MEETING OF PLANS COMMITTEE
Remote meeting via Zoom
Thursday 2 July 2020 at 9.30 am

NOTICE OF MEETING

Temporary measures during the Coronavirus Pandemic:
Members of the public attending meetings or taking part in the public forum are advised that all Plans meetings taking place during the Covid-19 Pandemic will be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the YouTube channel - https://tinyurl.com/TorridgeYouTube

To: Councillor C Leather (Chair)
Councillor M Brown (Vice-Chair)
Councillors: R Boughton, P Christie, R Craigie, R Lock, D McGeough, P Watson and R Wiseman

Members are requested to turn off their mobile phones for the duration of the Meeting

AGENDA

1. Apologies For Absence
   To receive apologies of absence from the meeting.

2. Minutes (Pages 4 - 9)
   To receive the Minutes from the meeting held on 4 June 2020.
3. **Declaration of Interest**

Members with interests to declare should refer to the Agenda item and describe the nature of their interest when the item is being considered.

Elected Members of Devon County Council and Town/Parish Councils who have considered a planning application by virtue of their membership of that Council hold a personal interest and are deemed to have considered the application separately and the expressed views of that Council do not bind the Members concerned who consider the application afresh.

4. **Agreement of Agenda between Parts I and II**

5. **Urgent Matters**

Information to be brought forward with the permission of the Chair.

6. **Future Site Visits**

The Chair to advise the Committee of any future site visits.

7. **Public Participation**

The Chair to advise the Committee of any prior requests to speak made by members of the public and to advise of the details of the Council’s public participation scheme.

8. **Appeal Decisions Summary** (Pages 10 - 13)

Appeal Decision Summary and Reports of Planning Inspectorate

Summary

Application No: 1/0202/2019/OUT – Land at Hubbastone Road, Appledore

9. **Costs on Appeals**

There are no Costs on Appeals

10. **Delegated Decisions - AGMB Applications** (Page 14)

11. **Planning Applications**

The information, recommendations and advice contained in the reports are correct as at the date of preparation which is more than ten days in advance of the Committee meeting. Due to these time constraints any changes or necessary updates to the reports will be provided in writing or orally at the Committee meeting.

(a) **Application 1/0246/2020/OUT** (Pages 15 - 29)

Outline application for 3 no. dwelling with all matters reserved except access - re-submission of 1/0348/2019/OUT - Land South Of Rectory Rise, Petrockstowe, Devon.
12. **Planning Decisions** (Pages 30 - 37)

List of Delegated Planning Decisions, Consultee Abbreviations and Application Types enclosed 21 May 2020 to 18 June 2020.

13. **Exclusion of Public**

The Chair to move:-

That the public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting because of the likely disclosure of exempt information by virtue of Part 1 Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

14. **Part II - Closed Session**

There are no Part II items.

The background papers are considered to comprise the following documents:

- The individual planning application file (reference number quoted in each case)
- North Devon and Torridge Local Plan 2011-2031 (Adopted October 2018)
- Current Government guidance contained in Circulars, the National Planning Policy Framework, Planning Policy for Traveller Sites and Ministerial Statements
- Any other documents specifically referred to in the report.

All background papers referred to are available for examination during normal office hours.

**NOTE TO MEMBERS**

All letters of representations are readily available for inspection on the files or through the website and public access. If any Member requires assistance in using this facility, please contact the Development Enabling Manager directly.

Members of the Committee only will receive hard copies of representations received.

---

Meeting Organiser: Sandra Cawsey

For those wishing to speak at Plans Committee please contact:

Planning Support - Tel: 01237 428778 or 428711
Email: speak.planning@torridge.gov.uk
Website: www.torridge.gov.uk/speakplanning
1. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

2. MINUTES

It was proposed by Councillor Watson, seconded by Councillor Christie and –

Resolved:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 5 March 2020 be agreed and signed as a correct record.

(Vote: For 7, Abstentions 2)

2. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

The Chair reminded Members to declare their interests when the relevant item was up for discussion. Declarations of interest were made as indicated below and in accordance with the previously agreed arrangements for “dual-hatted” Members.

3. AGREEMENT OF AGENDA BETWEEN PARTS I AND II

That the Agenda as circulated be agreed.
4. **URGENT MATTERS**

There were no urgent matters.

5. **FUTURE SITE VISITS**

The Chair informed the Committee that there were currently no site visits planned.

6. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The Chair advised the Committee that Councillor Christie and Councillor Craigie had requested to speak on application 1/0121/20/FUL as members of the public. They would not take part in the debate and decision making of that application.

7. **APPEAL DECISIONS SUMMARY**

The Committee noted the Appeal Decisions.

Councillor Christie enquired as to the current position regarding an annual review of the Joint Local Plan. The Development Manager advised that Planning Policy Officers were looking at various elements of the Plan, and an update would be circulated to all Committee Members. Due the current situation the Local Plan Working Group had been postponed to a later date.

Councillor Christie referred to the Appeal Decision for Morrisons Bideford (Application No. 1/0098/2019/FUL) which had been refused. Since the Appeal Decision and during the current unprecedented situation, the Government had said that supermarkets do not have to adhere to delivery time restrictions. He asked when planning rules would be reinstated. The Development Manager reported that Central Government had, within a Ministerial Statement, stated that Authorities should not be enforcing deliveries out of restricted times. This is a temporary measure but there is no date yet as to when the rules will be reinstated.

Following enquiries raised by Councillor Craigie regarding the main issues considered by the Planning Inspector in the Appeal Decision for land at Burwood, Torrington, the Development clarified the reasons as to why the Appeal had been allowed.

8. **COSTS ON APPEALS**

The Committee noted the costs on Appeals.

9. **DELEGATED DECISIONS - AGMB APPLICATIONS**

The Committee noted the Delegated Decisions.
10. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

   (a) Application No. 1/0277/2020/FUL

   **Application No. 1/0277/2020/FUL** - Extension to garden store to include home office ancillary to the main dwelling. - Orchard Lodge, Orchard Hill, Bideford

   **Interests:** None

   **Officer recommendation:** Grant

   The planning application had been referred to Plans Committee as the applicant is related to a member of Torridge District Council staff.

   The Planning Officer presented the application and advised Members of the main planning considerations.

   Following a brief discussion, it was proposed by Councillor Lock, seconded by Councillor Brown that the application be approved, and a recorded vote was taken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cllr R Boughton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr M Brown</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr P Christie</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr R Craigie</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr C Leather</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr R Lock</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr D McGeough</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr P Watson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr R Wiseman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   (Vote: For – Unanimous)

   The motion was carried.

   **RESOLVED:**

   That the application be Granted, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

   (b) Application No. 1/0121/2020/FUL

   **Application No. 1/0121/2020/FUL** - Retrospective application for retention of flat roof covering existing open yard - Danny's, 2A Bridgeland Street, Bideford
Interests: Councillor Christie declared a Prejudicial Interest – Chairman of Bideford Bridge Trust, owners of the property – and took no part in the debate and decision making. Councillor Craigie declared a Prejudicial Interest – Trustee of Bideford Bridge Trust – and took no part in the debate and decision making.

Officer recommendation: Grant

The planning application had been called into Plans Committee by Councillor McGeough for the following reason:

“the proposal is not in keeping with the listed building it is attached to, and is out of character with the surrounding conservation area”.

Prior to the presentation the Committee were informed of the following update:

“A late representation letter objecting to the application”.

The Planning Officer presented the application and advised Members of the main planning considerations.

During the debate the following issues/concerns were raised:

- The Impact on Listed Building and surrounding conservation area
- Overbearing impact on neighbouring Cottage
- Although this development is detrimental to the character of a listed building, it was acknowledged that it sits amongst various other developments that had previously been granted, making it difficult to refuse this application.

The Planning Officer addressed the meeting and explained his reasons for the recommendation of approval, and the need to be consistent in decision making. He also clarified that the images of the neighbouring property who had objected to the application, had been taken in 2018. He had visited the site itself, but due to the current situation and the limitations imposed on site visits he did not feel it appropriate to visit a vulnerable persons property.

The Development Manager reminded Members that this is a retrospective application, and should the application be refused, enforcement action would be taken for the removal of the flat roof area.
It was proposed by Councillor Leather, seconded by Councillor Lock that the application be approved, and a recorded vote was taken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cllr R Boughton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr M Brown</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr P Christie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr R Craigie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr C Leather</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr R Lock</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr D McGeough</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr P Watson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr R Wiseman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Vote: For 6, Against 1)

The motion was carried.

RESOLVED:

That the application be Granted, subject to the condition as set out in the report.

Councillor P Christie addressed the Committee as a member of the public objecting to the application
Councillor R Craigie addressed the Committee as a member of the public objecting to the application
The Development Manager read to the meeting a late representation letter received objecting to the application

(c) Application No. 1/0122/2020/LBC

Application No. 1/0122/2020/LBC - Retrospective application for retention of flat roof covering existing open yard - Danny’s, 2A Bridgeland Street, Bideford

Interests: Councillor Christie declared a Prejudicial Interest – Chairman of Bideford Bridge Trust, owners of the property – and took no part in the debate and decision making. Councillor Craigie declared a Prejudicial Interest – Trustee of Bideford Bridge Trust – and took no part in the debate and decision making.

Officer recommendation: Grant

The planning application had been called into Plans Committee by Councillor McGeough for the following reason:
“the proposal is not in keeping with the listed building it is attached to, and is out of character with the surrounding conservation area”.

Prior to the presentation the Committee were informed of the following update:

A late representation letter objecting to the application.

The Planning Officer presented the application and advised Members of the main planning considerations.

It was proposed by Councillor Watson, seconded by Councillor Wiseman that the application be approved, and a recorded vote was taken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cllr R Boughton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr M Brown</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr P Christie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr R Craigie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr C Leather</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr R Lock</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr D McGeough</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr P Watson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr R Wiseman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Vote: For – Unanimous)

The motion was carried.

RESOLVED:

That the application be Granted, subject to the condition as set out in the report.

11. PLANNING DECISIONS

RESOLVED

That the Planning decisions for the period 20 February 2020 and 21 May 2020 be noted.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and closed at 10.42am
# APPEAL DECISIONS SUMMARY

Committee 2\textsuperscript{nd} July 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Address/Proposal</th>
<th>Appeal Decision</th>
<th>Officer Recommendation</th>
<th>Committee/Delegated</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/0202/2019/OUT</td>
<td>Land At Hubbastone Road Appledore Devon Outline application for 5 dwellings with all matters reserved</td>
<td>Appeal Dismissed</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 June 2020

by Mrs H Nicholls FdA MSc MRTP

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W1145/W/20/3244122
Hubbastone Road, Appledore, Bideford EX39 1QH

• The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
• The appeal is made by Mr John Craner against the decision of Torridge District Council.
• The application Ref 1/0202/2019/OUT, dated 6 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2019.
• The development proposed is residential development for five new dwellings on land at Hubbastone Road.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The application was made in outline form with all matters reserved for future consideration. Other than the site location plan, all submitted plans showing the proposed site layout, point of access, scale and appearance of dwellings have been treated as purely indicative.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are whether the proposal accords with the provisions of local planning policies in respect of locating new housing and its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Location of development

4. The appeal site is located along Hubbastone Road, to the south of dwellings on South Road. Whilst the site is not isolated given its location adjacent to dwellings and an industrial area, it is outside of the development boundary for Appledore under the North Devon and Torridge Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (adopted Oct 2018) (NDTLP) and Proposals Map 8B.

5. NDTLP Policy ST06 directs development to the areas within the development boundaries of the named local centres, villages and rural settlements. Appledore is listed as a local centre. However, the site lies outside of the development boundary and is therefore in the open countryside in policy terms.Whilst NDTLP Policy NOR seeks to provide housing within Appledore, it seeks to do so on existing commitments, proposed allocation sites and through redevelopment of previously developed sites.
6. Due to the site’s location outside of the defined settlement boundary, it also lies within the ‘Undeveloped Coast and Estuary’. In such locations, Under NDTLP Policy ST09, development will be supported where it does not detract from the unspoilt character, appearance and tranquillity of the area, and only where it cannot reasonably be located outside the Undeveloped Coast and Estuary, for which no justification has been provided in this case.

7. NDTLP Policy ST07 seeks to limit development in the countryside to that which is enabled to meet local economic and social needs, rural building reuse and development which is necessarily restricted to a countryside location. The proposal to construct up to five open market dwellings in the countryside does not appear to accord with any of the specific criteria for such development.

8. Under NDTLP Policy ST19 and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), there is an acceptance that ‘entry level exception sites’ may be developed on the edges of main centres, such as Appledore. However, the proposal exclusively comprises open market housing and does not accord with the provisions of the aforementioned Policy or the NDTLP Practice Note 2 ‘Approach to ‘Entry-level Exception Sites’ (January 2019).

9. Whilst the proposal would utilise an area which was allegedly used as surplus garden and would involve the demolition of a little-seen dilapidated building, the site is not in a suitable location for new unrestricted residential development on the basis of the clear and unambiguous strategy set by the Development Plan.

10. In view of this main issue, the proposal conflicts with, in particular, NDTLP Policies ST06, ST07 and ST09.

Character and appearance

11. On approach from the south (Hubbastone Road), the elevated site sits behind a large stone retaining wall and is formed from the embankment and vegetation growing above it. Dwellings in South Road are located above the site at a higher level again and are visible on approach to the site, albeit behind a large degree of vegetation. The site’s vegetation provides a semi-rural quality to the area, despite the proximity of large industrial buildings to the east and housing to the north. To the west and south-west of the site, there is an extensive area of largely undeveloped agricultural land of which the site appears more an intrinsic part.

12. Despite the existence of the industrial buildings to the east, and dwellings to the north, the appeal site is green and its value is in its role as a vegetated embankment to provide some separation between the dwellings and retaining wall at the roadside edge. A residential development as detailed in the illustrative plans would substantially urbanise the site and introduce imposing development close to, and higher than Hubbastone Road, with detriment to its semi-rural character.

13. Whilst the submitted access and layout plans are provided for illustrative purposes only, they detail the extensive excavations from the site to provide an access and estate road at an acceptable gradient, developable area, gardens and retaining structures. Such works would result in a harsh and unsympathetic development, with little ability to retain any of the softness currently provided by trees and vegetation. Due to the siting, gradient, scale
and form of the site, an alternative scheme would be unlikely to yield a dramatically different outcome.

14. I note that a number of alterations have been made to the appeal application during the course of its consideration. As the proposal is in outline form, those changes are also assessed on an illustrative basis. That the site may constitute brownfield land by virtue of the existence of a small building without proven lawful use does not change my view about the harm that would result from the introduction of dwellings thereupon.

15. In view of this main issue, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would therefore conflict with NTDLP Policies ST04, ST09, DM04 and DM08A. These Policies, when read together, seek to ensure that new development responds to the characteristics of the site, its wider context and protects the unspoilt character, appearance and tranquillity of the area.

Planning balance and conclusion

16. The proposal would result in the provision of up to five new dwellings which would add to the local housing stock and result in economic benefits throughout the construction phase and throughout occupation. There would also be some social benefits from the proposal through increased access to housing. I attribute these benefits modest weight.

17. However, neither the benefits of the scheme or the other matters raised amount to considerations of sufficient materiality to outweigh the identified harm or associated Development Plan conflict.

18. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Hollie Nicholls
INSPECTOR
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number</th>
<th>Address/Proposal</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/0320/2020/AGMB</td>
<td>Prior notification for the change of use of agricultural building to 1 dwelling under Class Q and associated operational development Barn At Grid Reference 237741 122133, Parkham, Devon.</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Application Number: 1/0246/2020/OUT
Registration date: 25 March 2020
Expiry date: 20 May 2020
Applicant: Mrs D Mounce
Agent: Sherry Consultants
Case Officer: Kristian Evely
Site Address: Land South Of Rectory Rise, Petrockstowe, Devon.
Proposal: Outline application for 3no. dwelling with all matters reserved except access - re-submission of 1/0348/2019/OUT
Recommendation: Grant
Reason for referral:

This application has been called into planning committee by Cllr Wiseman. The reason being, further development is unsustainable in this location. Petrockstowe lacks many basic services and already has approval for around 14 undeveloped dwellings.

Relevant History:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/0348/2019/OUT</td>
<td>Outline application for 3no. dwellings with all matters reserved except access</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td>23.07.2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Description & Proposal

Site Description:
The site is located within the countryside, adjacent to the Rural Settlement of Petrockstowe. The site is accessed from Rectory Rise to the north, and slopes up from the highway between two dwellings and into part of an agricultural field. This site is bordered by dwellings to the southeast, east and north, and the site slopes southwest down northeast. The site is partially screened by hedgerow and tree screening, including residential boundaries. The site area is 0.47ha.

Proposal:
This application seeks outline planning permission for 3 dwellings, with all matters reserved except access.

Consultee representations:

Petrockstowe Parish/Town Council:
Petrockstowe Parish Council would like the following to be taken into consideration:

1. The field is in a designated rural area outside the built-up boundary of the village. As Petrockstowe is not one of the villages identified in the Local Plan where new development should be directed, this is therefore contrary to local plan policy ST07. As this plan has only recently been adopted, we believe it should be complied with.
2. Whilst the Parish Council realise that TDC has not met its allocation of land suitable for development for the next 5 years, we feel that as we already have planning approved for 10 houses at Syncocks Farm, 5 barn conversions at Berry Farm, 5 barn conversions at Hallwood Farm and one at Way Farm, this village would seem to be supplied with dwellings for well into the future.
3. The infrastructure in the village is sadly lacking. We have no shop, no post office, no regular bus service, no doctor's surgery and no school. To access these, residents have to use their car to drive either to Hatherleigh or Torrington.
4. The access is dangerous. The alterations that are proposed will only make it worse as they reduce the width of the main route through the village by almost 50%. This would be particularly dangerous with large tractors and trailers coming through. We have a large (and expanding) agricultural contractor based at Petrockstowe Station, in addition to the normal farming traffic. We also have lorries transporting logs turning on to the carriageway, almost opposite this access, from New Lane. The Highways report pertaining to this application is the same as the original application and cannot apply to this revised access.
5. The field in question has an extremely steep gradient, as the contour lines on the plan show and the councillors cannot see how any dwelling could be constructed without overlooking the properties on Rectory Road. There is no detail about the properties proposed but even bungalows would be intrusive. The P.C. believe that more detail should be shown as to height, scale and external appearance.
6. There would be a detrimental effect to the existing wildlife both with light pollution and the disruption building would cause. As reported on the last application, a councillor has conducted 2 Bat
surveys a year in 2018 and 2019 on behalf of the Devon Greater Horseshoe Bat Project which showed the hedgerow to be regularly used by several species of bats including pipistrelle, myotis, noctules and greater horseshoe. Slow worms and occasionally adders have also been seen there.

We trust you will give these objections your careful consideration.

Devon County Council (Highways):
Comments are made on the basis of the newly submitted plan no. S19/11-04 and the stage 2 road safety audit which I requested previously due to changes proposed to the highway and to consider the unusual proposal for an access on the inside of a bend.

The site would access Rectory Rise on the inside of a bend, with the proposed build outs at the access providing visibility from and of emerging traffic in both directions along the road. Such a build out will reduce the effective road width at this corner, however this corner, which is often used as a place for vehicles to pass, is currently between 8.6m wide with some overgrown verge and 9.3m. The general road width either side of the access is 5m.

The proposal would be able to provide visibility splays of 30m to the south and 23m to the north from 2.4m back from the give way line to the nearside carriageway edge with the proposed build outs in place. These build outs will be designed to effectively be rumble strips, in order to be able to be overrun by larger agricultural vehicles if required, but deter lighter traffic from doing so.

The level of traffic through the village is light, and the volume of traffic that will use the access is limited to that associated with three dwellings, likely to be between 18 and 24 vehicles per day. With estimated existing 85%ile speeds of 20mph on Rectory Rise and the low level of traffic on the road, the proposed splays achievable without narrowing the road below 5.5m are considered acceptable.

An existing street light at this corner will help to illuminate the build outs at night.

To ensure that passing drivers are aware of the situation, signs to diagram 512.2 (S2-2-10) 'junction on the inside of a bend ahead' are required on both approaches to the access.

With the proposed over-runable build outs to achieve visibility in place, the road width will remain wide enough for vehicles to pass safely, and the situation will be no worse than at a number of points on all access roads to Petrockstowe including numerous sections of variable width on the road to Torrington which is used by clay lorries and agricultural vehicles on a daily basis without incident.

If approved, the proposal shall be subject to further road safety auditing and detailed design work.

Recommend : Approval subject to conditions

Environmental Protection Officer:
In relation to the above application, the Environmental Protection Team has no objections in principle.

Having regard for the sensitive end use (ie. dwellings with amenity areas), the land quality of the application site should be assessed, prior to development, for the presence of any potential ground contamination that may be harmful to future occupants. Although the 'Planning Statement' states that the application site has historic arable use only, a phase 1 contaminated land survey would be required. Should planning consent be granted, the Environmental Protection Team recommends the imposition of the Authorities standard full contaminated land condition.

The application site adjoins existing residential properties that may be adversely affected by construction works should planning consent be granted. In order to ensure existing residential amenity is protected, the Environmental Protection Team recommends the imposition of a condition restricting construction works and deliveries to site to 0700-1900 hours during Monday to Friday and 0800-1300 hours on Saturdays with no works on Sundays or Bank Holidays.
Representations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of neighbours consulted:</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of letters of support:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of representations received:</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of neutral representations:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of objection letters:</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3rd party representations were summarised on the 20/05/2020 as set out below:

- Cynical timing of the application during this period of lock down (impacting consultation, etc)
- Overlooking/loss of privacy
- Impact on the character and appearance of the area
- Dominance/overbearing impacts
- Highways safety
- Narrowing of road and development with no footpath is unacceptable
- No housing need in this area for 3 dwellings
- Nuisance (light, noise, etc)
- Unsustainable due to lack of services
- Loss of ecology
- Increased crime risk
- Surface water drainage

Policy Context:

North Devon and Torridge Local Plan 2011-2031:

ST01 (Principles of Sustainable Development); ST04 (Improving the Quality of Development); ST03 (Adapting to Climate Change and Strengthening Resilience); ST07 (Spatial Development Strategy for Northern Devon's Rural Area); ST14 (Enhancing Environmental Assets); ST15 (Conserving Heritage Assets); DM01 (Amenity Considerations); DM02 (Environmental Protection); DM04 (Design Principles); DM05 (Highways); DM06 (Parking Provision); DM07 (Historic Environment); DM08 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity); DM08A (Landscape and Seascape Character); DM24 (Residential Development in Rural Settlements);

Government Guidance:

NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework); NPPG (National Planning Practice Guidance); NERC (Natural Environment & Rural Communities); WACA (Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981);

Planning Considerations

Main Planning Considerations:

- Principle of Development
- Character and Appearance
- Access and Parking
- Impact on Residential Amenities
- Ecology
- Drainage
- Heritage
- The Planning Balance

1. **Principle of Development**

1.1. Petrockstowe is considered to be a 'Rural Settlement', as defined by policy ST07 of the North Devon and Torridge Local Plan (NDTLP). Rural Settlements are generally considered to be locations whereby new housing is resisted due to their rurality and lack of services, unless the proposed housing meets with a locally identified need. Policy ST07 (3)
notes that in Rural Settlements which contain at least one prescribed service or community facility, appropriately located development of a modest scale will be enabled to meet locally generated needs. The NDTLP Glossary defines Rural Settlements as: ‘a small, closely grouped cluster of housing that contains at least one local service or community facility.’ Petrockstowe contains a pub, church, village hall and cricket/recreation ground so is certainly one of the larger rural settlements within the District and was previously identified as a village in an older local plan. Because Petrockstowe is a ‘Rural Settlement’ there is no settlement boundary, however, any development should be considered in conjunction with policy DM24 (rural settlements).

1.2. Policy DM24 notes that in rural settlements, proposals for local occupancy dwellings to meet a locally identified housing need will be supported where:

a) The development forms part of a small closely grouped or contiguous built form of housing that is physically separate from urban areas of other defined settlements;
b) The scale is proportionate to the settlements size, form and character;
c) The site is within or directly adjoining the built form of the settlement;
d) The size of the dwellings are no larger than can be justified by the established need;
e) It would not harm the settlements rural character and setting; and
f) Secure arrangements are made to ensure the dwellings remain available to meet the locally identified housing needs of the local community both initially and in the long term providing the need exists.

1.3. Although the site is within the countryside (as defined within the glossary of the NDTLP) the development does comply with policy DM24 (a), (b) and (c). Linked with this, the proposal can be considered ‘appropriately located’ and of a ‘modest scale’ relative to the size and form of the existing settlement, as required by Policy ST07 (3). Nonetheless, this application proposes open market housing without any 'local needs' tie and no information has been provided to prove any housing need in this location. Therefore the proposal is considered to be contrary to policies DM24 and ST07 of the NDTLP in this regard.

1.4. Notwithstanding the above, as a result of the Burwood Appeal (APP/W1145/W/19/3238460), the Council accepts that it cannot currently demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites (5YHLS); with the appeal concluding that there is a supply of 4.23 years across Northern Devon. By virtue of not being able to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites (footnote 7, NPPF), there is a need to apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development (the ‘Presumption’) (paragraph 11(d), NPPF) as a material consideration in determining planning applications for housing.

1.5. Paragraph 11 (d) notes:

Where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, Local Planning Authorities should grant planning permission unless:

i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance (National Parks, AONB, SSSI, Heritage Assets, Habitat Sites) provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

1.6. For the purposes of the Presumption, policies of the development plan are not considered to be automatically out-of-date by virtue of not being able to demonstrate a 5YHLS. Whether a policy of the development plan is out-of-date is a matter for the decision taker, in light of their substance and considering their conformity with the NPPF. As the NDTLP was adopted relatively recently, none of the policies are generally considered to be out-of-date for the application of the Presumption.
1.7. The Presumption is set out in two parts by Paragraph 11 (d) of the NPPF, however, as this proposal does not harm a 'protected area', the decision taker/s in this case needs to consider the NPPF’s requirement to grant permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits - the so-called tilted balance (Paragraph 11(d)(i), NPPF).

1.8. In addition to the 'tilted balance', some weight can be given to policy ST21 of the NDTLP which relates to managing the delivery of housing. In particular, ST21 (2) is relevant, which supports development outside of settlement limits (where completions are below 90% of the annual requirement). The Burwood Appeal Decision determined that ST21 (2) is currently engaged, which requires any proposal to be in a location, of a scale, and nature commensurate with the deficit in required housing (a), demonstrate the ability to contribute in a timely manner to addressing the deficit in housing supply (b), be broadly consistent with the plans spatial strategy/vision along with the relevant settlement vision and development strategy (c), and be compliant with the remaining plan where relevant (d).

These points are considered below:

(a) The deficit of housing within Northern Devon is clearly substantial as a 5YHLS supply cannot be proven. This proposal is minor in scale, however, combined with other development, can assist in the contribution towards a 5YHLS.

(b) There is no evidence to suggest that this proposal will contribute in a timely manner to addressing the deficit in housing supply. As such, it is recommended that a shorter time condition is utilised for any permission, which may incentivise the landowner to develop the site in a more timely manner at the risk of the application lapsing.

(c) As previously indicated, Petrockstowe is one of the Districts larger rural settlements, with a range of services and a reasonably sized community. As such, 3 dwellings would not be inappropriate in terms of scale, and the location is considered reasonable bearing in mind its central location in the village (the proposal is broadly compliant with ST07 (3) in this regard. Nonetheless, ST07 (3) also requires any development to meet locally generated needs. Whilst there is a general need for housing in Torridge the spatial strategy encourages this housing to be in more 'sustainable areas' such as towns and villages. As this is a rural settlement, the spatial strategy requires any proposal to be for local needs. As such this proposal conflicts with the spatial strategy.

(d) The remaining planning considerations are discussed in the report below.

1.9. Given the above, the proposal falls contrary to Policy ST21, however, given the lack of 5YHLS 'the tilted balance is required to be considered. Notwithstanding this, the consideration of ST21 does assist with the consideration of some of the wider principles that may be required during the application of the tilted balance.

1.10. Taking into consideration all the above, this proposal is contrary to the Council’s spatial strategy in its conflict with Policy ST07 (3), however, due to the lack of a five year housing land supply, the planning considerations will need to be weighed up within the planning balance with the NPPF’s requirement to grant permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits as a material consideration. The planning considerations are set out below.

2. **Character and Appearance**

2.1. Policy ST04 of the NDTLP encourages improved design quality, and notes: development will achieve high quality inclusive and sustainable design to support the creation of successful, vibrant places. Designs will be based on a clear process that analyses and
responds to the characteristics of the site, its wider context and the surrounding area, taking full account of the principles of design found in Policy DM04.

2.2. Policy DM04 then proceeds to detail 14 design principles which should be taken into consideration within any new development. The crux of DM04 requires new developments to be of high quality design, including being well related to their surroundings, be of an appropriate scale, include quality materials, and to be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the local area.

2.3. Policy DM08A is also relevant which relates to landscape impacts, and seeks to ensure that proposals do not cause undue landscape harm.

2.4. No information has been provided regarding design and layout and therefore it is not possible to consider if the development is proportionate to the settlements character in terms of design. In addition, the development is upon a hillside location, and would thus be prominent. In the opinion of the planning officer, only a single storey development would be appropriate here. This is because the adjacent neighbours are all single storey bungalows (thus the proposal would be out of context with these if two storey), and in addition, the landscape and neighbouring amenity impact of the proposals would be reduced significantly by a single storey development.

2.5. As with any development of a field, there will be some negative impacts on the character of the area which would weigh against the scheme, however, subject to a condition requiring any development to be single storey in nature, these impacts would be sufficiently reduced and the proposal (subject to reserved matters), could be considered compliant with policies ST04, DM04 and DM08A of the NDTLP.

3. **Access and Parking:**

3.1. 3rd Party representations raise concerns regarding highways safety. In particular, this site is on the inside of a corner and thus visibility appears to be very poor. There are also limited pavements in the area, meaning any future occupiers would be required to walk on the public highway. The planning officer shared these concerns following the site visit.

3.2. Policy ST10 of the NDTLP relates to the districts Transport Strategy, and seeks to reduce the need to travel by car. It is considered that any occupants of open market housing are likely to have a reliance on private motor vehicles, without the community benefits produced by a local needs dwelling, however, this would often be the case for development within Torridge, especially outside of the strategic settlements. Therefore whilst this is a 'negative', it is only minor.

3.3. Paragraph 109 of the NPPF advises that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highways safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

3.4. Policy DM05 of the NDTLP relates to highways, and notes:

(1) All development must ensure safe and designed vehicular access and egress, adequate parking and layouts which consider the needs and accessibility of all highways users including cyclists and pedestrians.

(2) All development shall protect and enhance existing public rights of way, footpaths, cycleways and bridleways and facilitate improvements to existing or provide new connections to these routes where practical to do so.

3.5. Policy DM06 of the NDTLP is also relevant which requires development to provide suitable parking provision.
3.6. Access is not a reserved matter and therefore should be considered as part of this outline application, however, parking could be considered at a later date when considering layout. In support of this application, the applicants have provided a Road Safety Audit and access drawings. Devon County Council (DCC) has been consulted on this application in their role as Highways Authority, and refers the officer to their previous advice (1/0348/2019/OUT) which noted:

3.7. "Comments are made on the basis of the newly submitted plan no. S19/11-04 and the stage 2 road safety audit which I requested previously due to changes proposed to the highway and to consider the unusual proposal for an access on the inside of a bend.

The site would access Rectory Rise on the inside of a bend, with the proposed build outs at the access providing visibility from and of emerging traffic in both directions along the road. Such a build out will reduce the effective road width at this corner, however this corner, which is often used as a place for vehicles to pass, is currently between 8.6m wide with some overgrown verge and 9.3m. The general road width either side of the access is 5m.

The proposal would be able to provide visibility splay of 30m to the south and 23m to the north from 2.4m back from the give way line to the nearside carriageway edge with the proposed build outs in place. These build outs will be designed to effectively be rumble strips, in order to be able to be overrun by larger agricultural vehicles if required, but deter lighter traffic from doing so.

The level of traffic through the village is light, and the volume of traffic that will use the access is limited to that associated with three dwellings, likely to be between 18 and 24 vehicles per day. With estimated existing 85\%ile speeds of 20mph on Rectory Rise and the low level of traffic on the road, the proposed splay achievable without narrowing the road below 5.5m are considered acceptable.

An existing street light at this corner will help to illuminate the build outs at night.

To ensure that passing drivers are aware of the situation, signs to diagram 512.2 (S2-2-10) 'junction on the inside of a bend ahead' are required on both approaches to the access. With the proposed over-runable build outs to achieve visibility in place, the road width will remain wide enough for vehicles to pass safely, and the situation will be no worse than at a number of points on all access roads to Petrockstowe including numerous sections of variable width on the road to Torrington which is used by clay lorries and agricultural vehicles on a daily basis without incident.

If approved, the proposal shall be subject to further road safety auditing and detailed design work."

3.8. The Highways Officer therefore raises no objections, and recommends 4 conditions relating to surface water, visibility, and construction management. The Highways Officer has appraised the proposal from a technical standpoint focusing on highways safety, and in terms of the planning balance, this is deemed to result in a neutral impact/weighting. In highway safety/access terms the proposal is deemed to comply with policy DM05 of the NDTLP.

3.9. Nevertheless, the proposal does have some highways negatives, such as the proposal is reliant on signage and a somewhat undesirable build-out to make the scheme acceptable. In addition, there is a lack of public footpaths within the village in general. Whilst these reasons may not be sufficient to refuse the application on their own, they do result in a minor 'negative' point within the planning balance.
4. **Impact on Residential Amenities:**

4.1. Policy DM01 of the NDTLP relates to amenity considerations and notes, development will be supported where:

   a) It would not significantly harm the amenities of any neighbouring occupiers or uses; and
   
   b) The intended occupants of the proposed development would not be harmed as a result of existing or allocated uses.

4.2. In addition, policy DM02 of the NDTLP relates to Environmental Protection and seeks to ensure that development proposals will have an acceptable impact having regards to Hazards and Pollution.

4.3. This site is on high ground and therefore naturally overlooks dwellings to the north. However, this does not automatically mean than the development would be unacceptable, and indeed, 1000's of housing estates in the country are built on sloping land without any significant privacy issues. There does appear to be reasonable space on the site to achieve a design that would have a suitable separation from any neighbours, thus avoiding privacy and overbearing impacts, however, this would have to be considered in further detail at a reserved matters stage. The single storey condition detailed in section 2 is likely to reduce any privacy or overbearing impacts. At this stage the proposal is broadly compliant with DM01, and in terms of amenity the impact would be neutral/low.

4.4. In terms of hazard and nuisance the proposal would result in some light and noise nuisance, however, this is not likely to be at a level which will cause any statutory nuisance. In support of this view, the Council's Environmental Protection Officer raises no objections. If approved, a phase 1 land contamination report and construction hour's limitation condition would be required.

5. **Ecology:**

5.1. 3rd party representations raise concerns regarding ecology on site. Local Planning Authorities have a statutory duty to ensure that the impact of development on wildlife is fully considered during the determination of a planning application under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (Habitats Regulations 2010). This is further reinforced within the NDTLP through policies ST14 and DM08, which require development to maintain or where possible enhance biodiversity and mitigate against the potential loss of habitats.

5.2. An ecology survey was submitted with this application which indicated the scheme will not have an impact on any protected species, subject to recommended conditions (advising to stay away from boundary hedges). In addition, an ecology enhancement scheme has been submitted to ensure the proposal produces adequate 'net gain'. This shows approximately 130metres of new hedgerow, and 3 landscape areas (further information to be submitted at reserved matters). A condition is recommended to ensure the hedgerow is provided prior to the occupation of any dwelling.

5.3. In conclusion, your officers consider that this scheme complies with the statutory duties resulting from the above acts. In addition, a positive will be produced in the form of ecological enhancements.

6. **Foul Water/Drainage:**

6.1. 3rd party objections raise concerns regarding drainage and surface water.
6.2. Policy ST03 of the NDTLP notes that development should ‘adopt effective water management including Sustainable Drainages Systems, water quality improvements, water efficiency measures and the use of rainwater’. In addition, policy DM04 notes development should provide effective water management including Sustainable Drainage Systems, water efficiency measures and the re-use of rainwater.

6.3. The NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance provide further advice on foul drainage, with a hierarchical approach being used. The PPG notes new development should aim to discharge foul water into the public sewer; however, if this is not possible then a package treatment plant may be used. It proceeds to note if a package treatment plant is not possible to use, then a septic tank will be considered. Justification for the use of alternative drainage systems other than mains drainage is required.

6.4. The site is not within a Critical Drainage Area nor is it within designated Flood Zones 2 or 3. Foul water will be discharged to public sewer which is acceptable. In addition, the proposed drainage strategy does indicate that soakaways are achievable, albeit detailed construction drawings for the foul water connection and the design of the soakaways will need to form part of a reserved matters application. At this outline stage the proposal is acceptable in principle having regards to drainage.

7. **Heritage**

7.1. This proposal is not considered to impact on the setting of any heritage asset and is acceptable in this regard.

8. **The Planning Balance**

8.1. Planning Law indicates that planning decisions must be taken in accordance with policy, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case, because the LPA cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing, there is a need to apply ‘the presumption in favour’ and the ‘tilted balance’ as a material consideration. As with most planning decisions, there will be benefits and harm, and it is up to the decision makers to ensure that the negative aspects of the scheme are not significantly harmful and/or if the negative impacts demonstrably and significantly outweigh the positives, the proposal should be refused.

8.2. In this case the site is within an area defined by ST07 (3) as being less sustainable, and falls contrary to Policies ST07, ST21 and DM24 of the NDTLP as detailed above due to the proposal not being restricted to local needs.

8.3. Nevertheless, a planning balance approach is required given the presumption in favour of sustainable development / tilted balance as this is a material consideration by virtue of not being able to demonstrate a 5YHLS. It is important to look at each site and application on its own merits and whilst Petrockstowe falls to be defined as a rural settlement, it is important to note its specific sustainability credentials when applying the tilted balance.

8.4. This site is well linked to the settlement of Petrockstowe. In comparison to other rural settlements, Petrockstowe could be considered more sustainable due to its size, range of services, and the local community which serves the surrounding rural area. In noting the NDTLP glossary definition for rural settlements, it must be seen that Petrockstowe is on the larger side (going well beyond a ‘small, closely grouped cluster of housing) and has a greater number of services than the minimum qualifying requirement (4 as opposed to 1). It is acknowledged that there will still be a likely reliance on motor vehicles for day to day needs, however, this does not automatically dictate that the proposal is unsustainable, and many of the villages in Torridge’s rural hinterland would inevitably be the same. In this case three open market dwellings are proposed, and the development is considered appropriate in scale to the size of the village and the likely need for new housing within this
rural area. There is no reason to suggest 3 dwellings would not contribute to the supply of housing in this area in a timely manner which will be supported by a shortened time condition, and the proposal is broadly compliant with the remaining development plan where relevant. It is appreciated that there are extant planning permissions for approximately 10 units of accommodation in the village, however, an additional 3 units is not considered to result in a substantial increase to the size of the settlement in which a refusal would be warranted. The proposal is considered to be appropriately located and modest in scale, as required by Policy ST07 (3).

8.5. Thus in terms of the benefits, this scheme would result in 3 dwellings which would be a modest contribution to the supply of housing in Northern Devon. This positive is considered to carry moderate weight given the current lack of 5YHLS. In addition, the proposal would result in an ecological net gain, which is of moderate benefit. Furthermore, the development will contribute in the short term to the local economy via employment during the construction phase, and longer term via the use of local businesses by future occupiers. This is considered of limited benefit.

8.6. In terms of the harms, moderate negative weight would have to be applied due to the conflict with the spatial strategy set out in policies ST07 (3) and DM24. In addition, there are some limited highways and landscape impacts, and some very limited neighbouring amenity impacts as detailed elsewhere in this report (subject to the proposal being restricted via condition to single storey dwellings). It is not considered that any of these negatives on their own would be sufficient to warrant a reasonable reason for refusal.

8.7. Drainage, and heritage impacts are considered neutral.

8.8. In terms of the planning balance, the positives and negatives of the scheme are finely balanced, especially when considering the relative level of sustainability of Petrockstowe compared to other rural settlements, and the scale and location of development being considered appropriate. As set out in 8.1, in a scenario where the Local Planning Authority cannot demonstrate a 5YHLS, the presumption in favour is relevant. In this case, the scheme is finely balanced and thus the presumption indicates that the scheme should be approved. In order to recommend refusal, any negatives would have to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the positives of the scheme.

8.9. In conclusion, based on the above material considerations and the planning balance, the planning officer considers the housing to be reasonably located within a reasonably sized rural settlement, and the benefits of the scheme outweigh the harm (subject to condition). Thus approval is recommended.

Human rights

Consideration has been given to the Human Rights Act 1998.

Conclusion

It is therefore considered that subject to the compliance with the attached conditions and taking into account all other material planning considerations, including the development plan the proposal would be acceptable.

Recommendation

GRANT subject to the following conditions

1. Approval of the details of
   a) layout,
b) scale,
c) appearance,
d) landscaping

(hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced.


2. (i) Application for the approval of reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of two years from the date of this permission.

(ii) The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of two years from the date of this permission or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last reserved matters to be approved whichever is the later.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 92(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

3. The development shall take the form of single story dwellinghouses

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity

4. Construction works shall not take place other than between 0700hrs and 1800hrs on Mondays to Fridays, Saturdays between 0800hrs and 1700hrs and at no time on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenities of neighbouring properties.

5. Unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority, development other than that required to be carried out as part of an approved scheme of remediation must not commence until conditions A to D have been complied with. If unexpected contamination is found after development has begun, development must be halted on that part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination to the extent specified by the Local Planning Authority in writing until condition D has been complied with in relation to that contamination.

a) Site Characterisation

An investigation and risk assessment, in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application, must be completed in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The contents of the scheme are subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced. The written report is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The report of the findings must include:

(i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;

(ii) an assessment of the potential risks to:

o human health,

o property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes,

o adjoining land,
o groundwaters and surface waters,

o ecological systems,

o archeological sites and ancient monuments;

(iii) an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s).

This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency’s ‘Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11’.

Approval by the Local Planning Authority of the report submitted at this stage will confirm whether there is a need to undertake remediation measures under conditions b, c and e below.

b) Submission of Remediation Scheme

A detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment must be prepared, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

c) Implementation of Approved Remediation Scheme

The approved remediation scheme must be carried out in accordance with its terms prior to the commencement of development other than that required to carry out remediation, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report (referred to in PPS23 as a validation report) that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

d) Reporting of Unexpected Contamination

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of condition a, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of condition b, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority in accordance with condition c.

e) Long Term Monitoring and Maintenance

Where an approved remediation scheme includes a requirement for a monitoring and maintenance scheme to ensure the long-term effectiveness of the proposed remediation over time, a report setting out monitoring and maintenance requirements must be submitted in writing for the prior approval of the Local Planning Authority.
Following completion of the measures identified in that scheme and when the remediation objectives have been achieved, reports that demonstrate the effectiveness of the monitoring and maintenance carried out must be produced, and submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11'.

Reason (common to all): To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.

6 The proposed development shall be undertaken in accordance with the recommendations set out in the Ecological Appraisal prepared by Tarka Ecology, dated May 2019.

Reason: To ensure that the development would not result in an adverse impact on protected species.

7 The ecological improvement scheme provided as part of this application, including the installation of new hedge bank, shall be completed prior to the occupation of the first dwelling. If within a period of five years from the date of the planting of any tree (as part of the hedgerow or ecological improvement scheme), that tree, or any tree planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted, destroyed, dies or becomes seriously damaged or defective another tree of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Additional details within landscape areas 1, 2 and 3, as indicated on the submitted plans, will be required for approval at reserved matters (as part of any landscaping).

Once provided on site, the ecological improvements shall be retained and maintained as such.

Reason: To ensure the proposal produced an ecological net gain

8 Prior to commencement of any part of the site the Planning Authority shall have received and approved a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) including:

(a) the timetable of the works;
(b) daily hours of construction;
(c) any road closure;
(d) hours during which delivery and construction traffic will travel to and from the site, with such vehicular movements being restricted to between 8:00am and 6pm Mondays to Fridays inc.; 9.00am to 1.00pm Saturdays, and no such vehicular movements taking place on Sundays and Bank/Public Holidays unless agreed by the planning Authority in advance;
(e) the number and sizes of vehicles visiting the site in connection with the development and the frequency of their visits;
(f) the compound/location where all building materials, finished or unfinished products, parts, crates, packing materials and waste will be stored during the demolition and construction phases;
(g) areas on-site where delivery vehicles and construction traffic will load or unload building materials, finished or unfinished products, parts, crates, packing materials and waste with confirmation that no construction traffic or delivery vehicles will park on the County highway for loading or unloading purposes, unless prior written agreement has been given by the Local Planning Authority;
(h) hours during which no construction traffic will be present at the site;
(i) the means of enclosure of the site during construction works; and
(j) details of proposals to promote car sharing amongst construction staff in order to limit construction staff vehicles parking off-site
(k) Details of wheel washing facilities and obligations
(l) The proposed route of all construction traffic exceeding 7.5 tonnes.
(m) Details of the amount and location of construction worker parking.
(n) Photographic evidence of the condition of adjacent public highway prior to commencement
of any work;

Reason: To ensure highways safety during the construction phase of development in
accordance with DM05 of the NDTLP.

9 The site access and visibility splays shall be constructed, laid out and maintained for that
purpose in accordance with the approved plans where the visibility splays provide intervisibility
between any points on the X and Y axes at a height of 1.05 metres above the adjacent
carriageway level and the distance back from the nearer edge of the carriageway of the public
highway (identified as X) shall be 2.4 metres and the visibility distances along the nearer edge
of the carriageway of the public highway (identified as Y) shall be at least 30 metres in a
southerly direction and 23 in the other direction.

REASON: To provide a satisfactory access to the site with adequate facilities and to provide
adequate visibility from and of emerging vehicles.

10 The site access road shall be hardened, surfaced, drained and maintained thereafter to the
satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority for a distance of not less than six metres back from
its junction with the public highway

REASON: To prevent mud and other debris being carried onto the public highway

11 Provision shall be made within the site for the disposal of surface water so that none drains on
to any County Highway

REASON: In the interest of public safety and to prevent damage to the highway
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## Torridge District Council

### Planning Decisions

#### Between 21.05.2020 and 18.06.2020

### List of Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No:</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Proposal and Address</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Decision/Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/0555/2018/OUTM</td>
<td>James Jackson</td>
<td>Application for outline permission for residential development (up to 170 dwellings), following demolition of existing agricultural store, with public open space, engineering works and associated infrastructure, and access with all other matters reserved. - Land At North Road, Holsworthy, Devon.</td>
<td>Hallam Land Management Limited</td>
<td>PER 03.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0885/2019/REM</td>
<td>James Jackson</td>
<td>Application for reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) pursuant to permission 1/0537/2017/OUT - Land To West Of Dobles Lane, Dobles Lane, Holsworthy.</td>
<td>DLUX Developments</td>
<td>PER 03.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0886/2019/REMM</td>
<td>James Jackson</td>
<td>Application for reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) pursuant to permission 1/0467/2018/OUTM - Land To The West Of Dobles Lane, Dobles Lane, Holsworthy.</td>
<td>DLUX Developments</td>
<td>PER 03.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1046/2019/FUL</td>
<td>Debbie Fuller</td>
<td>Proposed barn conversion - Lipson Farm, Ashwater, Beaworthy.</td>
<td>Ms E Crowe</td>
<td>PER 03.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1093/2019/FUL</td>
<td>Laura Davies</td>
<td>Erection of 4 one-bedroom flats and associated works - Land Adjacent To Woolsery Village Hall, Woolsery, Bideford.</td>
<td>Mr Brian Butler</td>
<td>PER 21.05.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0114/2020/REMM</td>
<td>James Jackson</td>
<td>Reserved Matters pursuant to 1/1260/2017/OUTM - construction of a holiday village comprising up to 34 caravans, reception building, car parking, landscaping, and other associated infrastructure - Roadford Lake, Broadwoodwiger, Devon.</td>
<td>Lake Lodge Park Limited</td>
<td>PER 08.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Date</td>
<td>Application Type</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Application Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0116/2020</td>
<td>REMM</td>
<td>Ryan Steppel</td>
<td>Application for Reserved Matters of Landscape, Appearance, Layout and Scale pursuant to 1/0611/2018/OUTM - Land At Stibb Cross, Devon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0121/2020</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Ryan Steppel</td>
<td>Retrospective application for retention of flat roof covering existing open yard - Danny's, 2A Bridgeland Street, Bideford.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0122/2020</td>
<td>LBC</td>
<td>Ryan Steppel</td>
<td>Retrospective application for retention of flat roof covering existing open yard - Danny's, 2A Bridgeland Street, Bideford.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0119/2020</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Angelo Massos</td>
<td>Erection of agricultural storage building - Land At Kents View, Bridgerule, Devon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0136/2020</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Angelo Massos</td>
<td>Proposed new access to agricultural field, hard standing and composting toilets - Land At Grid Reference 235477 105108, Holsworthy, Devon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0004/2020</td>
<td>NMAT</td>
<td>Ryan Steppel</td>
<td>Non material amendment to 1/0517/2019/FUL - Window to dormer gable and revised areas of wall cladding - Ashcote, Diddywell Close, Northam.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0155/2020</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Sarah Boyle</td>
<td>Proposed loft conversion involving two gable dormer windows to front elevation, removal of chimney, new parking area and raised platform to the rear (AMENDED PLANS). - 4 Polywell, Appledore, Bideford.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0156/2020</td>
<td>CPL</td>
<td>Sarah Boyle</td>
<td>Single storey rear extension, roof dormer window in rear elevation, alteration to existing porch and sun pipe on front elevation. - 4 Polywell, Appledore, Bideford.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0163/2020</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Angelo Massos</td>
<td>Creation of entrance and proposed tracks - Land At Painters Wood, Meddon, Devon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0183/2020</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Mr Peter Stapley</td>
<td>Creation of equestrian arena - Land At The Retreat, Highampton, Devon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description of Application</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0008/2020</td>
<td>Ryan Steppel</td>
<td>Non material amendment pursuant to planning approval 1/1087/2016/ FUL - Re-positioning</td>
<td>Mr Raymond</td>
<td>12.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of Velux windows from south to north elevation. - 1 Highfield, Northam, Bideford.</td>
<td>Trevor Maine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0209/2020</td>
<td>Ryan Steppel</td>
<td>Porch and garage extension, new doors and raised deck area - 6 Hillcrest Road, Bideford.</td>
<td>Mr Steve Wilton</td>
<td>22.05.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0210/2020</td>
<td>Ryan Steppel</td>
<td>First floor extension above garage with balcony - 112 Bay View Road, Northam, Bideford.</td>
<td>Mr John</td>
<td>01.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0219/2020</td>
<td>Debbie Fuller</td>
<td>Proposed demolition of redundant agricultural building and erection of two detached</td>
<td>Mr Quentin</td>
<td>04.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>holiday cottages - Cheristow Farmhouse, Hartland, Bideford.</td>
<td>Craven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0221/2020</td>
<td>Mr Peter Stapley</td>
<td>Extension to dwelling as previously approved 1/1223/2016/ FUL - 21 Kenwith Road,</td>
<td>Mr And Mrs H</td>
<td>01.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bideford, Devon.</td>
<td>Gabl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0223/2020</td>
<td>Ryan Steppel</td>
<td>Window to side elevation - 12 Greenfield Close, Bideford.</td>
<td>Mr Ken</td>
<td>27.05.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0224/2020</td>
<td>Laura Davies</td>
<td>Reserved matters application for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for 5 no.</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs</td>
<td>21.05.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dwellings pursuant to application 1/1257/2016/OUT - Land East Of North Road, Bradworthy, Devon.</td>
<td>Osborne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0228/2020</td>
<td>Ryan Steppel</td>
<td>Proposed conservatory and terrace to clubhouse - Libbaton Golf Club, Libbaton</td>
<td>Mr Herniman</td>
<td>26.05.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Golf Course, High Bickington.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0231/2020</td>
<td>Angelo Massos</td>
<td>Change of use of land to residential garden, cladding of dwelling and alterations to</td>
<td>Mr R Hunt</td>
<td>27.05.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fenestration positions and style. - Water Tower, Higher Clovelly, Devon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Approver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0233/2020</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Debbie Fuller</td>
<td>Retrospective application for pond, stable blocks and manège - Weekstone Farm, Pancrasweek, Holsworthy.</td>
<td>Mrs Sylvia Darby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0236/2020</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Laura Davies</td>
<td>Change of use of land to equestrian and creation of two maneges for private use. - Osbournes Farm, Kimworthy, Bradworthy.</td>
<td>Mrs Tina Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0237/2020</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Angelo Massos</td>
<td>Installation of hard standing at site entrance - Land At Grid Reference 235278 089867, St Giles On The Heath, Devon.</td>
<td>Mrs Elspeth Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0238/2020</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Sarah Boyle</td>
<td>Erection of one dwelling and installation of treatment plants for The Spinney and Rowan Mead - Land To The Rear Of The Spinney, Daddon Hill, Northam.</td>
<td>Mr Pusey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0242/2020</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Debbie Fuller</td>
<td>Change of use of land and creation of riding arena - Land Adjacent Long Close Cottage, Parkham, Devon.</td>
<td>Mrs Lucy Kendall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0247/2020</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Debbie Fuller</td>
<td>Proposed single storey extension to south west elevation and single storey extension to south east elevation to include raised decking above. - Weekstone Farm, Pancrasweek, Holsworthy.</td>
<td>Mrs Sylvia Darby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0251/2020</td>
<td>FUH</td>
<td>Kristian Evely</td>
<td>Extension and raising of the roofline to form first floor accommodation - 41 Pathfield, Torrington, Devon.</td>
<td>Mrs A Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0255/2020</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Kristian Evely</td>
<td>Building of retaining walls, erection of new steps and hand rail, installation of dropped kerb and tarmac driveway - 27 Stucley Road, Bideford, Devon.</td>
<td>Mrs Tina Bissett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0259/2020</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Ryan Steppel</td>
<td>Variation of Condition 2 of planning permission 1/0647/2017/FUL - Amendments to design of dwelling - Hillside, Yarnscombe, Barnstaple.</td>
<td>Yvette Parkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0261/2020</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Sarah Boyle</td>
<td>Change of use of land to allow continued use of campsite and expansion for 6 hard standing pitches, to site 5 glamping pods and 1 mobile amenities facility. - Land At Walnut Farm, Halwill Junction, Beaworthy.</td>
<td>Mr Peter Hanington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Approved By</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0262/2020/FUL</td>
<td>Debbie Fuller</td>
<td>Installation of 15 ground mounted solar panels (JA Solar 340Wp Black Frame modules), 5 wide by 3 high on Cornish Rocker frame. Width 9m, maximum height 3m. (affecting a public right of way) - Meadowside, Virginstow, Beaworthy.</td>
<td>Hilary Marshall</td>
<td>09.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0263/2020/FUL</td>
<td>Sarah Chappell</td>
<td>Replacement roof and installation of rooflights - 4 Bucks Mills, Bideford, Devon.</td>
<td>Mr Ian Mcintosh</td>
<td>12.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0264/2020/LBC</td>
<td>Sarah Chappell</td>
<td>Replacement roof and installation of rooflights - 4 Bucks Mills, Bideford, Devon.</td>
<td>Mr Ian Mcintosh</td>
<td>12.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0272/2020/FUL</td>
<td>Kristian Evely</td>
<td>Roof extension to create new first floor and rear single storey extension and internal alterations. (amendment to permission 1/0869/2019/FUL) - 13 Kenwith Road, Bideford, Devon.</td>
<td>Mr Nick Tucker</td>
<td>09.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0277/2020/FUL</td>
<td>Kristian Evely</td>
<td>Extension to garden store to include home office ancillary to the main dwelling. - Orchard Lodge, Orchard Hill, Bideford.</td>
<td>Mr Quinton Davies</td>
<td>10.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0281/2020/LBC</td>
<td>Sarah Chappell</td>
<td>Single storey glazed porch extension - Milton House, Milton Damerel, Holsworthy.</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs Ian</td>
<td>28.05.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0282/2020/FUL</td>
<td>Debbie Fuller</td>
<td>First floor extension directly above existing ground floor lounge and bathroom. - West Loatmead, Bradworthy, Holsworthy.</td>
<td>Mr Gerard McElroy</td>
<td>10.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0285/2020/FUL</td>
<td>Sarah Boyle</td>
<td>Demolition of garage, creation of side and rear extensions with rear dormer window. (Amended Plans) - Homeleigh, Thornbury, Holsworthy.</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Etheridge</td>
<td>10.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0286/2020/FUL</td>
<td>Angelo Massos</td>
<td>Erection of no.3 bungalows - Land South West Of Buckland Brewer, Devon, .</td>
<td>Mr Ali Boyd</td>
<td>12.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0287/2020/FUL</td>
<td>Angelo Massos</td>
<td>Retrospective application for the change of use of land to domestic, construction of outdoor swimming pool with enclosing wall, plant room and changing shed, creation of new vehicular access. - Weekaborough Farm, Hartland, Bideford.</td>
<td>Mrs L Johnson &amp; Mr A Bleach</td>
<td>03.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0290/2020/FUH</td>
<td>Sarah Boyle</td>
<td>Proposed extension to form sitting room or guest bedroom. - Littlecot, Putford, Holsworthy.</td>
<td>Mr Nigel Jarmin</td>
<td>03.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Decision Maker</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0296/2020/</td>
<td>Helen Smith</td>
<td>Detached dwelling - Land Off Staddon Road, Appledore, Devon.</td>
<td>Mr Matthew Phillips</td>
<td>16.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0297/2020/</td>
<td>Helen Smith</td>
<td>Detached dwelling - Land Off Staddon Road, Appledore, Devon.</td>
<td>Miss Emma Phillips</td>
<td>15.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0303/2020/</td>
<td>Angelo Massos</td>
<td>Resubmission of application for single storey extension originally approved under 1/0717/2019/FUH (amended plans) - Chantwell, First Raleigh, Bideford.</td>
<td>Mr Paul Wilson</td>
<td>04.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0309/2020/</td>
<td>Mr Peter Stapley</td>
<td>Single storey extension to replace existing conservatory - The Old Barn, Fore Street, Dolton.</td>
<td>Mr And Mrs David Crane</td>
<td>09.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0310/2020/</td>
<td>Ryan Steppel</td>
<td>Retrospective application for the continued use of annexe as holiday let - Affecting a Public Right of Way - Higher Northcott Farmhouse, Ashreigney, Chulmleigh.</td>
<td>Harriet Wilson</td>
<td>10.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0312/2020/</td>
<td>Angelo Massos</td>
<td>Single storey rear extension - extending beyond the rear wall of the dwellinghouse by 3.35m, maximum height of 3.5m and an eaves height of 2.4m - 46 Hanson Park, Northam, Bideford.</td>
<td>Ms Keeley Marshall</td>
<td>22.05.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0316/2020/</td>
<td>Sarah Boyle</td>
<td>Certificate of existing lawful use - construction of barn - Hollies, Halwill, Beaworthy.</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs Day</td>
<td>01.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0318/2020/</td>
<td>Mr Peter Stapley</td>
<td>Two storey rear extension to dwelling with associated works - High Park Lodge, Littleham, Bideford.</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs White</td>
<td>10.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0321/2020/</td>
<td>Kristian Evely</td>
<td>Certificate of proposed lawful development for the erection of 5.4m wide x 5.5m deep single storey side extension with a maximum height of 4 metres. - Hill View, Parkham, Bideford.</td>
<td>Mr Marcus Lang</td>
<td>10.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0341/2020/</td>
<td>Debbie Fuller</td>
<td>Conversion of barns into additional residential accommodation and link extension to replace existing porch - North Hogg Park Barn, Chilsworthy, Holsworthy.</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Baker</td>
<td>17.06.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/0355/2020/</td>
<td>Laura Davies</td>
<td>Erection of agricultural building - Land At Grid Reference 233540 121268, Woolserly, Devon.</td>
<td>Mr. Dale Hancock</td>
<td>28.05.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1/0365/2020/ NMAT Helen Smith Non material amendment to planning permission 1/0528/1996 - Change of description to include 'and non-compliance with conditions 1 and 6 of planning consent HN 961.' - Greenways Valley Holiday Park, Torrington, Devon. Mr Mark Bambridge PER 18.06.2020

1/0009/2020/ NMAT Debbie Fuller Non material amendment pursuant to planning permission 1/0380/2019/FUL - Velux window, replacement kitchen window with door and window, layout garden room - Baraq, Bridgerule, Holsworthy. Mrs Susan Cowan-Dickie PER 15.06.2020

1/0369/2020/ TCA Kristian Evely Works to trees within a conservation area - removal of five overgrown sycamore saplings, and planting of two Victoria Plum Trees, and one Damson Tree as replacements. - The Manse, Castle Street, Torrington. Stuart Smithson PER 05.06.2020

1/0397/2020/ NMAT Angelo Massos Non Material Amentment to planning permission 1/0833/2012/FULM - Placement of 20 string inverter boxes on 2 x 6.65 metre racks adjacent to Inverter Station 8 with cabling connecting to inverter station. - Pitworthy Solar Farm, Pancrasweek, Devon. Pitworthy Solar Limited PER 15.06.2020

Refused

1/1166/2019/ FUL Helen Smith Retrospective application for engineering works and change of use of land to B2 and B8 use including diversion of existing Public Right of Way - Staines Trailers Ltd, Huntshaw, Torrington. Mr E Staines REF 05.06.2020

1/0320/2020/ AGMB Angelo Massos Prior notification for the change of use of agricultural building to 1 dwelling under Class Q and associated operational development - Barn At Grid Reference 237741 122133, Parkham, Devon. Mr. Jason Lang REF 15.06.2020

Not Determined Deemed Permission

1/0336/2020/ AGR Mr Peter Stapley Erection of steel framed portal agricultural building - Gammaton Barton Farm, East The Water, Bideford. Miss Helen Bellew NDDP 22.05.2020
### Not Permitted Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Receiving Officer</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/0361/2020/AGR</td>
<td>Debbie Fuller</td>
<td>Erection of agricultural storage building - Highford Farm Cottage, Higher Clovelly, Bideford.</td>
<td>Mr David Taw</td>
<td>01.06.2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### No Objections – Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Receiving Officer</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/0270/2020/TRE</td>
<td>Sarah Boyle</td>
<td>TPO/0001/2020 - South West Water need to construct a 150mm new foul sewer in the track - North West Of Cleave Lodge, Northam, Devon.</td>
<td>Mr James Howorth - SWW</td>
<td>10.06.2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>