Exmouth Town Council

Town Hall, St Andrews Road
Exmouth, Devon, EX8 1AW

tel: 01395 276167
email: reception@exmouth.gov.uk
www.exmouth.gov.uk

This meeting is open to the Public and Press

8 April 2026

To: Members of the Exmouth Town Council Planning Committee, other members of Exmouth Town Council for information & The Press

Dear Councillors

A Meeting of the Exmouth Town Council Planning Committee, to which you are summoned, will be held in the Chamber at Exmouth Town Hall, St Andrews Road, EX8 1AW on **Monday 13 April 2026 at 6.15pm** to consider the matters detailed on the agenda below.

Yours faithfully

Lisa Bowman
TOWN CLERK

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence

PUBLIC SPEAKING

- Representations will be taken ahead of each discussion by Councillors on each application.
- **Members of the public wishing to speak on an application are required to pre-register in advance of the meeting.**
  To register you must email reception@exmouth.gov.uk or telephone 01395 276167 by 12 noon.
  The number of people that can speak on each application is limited to:
  - Major applications – parish/town council representative, 5 supporters, 5 objectors and the applicant or agent
  - Minor/Other applications – parish/town council representative, 2 supporters, 2 objectors and the applicant or agent.
- Representations may be up to 3 minutes.
- Speakers must begin, within their representation, by stating their name and interest in the application, and whether they are supporting or objecting to the application.
- Speakers must endeavour to avoid repeating themselves or earlier comments by others.
- The Chairman, at their absolute discretion, may ask for members of the public wishing to make similar points to choose one speaker to represent them all. This is to enable the business of the meeting to be carried out in a timely way and allow representations on other applications to be heard.

2. **Minutes of meeting held on 30 March 2026:**
   To confirm the minutes (copies attached)

3. **To receive any declarations of interest from members:**
   Members to declare any interests they may have on the agenda and agree any dispensations to stay.

4. **Urgent Business:**
   To consider any items which, in the opinion of the Chairman should be dealt with as a matter of urgency.

5. **Tree and advertising consent applications**

HALSDON

Planning Application No: 26/0579/TRE

Location: Street Record, Mudbank Lane, EX8 3EG
Applicant: Bradleys Estate and Block Management
Proposal: T3, Silver Birch: prune southern aspect back to inline with wooden fence below, maximum diameter of cut 25mm.

Target Date: 17.04.26

LITTEHAM

Planning Application No: 26/0205/ADV

Location: Unit 6 and 7 Sideshore, Queens Drive, EX8 2GD
Applicant: Mr Oliver Bridge
Proposal: 2 no non-illuminated circular signs. One on the west elevation and one on the east elevation.

Review proposed response and consider scope for a split decision.

Target date: 22.04.26

TOWN

Planning Application No: 26/0306/ADV

Location: 10 The Strand, EX8 1AB
Applicant: Tandoori Nights
Proposal: 1 no. illuminated fascia sign and 4 no illuminated projecting vintage lanterns.

Target Date: 27.04.26

6. Planning applications.

BRIXINGTON

Planning Application No: 22/1597/FUL

Location: Bystock Court Old Bystock Drive, EX8 5EQ
Applicant: Miss J Rhodes
Proposal: Proposed change of use of existing agricultural pig house and office/store to dog kennel and associated management office along with associated new hard surface gravelled area and installation of up to 5 storage containers.

Amended plans for consultation.
Proposal description amended, previously:
"Proposed change of use of existing agricultural pig house and office/store to dog kennel and associated management office along with associate new hard surface gravelled area." and amended site plan

Date limit for comments: 21.04.26

HALSDON

Planning Application No: 26/0572/FUL

Location: 42 Bapton Close, EX8 3LQ
Applicant: Mr Jason Coles
Proposal: First floor dormer extension to the southeast elevation and new window with obscured glass to the first-floor northeast elevation.

Date limit for comments: 20.04.26

Planning Application No: 26/0571/FUL

Location: 25 Springfield Road, EX8 3JY
Applicant: Mrs Janet Cuff
Proposal: Demolition of existing conservatory to create a single storey extension to the northwest elevation and additional window on the northeast elevation.

Date limit for comments: 20.04.26

LITTLEHAM

Planning Application No: 26/0360/FUL

Location: 2 The Red Lodge, 11 Elwyn Road, EX8 2EL
Applicant: Ms E Mckie
Proposal: Proposed single storey extensions on East & West elevation and pitched roofs to existing formers.

Date limit for comment: 15.04.26

Planning Application No: 26/0478/FUL

Location: Cranford Club, 42 Salterton Road, EX8 2EQ
Applicant: Cranford Sports Club, Ms Jill Anderson
Proposal: Construction of a new exercise studio and wet changing facilities, construction of new tennis court with floodlights, refurbishment of tennis courts with additional floodlights.

Date limit for comments: 15.04.26

Planning Application No: 26/0498/FUL

Location: 22 Bicton Street, EX8 2RU
Applicant: Mrs Kate Fagelman
Proposal: To replace the existing wooden and lead clad guttering with black cast aluminium rounded guttering.

Date limit for comments: 15.04.26

Planning Application No: 26/0499/LBC

Location: 22 Bicton Street, EX8 2RU
Applicant: Mrs Kate Fagelman
Proposal: To replace the existing wooden and lead clad guttering with black cast aluminium rounded guttering.

Date limit for comments: 15.04.26

Planning Application No: 26/0542/FUL

Location: 46 Capel Lane, EX8 2PW
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Clack
Proposal: Proposed demolition of existing single storey structure, construction of new single storey rear extensions and extension to existing dormer, including the recladding of the dormer walls and installation of a new flat roof to the dormer.

Date limit for comments: 16.04.26

Planning Application No: 26/0375/FUL

Location: 8 Maer Vale, EX8 2DX
Applicant: Mr Geoff Shea
Proposal: Proposed single-storey rear extension (to replace the existing conservatory)
and a new pitched roof to the existing front garage.

Datre limit for comments: 23.04.26

TOWN

Planning Application No: 25/2398/LBC

Location: The Royal Beacon The Beacon, EX8 2AF
Applicant: Mr Keith Richardson (Richardson Hotels Ltd)
Proposal: Change of use, associated demolitions and proposed conversion of grade II listed hotel, to 19 no. 1,2 and 3 bed apartments with basement storage, associated parking and infrastructure, demolition of rear modern block to provide 2 newbuild semi-detached mews houses including integrated garages

Amended plans for consultation.

Architectural Updates

Interiors

• The existing ballroom is proposed to be converted to a 2 bed - 4 person apartment, accessed via the original formal ballroom entrance

• This updates the description to 19 apartments proposed, previously 20. This change is recorded within the package of resubmitted architectural information and noted for information, that this will affect the following reports already provided without their being resubmitted:

- 251031_P1482_BAR_EW_Biodiversity Assessment
- A3600 – Royal beacon Hotel Heritage Statement 14th Nov 2025
- ITB210514-001 Royal beacon Hotel Exmouth – Transport Statement
- Planning Statement_Royal Beacon Hotel 141125
- Royal beacon – Savills report Final October 2025 with Appendices 061125
- Royal Beacon Hotel – Savills Report (Viability)

• Lower Ground Floor plan: Amendments to new escape stair, lift and storage

• Ground Floor plan: Amendments to new escape stair, lift. New vehicle entry roller shutter. Revised entrance to Mews House 2. Updated schedules

• First Floor plan: Amendments to new escape stair, lift. Ballroom Proposals and Mezzanine configuration revised. Revised apartment layouts for accommodation facing, The Beacon

Date limit for comments: 15.01.26

Planning Application No: 25/2397/MFUL

Location: The Royal Beacon The Beacon, EX8 2AF
Applicant: Mr Keith Richardson (Richardson Hotels Ltd)
Proposal: Change of use, associated demolitions and proposed conversion of grade II listed hotel, to 19 no. 1,2 and 3 bed apartments with basement storage,

associated parking and infrastructure, demolition of rear modern block to provide 2 newbuild semi-detached mews houses including integrated garages

Amended plans for consultation.

Architectural Updates

Interiors

• The existing ballroom is proposed to be converted to a 2 bed - 4 person apartment, accessed via the original formal ballroom entrance

• This updates the description to 19 apartments proposed, previously 20. This change is recorded within the package of resubmitted architectural information and noted for information, that this will affect the following reports already provided without their being resubmitted:

- 251031_P1482_BAR_EW_Biodiversity Assessment
- A3600 – Royal beacon Hotel Heritage Statement 14th Nov 2025
- ITB210514-001 Royal beacon Hotel Exmouth – Transport Statement
- Planning Statement_Royal Beacon Hotel 141125
- Royal beacon – Savills report Final October 2025 with Appendices 061125
- Royal Beacon Hotel – Savills Report (Viability)

• Lower Ground Floor plan: Amendments to new escape stair, lift and storage

• Ground Floor plan: Amendments to new escape stair, lift. New vehicle entry roller shutter. Revised entrance to Mews House 2. Updated schedules

• First Floor plan: Amendments to new escape stair, lift. Ballroom Proposals and Mezzanine configuration revised. Revised apartment layouts for accommodation facing, The Beacon

Date limit for comments: 15.01.26

WITHYCOMBE RALEIGH

Planning Application No: 24/1250/FUL

Location: Land Adjacent 24 Dukes Crescent
Applicant: Highland Property Development (Exmouth) Ltd
Proposal: Proposed 4 dwellings with associated off-road parking spaces and rear amenity gardens

Amended plans for consultation.
Mitigation strategy for the Ancient Woodland and alterations to the Site layout.

Date limit for comments: 22.04.26

7. Other items

i. Notification of New premises licence application received – Piers Motley Auctions Ltd

Ref No: 061645
Premises: Bicton Street Auction Rooms, Bicton Street, EX8 2RT
Ward: Town
Name of Applicant: Piers Motley Auctions Ltd

Consider the above premises licence, details of the application can be viewed on EDCC's website.

Date limit for comments: 27.04.26

Representation must relate to one or more of the four licensing objectives:

- the prevention of crime and disorder
- public safety
- the prevention of public nuisance
- the protection of children from harm

Notification of a street trading application – Art Festi

---

8. Items for information

i. Appeal decision

Appeal ref: 6001291
Appeal by: Steve Richards
Application Ref: 25/1062/FUL
Location: 15 Halsdon Avenue, EX8 3DL
Proposal: Erect a single storey 1- bed detached dwelling with associated amenity space.

The above appeal is dismissed; the decision notice is attached for information.

ii. Street trading application submitted by Exmouth Town Council – Art Festival Art Car Boot Market

The applicant is: Exmouth Town Council
Location: The Strand, Exmouth, EX8 1AF
Dates: Saturday 2nd May 2026
Times: 10:00 - 16:00
The application is for: Maximum of 50 x traders for the Exmouth Art Festival Art Car Boot Market on the Strand.
There will be a number of table and chairs next to the stalls but these will not block thoroughfares.
The applicant has noted the following on their application: There will be no single use plastics or diesel generated.
A map of the trading site is attached for information.

9. East Devon District Council – Planning Decisions

Application	*Exmouth Town Council View*	*EDDC Decision*
26/0286/HRN Boundary Hedgerow (East Of Quentance Farm)	No objection	Approval
26/0293/HRN Boundary Hedgerow (Castle Lane)	No objection	Approval
26/0285/HRN Boundary Hedgerow (South of Knowle Hill Recycling Centre)	No objection	Approval
26/0290/HRN Boundary Hedgerow (South of Quentance Farm)	No objection	Approval
26/0289/HRN Boundary Hedgerow (Budleigh Cycle Path, South Of Quentance Farm)	No objection	Approval
26/0292/HRN Boundary Hedgerow (Budleigh Cycle Path, South Of Quentance Farm)	No objection	Approval
26/0288/HRN Boundary Hedgerow (South East Of Quentance Farm)	No objection	Approval
26/0291/HRN Boundary Hedgerow (South West Of Quentance Farm)	No objection	Approval
25/0970/LBC Point in View Church, Summer Lane	No objection	Approval
26/0040/FUL 52 Bapton Close	No objection	Approval
25/2235/FUL Queens Drive Seawall	No objection	Approval
25/2219/FUL & 25/2220/LBC The Golden Dragon 1A The Beacon	No objection	Approval

Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2026

by K Reeves BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 April 2026

Appeal Ref: 6001291
15 Halsdon Avenue, Exmouth, Devon EX8 3DL

- The appeal is made under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
- The appeal is made by Mr Steve Richards of S.D Richards Holdings Ltd against East Devon District Council.
- The application Ref is 25/1062/FUL.
- The development proposed is to erect a single storey 1-bed detached dwelling with associated amenity space.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal was made against a failure to give notice of a decision on the planning application within the prescribed period. However, the Council has advised that, had it been in a position to determine the application, the application would have been refused.

3. A previous appeal decision[1] relating to this site dismissed a proposal for a two-storey dwelling. Although the present scheme differs in scale and form, the earlier decision remains a material consideration, and I have had regard to it where relevant to the current appeal.

4. The appellant states that the submitted arboricultural assessment did not appear on the Council's online portal. However, the document forms part of the appeal submissions before me, and both main parties have had the opportunity to comment on its contents. Taking it into account therefore does not prejudice any party, and I have had regard to it where relevant to the main issues.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are:

   - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area;

   - whether the proposal would provide an acceptable standard of living conditions for future occupiers, having particular regard to the presence, influence and protection status of protected trees; and

[1] Appeal reference APP/U1105/W/24/3345960

- whether the proposal makes satisfactory provision for the management and disposal of surface water.

Reasons

Character and appearance

6. The submitted block plan shows a single-storey dwelling positioned centrally within a narrow and enclosed plot. The surrounding area is characterised by generous rear gardens, consistent building lines and a spacious, open grain, with dwellings arranged in a manner that affords clear visual separation and a strong sense of rhythm. This pattern of development contributes significantly to the area's suburban character, where buildings sit comfortably within their plots and benefit from meaningful spacing that reinforces the established form and openness of the locality. The prevailing character is therefore one of well-proportioned plots, mature landscaping and a coherent structure of development that reads clearly from both public and private vantage points.

7. The appeal site differs markedly from this prevailing form. It is a backland parcel that is behind existing garages and accessed via a narrow corridor. It lacks the frontage, visibility and spatial generosity that typify the surrounding residential pattern. Its constrained shape and limited width restrict opportunities for meaningful landscaping or visual integration with the wider area. The protected Lime trees on the southwestern boundary and the overhanging Maple to the north exert a strong physical and visual influence over the site, enclosing it and reducing the sense of openness that characterises neighbouring plots. Their scale and proximity limit the flexibility of any layout and create a markedly different spatial experience compared with the more open and expansive gardens nearby.

8. Although the proposed dwelling is modest in scale, the combination of the site's restricted dimensions, its enclosed nature and the dominance of mature trees would result in a form of development that appears compressed within its boundaries. The block plan does not demonstrate that the dwelling could sit comfortably within the plot or relate positively to the established pattern of development. Instead, the proposal would introduce built form into a space that currently functions as part of the wider garden setting, eroding the spaciousness that contributes to the area's character. The lack of meaningful separation from boundaries and the inability to provide landscaping of a scale comparable to neighbouring plots would further accentuate the sense of a cramped and incongruous addition.

9. The earlier Inspector concluded that development on this site would appear cramped and out of keeping with the surrounding pattern of development. The current submission, despite its reduced scale, does not provide the evidence necessary to reach a different conclusion. The fundamental constraints of the site, its narrowness, backland position and the enclosing effect of protected trees, remain unchanged. As a result, the proposal would continue to read as an incongruent and poorly integrated form of development that fails to respect the established suburban grain.

10. For these reasons, the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it conflicts with Strategy 6 and Policy D1 of the East Devon Local Plan 2013 – 2031 (LP) and Policies EN1 and EB2 of the Exmouth Neighbourhood Plan 2018 – 2031 (NP),

which collectively seek, in part, high-quality design that respects, reinforces and enhances local character and appearance.

Living conditions

11. The block plan shows the dwelling positioned close to the southwestern boundary, where two large Lime trees stand. These trees, which are protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO), have broad canopies that would cast shade across the proposed garden and the internal space for substantial parts of the day. The Maple to the north, also protected, has an extensive overhang that would further limit daylight reaching both internal and external areas. The combined influence of these trees would significantly reduce natural light to the property.

12. The garden would be modest in size and heavily affected by the presence of the protected trees. The arboricultural evidence identifies that the Lime trees have compromised structural form and require cyclical pollarding, while the Maple is showing signs of decline, including crown thinning. Despite these issues, all three TPO trees remain visually dominant and would overshadow the outdoor space for much of the day. Similar concerns were raised in the previous appeal, and the current proposal does not demonstrate that the quality of outdoor amenity would be materially improved.

13. The proximity of the dwelling to the protected trees would also create a constrained and enclosed environment for future occupiers. Limited separation distances to boundaries mean that habitable rooms may face fencing, dense vegetation or tree trunks at close range. The proposed dwelling and hard landscaping could intrude into the root protection areas of the protected trees, further illustrating the tight spatial relationship between the development and these trees.

14. These constraints would not only diminish the usability and attractiveness of the outdoor space but would also create long-term pressure to prune or remove the TPO trees. The overshadowing, enclosure and dominance of the trees would make it likely that future occupiers would seek more intrusive management or removal, undermining their contribution to the character of the area. This would not represent a sustainable long-term relationship between development and trees, as required by Policy D3 of the LP.

15. For these reasons, the proposal would not provide an acceptable standard of living conditions for future occupants. The constrained nature of the plot, combined with the dominance of the protected trees and the resulting overshadowing and enclosure, means the proposal conflicts with Strategy 6 and Policy D1 of the LP and Policies EN1 and EB2 of the NP, which collectively require, in part, for development to ensure suitable living conditions. The proposal also conflicts with Policy D3 of the LP, insofar as it seeks to achieve a sustainable long-term relationship between development and existing protected trees.

Disposal of surface water

16. Policy EN22 of the LP requires development to demonstrate compliance with the Run-off Destination Hierarchy and to show that sustainable drainage options have been considered. The hierarchy requires infiltration to be explored and discounted before surface water is directed to a watercourse or sewer.

17. The appellant states that surface water would be connected to the existing storm drain. No infiltration testing, percolation results or drainage strategy are before me. There is no evidence that infiltration has been investigated or that alternative sustainable drainage options have been considered. The clay-based soils identified in the arboricultural evidence may present challenges for infiltration, but this has not been assessed. Nor has the feasibility of soakaways been examined, despite the extensive root protection areas that would constrain their location.

18. The Council's concern that the proposal fails to demonstrate compliance with the Run-off Destination Hierarchy is therefore well-founded. In the absence of this information, I cannot be satisfied that the development would deliver acceptable drainage. The proposal therefore conflicts with the requirements of Policy EN22 of the LP.

Other Matters

19. Representations in support state that the site is underused and that the proposal would make efficient use of land within the built-up area. They highlight national support for small-scale windfall development and the contribution a modest dwelling could make to the supply of smaller homes, particularly for those seeking to downsize. Supporters describe the proposed unit as modest and accessible, note the intention to construct an energy-efficient home, and consider that its single-storey form would limit neighbour impact.

20. I have taken all of these representations and considerations into account. They are material to the extent that they weigh in favour of the proposal, and I return to their relevance and overall weight in the planning balance below.

21. I note the appellant's reference to positive pre-application advice provided in 2022. However, such advice is not binding on the Council and cannot outweigh the need to assess the current proposal against the development plan and the site-specific constraints identified in this appeal.

22. The appellant also raises concerns regarding the Council's conduct, including delays, lack of communication and the absence of timely officer engagement. While such matters can understandably cause frustration, they do not bear on the planning merits of the proposal. Administrative shortcomings, if any, cannot justify granting permission for a development that would otherwise conflict with the development plan.

23. The appeal site is in the Zone of Influence of the Exe Estuary and East Devon Pebblebed Heaths Special Protection Area. However, as this appeal is being dismissed on other grounds there is no need to address this matter.

Planning Balance

24. The proposal would deliver a single small dwelling within the built-up area boundary. This carries some weight, particularly in the context of national policy support for windfall development and the provision of smaller homes. The appellant's intention to construct an energy-efficient dwelling is also a positive factor, as is the potential for the site to be brought into productive use. There would also be economic benefits, both in the short term during the construction period and in the longer term through expenditure by future occupiers. However, given the small scale of the development, these benefits carry limited weight.

25. The appellant also refers to the proposal as a self-build opportunity. National policy encourages local authorities to support self-build and custom-build housing, and I am mindful of the Council's statutory duties under the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015. However, the Council's most recent monitoring report indicates that demand for serviced self-build plots in East Devon is currently being met, with no identified shortfall in permissions. In this context, while the delivery of an additional self-build unit is a positive factor, it attracts only limited weight and does not alter the assessment of the site-specific constraints identified in the main issues.

26. I have also taken into account the other points raised by interested parties. The intention to deliver an energy-efficient dwelling carries modest weight, reflecting national policy support, though the benefit is limited by the scale of a single unit. The view that the site is underused attracts limited weight, as under-utilisation does not in itself indicate suitability for development. Assertions regarding limited neighbour impact attract very limited weight, as they do not address the concerns relating to the living conditions of future occupiers.

27. These benefits must be weighed against the harms identified. The proposal would fail to integrate with the established pattern of development and would appear cramped within its constrained plot. It would provide poor living conditions for future occupiers due to overshadowing, enclosure and limited usable outdoor space. It would place the protected trees under long-term pressure for intrusive management or removal, undermining their contribution to the character of the area. It would also fail to demonstrate acceptable drainage arrangements in accordance with the Run-off Destination Hierarchy.

28. These harms and the resulting conflict with the development plan attract significant weight. The benefits of the proposal, while acknowledged, are modest in scale and do not outweigh the identified conflicts with the development plan when read as a whole. The earlier Inspector reached similar conclusions in relation to the previous scheme, and the current proposal does not overcome those concerns.

Conclusion

29. For the reasons given above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed and planning permission refused.

K Reeves

INSPECTOR



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

