

**EXMOUTH TOWN COUNCIL**  
**Minutes of the Meeting of Exmouth Town Council**  
**Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber,**  
**Town Hall, St Andrews Road, Exmouth**  
**on Monday 20 November 2023 at 6:15pm**

**Present:**

Councillor Joe Whibley (Chair)  
Councillor A Colman  
Councillor Graham Deasy  
Councillor Tim Dumper  
Councillor Cherry Nicholas  
Councillor David Poor  
Councillor Andrew Woodward

Also in attendance was Councillor Fred Caygill who was a non-voting member.

**Apologies:** Councillor Mike Rosser

**Public Speaking Time**

Julian Short, Jenny Dawson and Geoff Crawford spoke during the public speaking time regarding planning application 22/1910/MFUL, Devoncourt Hotel, 16 Douglas Avenue, EX8 2EX, demolition of the existing Devoncourt building and outbuildings, construction of 51 open market and 15 Affordable residential apartments and new 65 bed hotel with access via Maer Road car park, associated car parking and landscaping works.

Amended plans for consultation.

Amended quantum of development, layout, form of buildings, design and Landscaping.

---

Note: The application stated above was discussed immediately after the Public Speaking Time. The Chairman then reconvened the Planning Meeting.

**P23/162. Minutes of the previous meeting**

Councillor Tim Dumper proposed, seconded by Councillor D Poor and it was agreed that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 6 November 2023 be approved.

**P23/163. Declarations of pecuniary interests and dispensations:**

Application:	23/2175/FUL The York Inn, 21 Imperial Road EX8 2BY
Councillor	Joe Whibley
Pecuniary or personal	Personal
Reason	Knows applicant and is Chair of East Devon District Council's Licensing and Enforcement Committee.
Application:	22/1910/MFUL Devoncourt Hotel, 16 Douglas Avenue
Councillor	G Deasy

Pecuniary or personal Reason	Personal Member of their Leisure Club
------------------------------	--

## P23/164. Urgent business

None

## P23/165. Tree and advertising consent applications

### BRIXINGTON

Planning Application No: 23/1998/TRE

Location: Solar Farm North Of Bystock Stables, Bystock, EX8 5ED

Applicant: Mr Daniel White

Proposal: T9, Turkey Oak: reduce crown by 3-4m.

T10, Turkey Oak: selected branch removal (remove lowest southern primary limb, leaving 1m stub (coronet cut) to minimise decay in the main stem).

Dismantle the semi-mature tree that the limb is fused to as it has poor form and a high likely hood of failure in the future - leaving a 3m habitat pole.

T11, Turkey Oak: reduce crown by 2m (reduce the remaining canopy of the large stem to balance the crown.); selected branch removal (fell the fractured stem into the wood.)

Comments Statutory Consultees:

Tree Officer's report previously circulated.

Recommendation – **SPLIT DECISION**

**APPROVAL** to carry out work described below subject to the following conditions:

T10, Turkey Oak: selected branch removal (remove lowest southern primary limb, leaving 1m stub (coronet cut) to minimise decay in the main stem). Dismantle the semi-mature tree that the limb is fused to as it has poor form and a high likely hood of failure in the future - leaving a 3m habitat pole.

T11, Turkey Oak: reduce crown by 2m (reduce the remaining canopy of the large stem to balance the crown.); selected branch removal (fell the fractured stem into the wood.)

**REFUSAL** to carry out work described below for the following reasons:

T9, Turkey Oak: reduce crown by 3-4m.

The tree grows separate to the wider woodland and thus has added individual amenity value. Whilst unsympathetic past pruning has been identified, insufficient quantitative evidence has been provided supporting the need to undertake the stated crown reduction works at this time.

View of representations: None

Decision: Proposed: CN

Seconded: AC

Split decision in accordance with the Tree Officer's report.

Planning Application No: 23/2033/TRE

Location: 31 Ivydale, EX8 4TA

Applicant: Knight

Proposal: T1: Oak - raise crown over the gardens up to a height of 5m from ground level. Remove limb growing on eastern side. Reduce crown by up to 2m to leave a tree with a finished height of 8m and a 3m gap from the house. Restricting cut size to 75mm diameter.

Target date: 27.11.23

Comments Statutory Consultees:

Tree Officer's report previously circulated.

Recommendation – **SPLIT DECISION**

**APPROVAL** to carry out work described below subject to the following conditions:

T1 Oak:

i) Crown reduce by no more than 1.5m leaving a balanced and uniform shape. No cuts larger than 65mm in diameter to be made.

ii) Crown lift to no more than 4.5m from ground level (garden level).

**REFUSAL** to carry out work described below for the following reasons:

T1: Oak - raise crown over the gardens up to a height of 5m from ground level.

Remove limb growing on eastern side. Reduce crown by up to 2m to leave a tree with a finished height of 8m and a 3m gap from the house. Restricting cut size to 75mm diameter.

Removal of the eastern limb will unbalance the tree's form, to the detriment of its amenity value. Reasonable works have been allowed, to continue the cyclical management of the tree.

View of representations: None

Decision: Proposed: AC

Seconded: CN

Split decision in accordance with the Tree Officer's report.

---

**HALSDON**

Planning Application No: 23/2045/TRE

Location: 18 Carberry Avenue, EX8 3EH

Applicant: Mrs Carter

Proposal: T5: Turkey Oak - reduce canopy by 3m over no.18's back to boundary with cuts taken back to growth points, no larger than 75mm diameter.

Target date: 21.11.23

Comments Statutory Consultees:

Tree Officer's report previously circulated.

Recommendation – **SPLIT DECISION**

**APPROVAL** to carry out work described below subject to the following conditions:

T5, Turkey oak:

(i) Crown reduction to a maximum of 2.5m reduction in radial spread, with typical

Pruning cuts made at a diameter of no greater than 50mm. One lateral branch to the southeast will require a single cut of approximately 75mm diameter.

**REFUSAL** to carry out work described below for the following reasons:

T5: Turkey Oak - reduce canopy by 3m over no.18's back to boundary with cuts taken back to growth points, no larger than 75mm diameter.

The tree contributes to the amenity of the local area. Lesser works have been approved limiting the extent of the proposed reduction, to avoid the tree being cut back simply to the fence line.

View of representations: None

Decision: Proposed: TD

Seconded: AT

Split decision in accordance with the Tree Officer's report.

---

## **LITTLEHAM**

Planning Application No: 23/1852/TRE

Location: Flat 1 9 Louisa Terrace, EX8 2AQ

Applicant: Dr Tom Roberts

Proposal: Yew: trim and reshape some of the more extensive branches of the tree.

Target date: 24.11.23

Comments Statutory Consultees:

Tree Officer's report previously circulated.

Recommendation - **APPROVAL**

View of representations: 2 x letters in support.

Decision: Proposed: DP

Seconded: GD

Approval in accordance with the Tree Officer's report.

Planning Application No: 23/2088/TRE

Location: 75A Salterton Road Exmouth EX8 2EN

Applicant: Mrs D Humphries

Proposal: T1 - Liquidambar: crown lift to 4m above ground level, maximum diameter of cuts 50mm. Tip reduce all extending and exposed limbs by 1-2m, maximum diameter cuts of 50cm. Remove all snapped branches and deadwood.

Target date: 04.12.23

Application deferred pending tree officer's report.

Planning Application No: 23/2111/TRE

Location: 79-81 Summerleaze Salterton Road Exmouth EX8 2EW

Applicant: Mr Joe Biddulph

Proposal: T1: Ash - fell to ground level.

Target date: 28.11.23

Application deferred pending tree officer's report.

---

## TOWN

Planning Application No: 23/2032/ADV

Location: The Phoenix, 31 Exeter Road, EX8 1PT

Applicant: Star Pubs And Bars

Proposal: Installation of illuminated and non-illuminated signs to the exterior of the Building

Target date: 13.12.23

Comments Statutory Consultees:

**County Highways Authority** had been consulted but not yet commented.

View of representations: None

Decision: Proposed: JW

Seconded: TD

Approval, subject to the illuminated signage being turn off outside business hours.

Planning Application No: 23/2089/TCA

Location: 6 Rolle Villas, EX8 2AE

Applicant: MS Sara Smart

Proposal: T1: Acacia - reduce height by no more than 2.5m and a lateral crown reduction of no more than 1.5m. T2: Oak - reduce crown height by no more than 2.5m and lateral crown reduction of no more than 1.5m. T3: Walnut - crown reduction of no more than 1m. T4: Sycamore - reduce height by no more than 4m (above previous pruning points) and lateral crown reduction of no more than 1.5m.

Target date: 21.11.23

Comments Statutory Consultees:

Tree Officer's report previously circulated.

Recommendation - **APPROVAL**

View of representations: None

Decision: Proposed: JW

Seconded: DP

Approval in accordance with the Tree Officer's report.

---

## **P23/166. Planning applications.**

### **BRIXINGTON**

None

---

### **HALSDON**

None

---

### **LITTLEHAM**

Planning Application No: 22/1910/MFUL

Location: Devoncourt Hotel, 16 Douglas Avenue, EX8 2EX

Applicant: Mr Azim Lalani

Proposal: Demolition of the existing Devoncourt building and outbuildings, construction of 51 open market and 15 Affordable residential apartments and new 65 bed hotel with access via Maer Road car park, associated car parking and landscaping works

Amended plans for consultation.

Amended quantum of development, layout, form of buildings, design and Landscaping.

Date limit for comments: 21.11.23

Comments Statutory Consultees:

**Town Council** - Meeting 26.09.22 - Objection, members felt this resubmission of the previously withdrawn application did not address the previous concerns raised. The proposal would result in the loss of a natural amenity; Policy EN1 of the Exmouth Neighbourhood Plan only supports development where it would not harm the amenity and environmental qualities within which it is located. The application still incorporated part of EDDC's car park as the parking provision for the hotel. Currently the car park is used as an overnight parking provision for motorhomes and for the Exmouth land train. Concern was raised about the impact that this proposal would have on these facilities and the loss of public parking spaces which make a positive contribution to the tourist facilities in the area. The site had not been appropriately marketed and at an unrealistic price and therefore did not meet the policy requirements of EE3. Policy CF1 does not support the reduction of health and wellbeing facilities. The applicant had not mitigated the loss of these facilities. In the context of recent storm water surges members were concerned the development would exacerbate existing sewage capacity issues in the town and did not meet the policy requirements of EN5 & EN6.

**Campaign to protect Rural England** – continue to object to the amended plans on the grounds that insufficient information and failure to address sustainability. The proposal is a departure from local planning policy and the Exmouth Neighbourhood

Plan.

**Police Architectural Liaison Officer** – Give further recommendations and conditions.

**Environmental Health** – 06.09.22 – A CEMP & specific noise level of fixed plant must be submitted to protect residential amenity.

The following statutory Consultees had been consulted but not yet commented on the amended plans.

- 
- Contaminated Land Officer
  - DCC Flood Risk Management Team
  - Economic Development Officer
  - EDDC Ecologist
  - EDDC Landscape Architect
  - Housing Strategy/Enabling Officer
  - EDDC Property Services/Estates
  - Environment Agency
  - County Highways
  - Urban Designer
  - EDDC Trees
  - SWW
  - RSPB
  - East Devon AONB
- 

View of representations:

2 x in support

**160 x Rep**

The amended plans do not mitigate the previous concerns raised, which in summary are:

- 
- Over development/density of development
  - Loss of green space & trees
  - Loss of the Devoncourt public facilities
  - Additional load on sewage system
  - Reduction on affordable housing provision
  - Proposed toilets in hotel accessed via the gym.
  - Loss of residential amenity and privacy due to issues of overlooking
  - Impact on neighbouring property Blair Atholl
  - Inclusion of the EDDC car park
  - Increase in traffic and additional pressure on the roads
  - Not marketed properly
- 

Cllr M Rosser had forwarded his comments which were shared as follows:

In addition for the many concerns raised I can see no evidence of compliance with Strategic policy 34 of the draft local plan which states that:- “All developments shall demonstrate actions taken to reduce embodied carbon and developers should retain existing buildings or at least their foundations unless it can be demonstrated that

refurbishment is either unviable or impracticable. Replacement of existing habitable buildings with new developments will only be supported in exceptional circumstances and will need to demonstrate that the full lifecycle carbon emissions will be net zero.”

ENP Policy: EN1, EB2, EE3, EN5, EN6, H2, GA3, CF1

Decision: Proposed: GD

Seconded: DP

Objection sustained; the amended plans did not mitigate any of the previous concerns raised in September 2022.

The proposal would still be visibly intrusive and out of keeping from the southern aspect. It was noted that the Urban Designer felt that the lower part of the site was not suited to large-scale development. Its design and appearance was out of keeping and harmful to its sensitive setting. Therefore the proposal was considered to still be contrary to policy EN1 of the Exmouth Neighbourhood Plan Policy EN1 where development is only supported if it would not harm the amenity and environmental qualities within which it is located.

The scale, density of the development was considered to be unacceptable and will have an overbearing impact on adjacent properties on Maer Road. Concerns were raised about the design of the hotel. The problems of scale, massing had not been addressed with serious design failures. It was therefore considered that the proposal did not meet the policy requirement for EB1 of the Exmouth Neighbourhood which states that development should be mindful of surrounding building styles and ensure a high level of design.

The proposal did not mitigate the loss of the hotel and the associated facilities and members questioned the viability issues cited. The application did not comply with policy EE3 of the Exmouth Neighbourhood Plan or E18 of the East Devon Local Plan.

Exmouth Neighbourhood Plan Policy CF1 does not support the reduction of health and wellbeing facilities. The applicant's provision of a small gym did not mitigate against the loss of the existing facilities.

Concerns remained about exacerbating the existing sewage capacity and the management of surface water run-off. The application should comply with policies EN5 and EN6 of the Exmouth Neighbourhood Plan.

Concern was also raised regarding the sustainability of the development with regards to the amount of embodied carbon emitted and the harm to the biodiversity of the landscape.

Members further expressed their disappointment that the applicant had not engaged further with the District Council's parking manager since an initial brief enquiry.

Planning Application No: 23/2273/FUL

Location: Land At 16 Raddenstile Lane

Applicant: Mr Nicholas Christie

Proposal: Proposed two-storey dwelling with associated amenity and facilities.



Date limit for comments: 01.12.23

Comments Statutory Consultees:

**County Highways Authority** had been consulted but not yet commented.

View of representations: 1 letter of support.

Note: This is a revised proposal by a new owner following approval of a previous application 22/1773/FUL which includes environmental and sustainability improvements and changes to comply with building regulations. The Planning Committee had no objection to the previous application.

Cllr M Rosser had forwarded his comments which were shared as follows:

This is a larger building than the one approved in application 2002. The majority of the committee approved the application, I thought that it was over development of the site and objected. Access to the site is restricted by the narrowness of Highfield Lane (I think the perspective drawing is quite misleading in this respect). A previous withdrawn application attracted an objection from the owner of no 14 Raddenstile Lane. The building would leave very little if any area of soft landscaping on the site. I am puzzled by the neighbour supporting the application stating that the development would have notable ecological enhancements. I think the development would virtually eliminate any biodiversity on the site. I think that the proposed building is far too big for the site and would object to the application.

ENP Policy: EB2

Decision: Proposed: GD  
No objection

Seconded: DP

Planning Application No: 23/2353/FUL

Location: 1 Cranford Close, EX8 2HR

Applicant: Mr Richard Goss

Proposal: Roof extension in addition to various alterations including replacing pergola with canopy, re-roofing with slate, raising and replacing rear decking and white render finish to external walls.

Date limit for comments: 29.11.23

Comments Statutory Consultees:

**County Highways Authority** had been consulted but not yet commented.

View of representations: None

Cllr M Rosser had forwarded his comments which were shared as follows:

No objection

ENP Policy: EB2

Decision: Proposed: DP

Seconded: GD

No objection

## **ADDENDUM**

Planning Application No: 23/1820/FUL

Location: 6 The Coach House Portland Avenue, EX8 2BS

Applicant: Mr Giles Tushingham

Proposal: Erection of detached garage building with room on upper floor, with construction of driveway. Demolition of existing garage

### Amended plans

Amended plans showing reduction and change to the design of the rear facing dormer - plans received 16 November 2023.

Date limit for comments: 30.11.23

Comments Statutory Consultees:

**Town Council** – 12.10.23 - No objection subject to conservation officer's report, the submission of a planting/landscape plan for the replacement for lost vegetation, and any approval conditioned that it cannot be used as independent accommodation.

**Conservation** - had been consulted but not yet commented on the amended plans.

26.10.23 - No objection in principle but overall design appeared cramped within the site, overbearing and too large, dominated the narrow roofscape. Garage should be reduced in size and appear more subservient.

**County Highways Authority** had been consulted but not yet commented.

View of representations:

**2 x Rep** – in respect of the original application. No further comments received regarding the amended plans.

Cllr M Rosser had forwarded his comments which were shared as follows:

Having considered the reasons for the public objections to this application, I would also now object to this application.

ENP Policy: EB2

Decision: Proposed: DP

Seconded: GD

No objection to the amended plans subject to the updated comments from the Conservation Officer and the submission of a planting/landscape plan for the replacement for lost vegetation, and any approval conditioned that it cannot be used as independent accommodation.

---

## **TOWN**

Planning Application No: 23/2175/FUL

Location: Flat, The York Inn 21 Imperial Road, EX8 2BY

Applicant: Mr Steven Drinkall

Proposal: Two proposed one-bedroom apartments over an existing public house.

Date limit for comments: 22.11.23

Comments Statutory Consultees:

**Environmental Health** – 06.11.23 – To protect the amenity of future occupiers, prior to the commencement of works a sound insulation scheme shall have been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

**Environment Agency** – 20.11.23 – Objection in the absence of a Flood Risk Assessment.

**County Highways Authority** had been consulted but not yet commented.

View of representations: None

ENP Policy: EB2

Decision: Proposed: JW

Seconded: TD

Objection; members shared the concerns of Environmental Health regarding noise and questioned if any amount of mitigation would be effective in protecting the amenity of future occupiers from the noise levels that was emitted from the York Inn. Councillor T Dumper believed that the proposal constituted overdevelopment. It was also noted that a FRA had not been submitted.

Planning Application No: 23/2253/FUL

Location: 6 Henrietta Place, EX8 1LD

Applicant: Mrs Rebecca Beasley

Proposal: Second floor extension to the rear of the existing property.

Date limit for comments: 21.11.23

Comments Statutory Consultees:

**County Highways Authority** had been consulted but not yet commented.

**Conservation** had been consulted but not yet commented.

View of representations:

ENP Policy: EB1 (Conservation Area) EB2

Decision: Proposed: JW

Seconded: AW

Objection; it was felt that the proposal would be out of keeping with the street scene. The extension would appear incongruous and have a harmful impact on the Conservation area. The proposal was therefore considered to be contrary to policy EB1 of the Exmouth Neighbourhood Plan which seeks to conserve heritage assets and EB2 which states that development should be mindful of surrounding building styles.

## **ADDENDUM**

Planning Application No: 23/1391/FUL

**Location:** 4 St Andrews Road, EX8 1AP

**Proposal:** Change of external materials

Amended elevation/floor/section plans dated 13 November 2023

Date limit for comments: 01.12.23

**Town Council – 17.07.23** - Objection; this premises is located on the Conservation boundary and in close proximity to a number of Listed building. Development in the surrounding area is of mixed use, commercial and residential, however they all share the same roofing material of slate tiles. It was felt that the introduction of a corrugated roof would be harmful and incongruous to the street scene. The proposal was therefore considered to be contrary to Exmouth Neighbourhood Plan Policy EB1 which seeks to conserve heritage assets.

15.08.23 - The proposal to replace the traditional materials identified as the timber boarding within the gable end apex, prominent slate tile roof and timber windows, would fail to preserve, enhance or better reveal the contribution the building makes to the setting and significance of the Grade II Thomas Tucker Building and the conservation area. In this respect the proposed development fails to satisfy para. 206 of NPPE21.

**County Highways Authority** had been consulted but not yet commented.

View of representations: None

## ENP Policy: EB1 (Conservation Area) EB2

**Decision:** Proposed: \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded: \_\_\_\_\_  
Application delegated to ward members to comment.

**WITHYCOMBE RALEIGH**

Planning Application No: 23/2302/FUL

Applicant: Mr and Mrs Chris and Annette Weeks

Proposal: Loft conversion with front and rear dormers and replacement solid roof to existing rear conservatory.

Date limit for comments: 23.11.23

**County Highways Authority** had been consulted but not yet commented.

View of representations: None

## ENP Policy: EB2

Decision: Proposed: AW

Seconded: JW

Objection; it was acknowledged that similar development had been approved at number 13 Newlands Avenue. However this proposal was further up on the other side of the road in a section of the street scene that was consistent in appearance. It was also noted that the proposed dormer was larger in scale which would dominate the front elevation. It was therefore felt that the proposal did not meet the policy criteria of Exmouth Neighbourhood Plan EB2 which states development should be mindful of surrounding building styles.

---

#### **P23/167. Other items**

None

---

#### **P23/168. Items for information**

##### **i. Notification of Tree Preservation Order**

It was noted that the following TPO had recently been made:

23/0054/TPO – Land at 5, Brookhayes Close

---

##### **ii. Appeal Notification**

Appeal by: Alan Marriott

Appeal Ref: APP/U1105/W/23/3331532

Proposal: Install wooden featheredge board corner fence along boundaries adjacent to Mount Pleasant Avenue and Swiss Close.

Location: 13 Mount Pleasant Avenue

Planning Application No: 23/1352/FUL

It was noted that an appeal had been made to the Secretary of State against the decision of EDDC to refuse planning permission for the above proposed development.

---

#### **P23/169. East Devon District Council – Planning Decisions**

<i>Application</i>	<i>Exmouth Town Council View</i>	<i>EDDC Decision</i>
22/2669/MFUL Warren View Sports Ground Halsdon Avenue	No objection	Conditional Approval
<b><u>23/1864/FUL</u></b> <b><u>20 Regents Gate</u></b>	<b>Objection</b>	<b>Approval</b>
<b><u>23/1412/FUL</u></b> <b><u>Summer Haye</u></b> <b><u>St Johns Road</u></b>	<b>Objection</b>	<b>Approval</b>
23/1961/FUL 1 Coleridge Close	No objection	Approval
23/2067/FUL 10 Sherwood Drive	No objection	Approval

<b><u>23/2072/FUL</u></b> <b><u>5 Stanley Walk</u></b>	<b>Objection</b>	<b>Conditional Approval</b>
---	------------------	-----------------------------

The chair reported back to members of the appeal inquiry for planning application 22/2120/MFUL, Jewson Ltd, Fore Street.

An update was given on the delegated Ward Decision from previous meeting.

Planning application No: 23/2156/FUL

Location: 86A Exeter Road, EX8 1PZ

Applicant: Mr & Miss Danny & Megan Sansom & Ford

Proposal: The application is to extend the existing building to form two additional self-contained flats as well as extend the ground floor to make good the existing rear extensions / yard.

Date limit for comments: 10.11.23

No objection

Planning application No: 23/2299/PIP (Planning in Principle)

Location: 28 Cranford Avenue, EX8 2PZ

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Lovejoy

Proposal: Permission in principle for demolition of dwelling and construction of 3 no. new dwellings

Date limit for comments: 10.11.23

Objection; members were concerned that that in the Avenues Design Statement, it recommends that buildings ought not cover more than 25% of a site. The proposed developed appeared to cover 45% or thereabouts of the site. It was therefore considered to excessive development on the site and contrary to Exmouth Neighbourhood Plan policy EB2 which states that development should be mindful of surrounding building styles and ensure a high level of design as exemplified in the Avenues Design Statement. There is now acknowledgement of a climate crisis and of the need to reduce carbon emissions. As such Strategic policy 34 of the draft local plan states that :- 'All developments shall demonstrate actions taken to reduce embodied carbon and developers should retain existing buildings or at least their foundations unless it can be demonstrated that refurbishment is either unviable or impracticable. Replacement of existing habitable buildings with new developments will only be supported in exceptional circumstances and will need to demonstrate that the full lifecycle carbon emissions will be net zero.' Members could not find evidence in the application of compliance with this policy.

**The meeting concluded at 19:45**

Signed..... Date.....  
(Chairman)