposals (extending the property to be directly adjacent to the streetscape/highway)**

It was **RESOLVED** to forward the findings of the above planning consultation to SHDC Development Management.

20/120 ANY FURTHER CURRENT PLANNING MATTERS

120.1 The Planning Committee had Recommended Refusal for planning application 3830/20/FUL at the previous meeting and now received a draft report which responded to Members' findings. It was **RESOLVED** to adopt the Recommendation at Annex A and forward the findings to SHDC Development Management.

120.2 Members received a report on recent tree felling in East Ward and it was agreed to apply to SHDC for a Tree Preservation Order assessment for trees within the locale; the application to be delegated to Cllrs Balkwill, Edmonds, Price and the Town Clerk.

Cllr Edmonds identified that she was content to work alongside Cllrs Price and Ralph on tree matters.

120.3 Members received a representation from a local resident regarding the private rental sector in Kingsbridge and struggles to house his family. Issues included: a lack of sufficient housing supply, landlord Section 21 notices, registration with SHDC housing, exceptionally high rental costs at circa £1k per month for a 3 bed property and people relocating to the area from remote locations which had increased during the Covid-19 pandemic.

Members acknowledged the issues raised, which would be shared by many other local families, but considered that KTC was not empowered to intervene in the individual case. KTC had highlighted to SHDC that it wished to assist in the monitoring of the South Hams & West Devon Housing Strategy 2021-2026 and review of the delivery plan. KTC had recently sold a plot of land to Kingsbridge Feoffees off Derby Road to provide housing for local people. A Feoffees 4 bed property was rented at circa £750 per month.

It was agreed to make SHDC aware of the plight of local families and to request a meeting with Members/Senior officers to explore how the planning system could assist them in finding affordable rented homes.

20/121 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

Not required.

20/122 ENFORCEMENT CASES

Members reviewed SHDC's listing of outstanding planning enforcement cases dated 4 January 2021 alongside updates received.

It was **RESOLVED** to request SHDC to delete all historic alleged enforcement cases.

20/123 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

7.00 p.m. on Tuesday 2 March 2021.

Annex:

A. Consultation feedback for planning application 3830/220/FUL.

The meeting closed at 9.10 p.m.

Consultation feedback for planning application 3830/220/FUL

112.2 **3830/20/FUL**
Case Officer: Claire Boobier
Applicant: Mr D Whittington – Dick Wittington Developments Ltd
Proposal: Readvertisement (revised plans and description) erection of six new dwellings
Site: Dennings, Wallingford Road, Kingsbridge, TQ7 1NF

Members noted extant outline approval at the development site for 14 dwellings (2574/16/OPA) and KTC's previous recommendation for Refusal on 3 occasions for the same, extant conditional approval for a home opposite (2710/19/FUL) and the submission of conditional matters for the same, the original proposal for 8 dwellings had been reduced to 6 dwellings due to the necessity for a bat survey of the existing dwelling in May/June 2021 alongside the reported intention for a subsequent separate application for its demolition and therefore likelihood of a future proposal for 2 further dwellings to realign with the original proposal for 8 dwellings in total, statutory and local feedback on SHDC's planning portal including SHDC Drainage recommendation for Objection on the grounds of insufficient information, JLP and SPD policies, SHMNA report, the emerging South Hams & West Devon Housing Strategy 2001-2026 and the deadline for KTC feedback had been extended to 25 February.

Kingsbridge Town Council Recommends Refusal on the following grounds:

1. Inappropriate housing mix.

The Design & Access Statement reports: "The housing is aimed at the family house market which is in great shortage in the Kingsbridge area" and argues for large detached homes citing the JLP and SPD as evidence!

It is curious that the applicant appears to be unaware of developments currently under construction at K5, off West Alvington Hill, which includes 26 in number 3 and 4 bed open market homes and Applegate, off Belle Hill, which includes 58 in number 3 and 4 bed open market homes i.e. 84 open market 3 and 4 bed homes in total.

All 6 dwellings have a study/home office earmarked providing the opportunity to become another main room lifting the proposals to potentially become 4 or 5 bedroom dwellings.

The emerging South Hams & West Devon Housing strategy 2021-2026 reports an under occupancy of 4 and 5 bed homes at 27% in the South Hams compared to the rest of England at 19%.

JLP Policy Dev8 reports: The most particular needs in the policy area are:

- i. Homes that redress an imbalance within the existing housing stock.

- ii. Housing suitable for households with specific need.
- iii. Dwellings most suited to younger people, working families and older people who wish to retain a sense of self-sufficiency.

SPD Policy Dev8.1 reports: A step-change in the delivery of smaller homes will enable greater churn within the existing housing stock as it will facilitate down-sizing for older people, as well as providing a first-step towards independent living for young people and young families. Housing stock that comprises a relative over-provision of large houses makes it increasingly difficult to rebalance the demographic profile and increase home ownership because the current housing stock is inherently unaffordable. Large dwellings, particularly those in coastal settlements, are not suited to smaller households or households that are earning close or similar to the national wage. When seeking to ensure a diversity of size, the number of bedrooms will be used as the key metric (as the number of bedrooms in a dwelling has a significant impact on how affordable it is), with the Strategic Housing Market Assessment Part 2 providing thresholds for the number of dwellings required by bedroom. In order to ensure that homes are not built with a surplus of rooms that can be used as bedrooms, the LPAs will carefully examine floor plans. The SHMNA Part 2 provides a breakdown of housing mix required to meet the needs of projected household formation throughout the plan period. The housing mix prescribed for each housing tenure type within the SHMNA Part 2 should be considered as the requirement for all schemes of over 5 units.

Strategic Housing Market Needs Assessment 2017 reports a requirement for owner occupied 1-2 bed homes for the 20 year period from 2017 at 49% with 4 or more bed homes at 18%.

Given the above Housing Strategy, JLP, SPD and SHMNA evidence it is strongly suggested that the housing mix proposals are totally inappropriate for Kingsbridge and will not meet the needs of local people.

2. Insufficient and confusing drainage information.

JLP Policy DEV35 reports that developments located within a Critical Drainage Area should include a Drainage Strategy setting out and justifying the option(s) proposed, present supporting evidence, and include proposals for long term maintenance and management. Options have been provided for off-site drainage which leads one to believe that the applicant is unsure about the issues. The SHDC Drainage consultation response dated 25 January 2021 objects to the proposals and seeks detailed information. Chiefly, there are currently unresolved surface water drainage matters at the nearby Applegate major housing development which is seeking to discharge via the Wallingford Road locale. Therefore, (if SHDC was minded to approve the application) the methodology for drainage should be considered at the decision stage with input from the applicant, SHDC, Devon County Council Flood Management, Environment Agency and South West Water and should not be left for consideration as a conditional matter.

3. Overlooking of adjacent residential dwellings.

It is disappointing that the planning application makes no mention of the approved planning permission (2710/19/FUL) for a dwelling on the opposite side of the road to units 1 to 4 which will suffer a loss of residential amenity alongside other nearby housing. This merely underlines what can only be described as the disingenuous nature of the Design and Access Statement which appears to be oblivious to any constraints or negatives.

4. Highways issues.

Notwithstanding Devon County Council's consultation response dated 15 January 2021, the access road to the site is narrow and local evidence highlights it is already difficult to navigate. Likewise, the adjacent Wallingford Road (from the junction with Fosse Road) is also problematic. It is inevitable that an increased traffic flow will mean householder, delivery and service vehicles will meet and with parking spaces occupied it will be difficult for 2 way traffic to transit. Moreover, a footway is not proposed to cope with the increased number of pedestrians. It is strongly suggested that the proposed access road to the site is unsuitable for vehicles and pedestrians.