

		Committee Date: 4th August 2021
Sidmouth Sidford (Sidmouth)	21/1132/FUL	Target Date: 23.06.2021
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Paley	
Location:	Land To The Rear Of Trow View Two Bridges Road	
Proposal:	Construction of one detached dwelling and private driveway on land to rear of Trow View.	

RECOMMENDATION:

- 1. That the Habitat Regulations Appropriate Assessment outlined within the Committee Report be adopted; and,**
- 2. That the application be APPROVED subject to conditions.**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This application is before the Committee because the recommendation is contrary to the views of Ward Members.

The proposal is to construct a large dwelling in the large back garden of Trow View. The host property was formerly divided into two flats but has now reverted to a single dwelling and has planning permission to be extended.

The garden of Trow View is large enough to accommodate the proposed dwelling without appearing cramped or at odds with the prevailing character of the area. Furthermore, the traditional design of the dwelling would be compatible with surrounding dwellings.

Although the dwelling would impact on the outlook, privacy and some overshadowing of gardens to surrounding properties, including the host dwelling, in no instance would these impacts be harmful to living conditions. The dwelling has been carefully designed to create a neighbourly relationship and, subject to the obscure glazing of a secondary bedroom window, would conserve neighbour amenity.

The Environment Agency's surface water flooding map indicates a potential risk of flooding on the site but this is a high level assessment which requires refinement. In collaboration with a consultant, Devon County Council and the Environment Agency, the applicant has demonstrated that the risk can safely be regarded as 'very low', the lowest possible category. This means that the sequential test does not need to be applied and the dwelling can be developed and occupied safely.

Access to the dwelling would be via the existing access which would be slightly widened. There would be sufficient visibility, parking and turning and the volume of traffic using the access can be safely accommodated. There is no objection from the Highway Authority.

In conclusion, the site is appropriate for development in principle and this proposal would be compatible with the character and appearance of the area and preserve the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties. It is therefore recommended for approval.

CONSULTATIONS

Local Consultations

Sidmouth Sidford - Cllr Stuart Hughes

24/05/2021 - As one of the local ward member I make the following observations:-

1. Visibility There is insufficient visibility to egress safely onto the A375 primary route between Sidford and Honiton with in excess of 7,000 daily vehicle movements.
2. Insufficient parking spaces for this development.
3. Over bearing development on neighbouring properties.

The proposed development would be sited within 18 metres of the neighbouring properties first floor which is less than the minimum requirement.

The overbearing nature of the proposal will also reduce daylight to neighbouring properties.

Further comments:

15/06/2021 - As one of the ward members I should like to make the following observations about this amended plan.

I still have concerns about the close proximity to the neighbouring property and the size of the proposed building.

Sidmouth Sidford - Cllr Marianne Rixson

21/05/2021 -

1 Highways

Previously the applicants submitted an application (21/0910/FUL) to convert the existing dwelling into a 5 bed house.

This new application (21/1132/FUL) is for two additional 4 bed dwellings on the same site.

However, please note that when the owners of Purbeck Cottage wanted to build one property in their back garden, a preapp was refused on the grounds of visibility:

‘the site access onto the main A375 road between Sidmouth and Honiton. Devon County Council, as the highway authority, have responded that the access has insufficient visibility to the north of the site, and therefore they would not support a new access in this location’.

Please note that Purbeck Cottage is adjacent to Trow View.

Furthermore, the refusal states:

'I would suggest that two parking spaces would be required for the new property. This is due to the limited available on street parking and that Sidford, despite having some services such as a public house and shop, is not considered a highly sustainable location such as a Town Centre which Local Plan Policy TC9 states could be considered an exception to the requirement for two parking spaces.'

2 Flood Risk

Please note that the flood risk assessment accompanying this application states this proposed development is in an area at **low risk of surface water flooding**.

2.1 Flood Risk Summary

The evidence below (from the government flood warning website) contradicts the claim made by the applicants in their flood risk assessment for this property.

It is in fact in an area at **high risk of surface water flooding**

<https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/risk>

2.2 Flood Alert

In fact, there has been a flood alert for Trow View due to the heavy rainfall experienced during May.

3 Over Development

There was another application (21/0910/FUL), approved in May, to convert the two flats into one property, to which I had no objection.

However, I believe this new application for an additional two x four bedroom properties on the same site will affect the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Furthermore, I would suggest this new application, together with the approved application (21/0910/FUL) will constitute over development of the Trow View site, as there will then be a total of 13 bedrooms, including both the approved and new application. Plus there will be shared access, which could lead to disputes in the future.

I believe this new application should be REFUSED on the grounds of highways visibility, flood risk and over development.

Further comments:

14/06/2021 -

1 Flood Risk

In my objection to the previous application, I commented that the flood risk assessment accompanying the application stated the proposed development is in an area at 'low risk' of surface water flooding.

1.1 Flood Risk Summary

The evidence below (from the government flood warning website) still applies and contradicts the claim made by the applicants in their flood risk assessment for this property.

It is in fact in an area at high risk of surface water flooding <https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/risk>

1.2 Flood Alert

There was a flood alert for Trow View due to the heavy rainfall experienced during May.

1.3 Floodline

This year alone, I have received several flood alerts as follows:

January	2
February	1
May	3

Surface water flooding should not be dismissed lightly, as we have had the wettest May on record for Devon and Cornwall – ‘Rainfall was 185mm which is 255% of the long term average (LTA) for May. All catchments received ‘exceptionally high’ rainfall. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/992663/Devon_and_Cornwall_Water_Situation_Report_May_2021.pdf

1.4 Devon Flood Risk Management Strategy

‘The effects of climate change, with more intense rainfall events are a growing concern and are considered for all flood risk management activity. This is particularly relevant for the reviewing of development proposals to ensure flood risk is not increased as a result.’

<https://www.devon.gov.uk/floodriskmanagement/document/devon-local-flood-risk-management-strategy-2021-2027>

2 Over Development & Amenity

I believe this revised application for an additional five bedroom property on this site will affect the amenity of neighbouring properties, including reduced daylight, overlooking and proximity.

I would ask you to bear in mind the comments of neighbours, who have serious concerns about this development, including invasion of privacy.

Furthermore, I would suggest this new application, together with the approved application (21/0910/FUL) will constitute over development of the Trow View site, as there will then be a total of 10 bedrooms, including both the existing dwelling and new application. Plus there will be shared access, which could lead to disputes in the future.

I believe this new application should be REFUSED on the grounds of surface water flood risk, over development and impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Parish/Town Council
13/05/2021 - Support

Further comments:

11/06/2021 - SUPPORT: Members would prefer to see the original proposal for two x 3 bedroom houses.

Other Representations

Four objections have been received for the original 2-dwelling scheme and the same objectors commented on the revised 1-dwelling scheme as follows:

2-dwelling scheme:

Excessive traffic generated
The entrance to the driveway floods
Overdevelopment of the site
Dominance/overbearing
Loss of privacy
Loss of light
Overshadowing
Light and noise intrusion and pollution from the driveway

1-dwelling scheme:

Too many cars sharing a drive
Inadequate visibility
Risk of flooding
House is too large for the plot
Dominance
Loss of privacy
Noise

Technical Consultations

Environment Agency

I am keen to finalise the Environment Agency's flood risk related input to the above planning application. I was anticipating a formal consultation to reflect the attached information, but this does not seem to have materialised. My response is made on the understanding that the attached information forms a constituent part of the planning application and that it is appended to the submitted flood risk assessment details.

Further to the analysis presented, I can confirm that the EA would be content for the surface water flood risk to be classified as 'very low risk' for this development site.

I trust that this answers the outstanding questions from Andrew Digby's email of 14/06/21, which was addressed to both DCC and the EA sustainable places team.

DCC Flood Risk Management Team

As this is essentially a challenge to the surface water flood map, the consultant should produce relevant evidence for DCC LLFA to review and if agreed we would need to liaise with the EA for them to add a note to the map as a caveat. This wouldn't change the mapping (the image) unless their model was developed based on the same parameters and system used by the EA. However a note would be placed on the mapping indicating that the LLFA hold information to show that the mapping at this location is inaccurate.

It is worth noting that the surface water flood map should not be used for individual properties.

DCC Highways

Observations:

I have visited the site and have the following comments:

The site is to the rear of an existing dwelling that has an existing vehicular access onto Two Bridges Road - A375, which runs between Sidmouth to the south and Honiton and the A30 Trunk Road to the north.

Trow View is situated next to the 20mph zone to the south and the 30mph limit to the north. Drawing number BD2027:03 Rev. B in the application documents shows that the visibility north, towards Sidbury, is 2.4m x 60m and to the south, towards Sidmouth it is 2.4m x 28m. I agree with these measurements.

Manual for Streets - Table 7.1 (Derived Safe Stopping Distances) advises for a 20mph road the distance should be at least 25 metres and for a 30mph road it should be at least 43 metres. Both visibility's exceed these minimum requirements therefore the CHA is content that the existing visibility splays are safe and suitable.

Recommendation:

THE HEAD OF PLANNING, TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENT, ON BEHALF OF DEVON COUNTY COUNCIL, AS LOCAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY, HAS NO OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING HISTORY

Reference	Description	Decision	Date
19/2153/OUT	Demolition of existing sheds and construction of 2no dwellings to the rear of the property (outline application with all matters reserved).	Withdrawn	10.01.2020

21/0910/FUL	Conversion of existing two apartments back to one house with the conversion of attic, addition of dormer windows, addition of two storey side extension and rear single storey extension.	Approval – standard time limit	21.05.2021
-------------	---	--------------------------------	------------

POLICIES

Sid Valley Neighbourhood Plan (Made)

Policy 1 Sid Valley Development Principles

Policy 6 Infill Development, Extensions and Trees

Policy 7 Local Distinctiveness

Policy 9 Residential Development

Adopted East Devon Local Plan 2013-2031 Policies

Strategy 6 (Development within Built-up Area Boundaries)

Strategy 46 (Landscape Conservation and Enhancement and AONBs)

Strategy 47 (Nature Conservation and Geology)

D1 (Design and Local Distinctiveness)

D2 (Landscape Requirements)

D3 (Trees and Development Sites)

EN22 (Surface Run-Off Implications of New Development)

TC2 (Accessibility of New Development)

TC7 (Adequacy of Road Network and Site Access)

TC9 (Parking Provision in New Development)

Government Planning Documents

NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework 2019)

National Planning Practice Guidance

Site Location and Description

The site is located on the A375 at Sidford and is within the Built-up Area Boundary. There are dwellings at the rear and on each side of the site and the field opposite the site has planning permission for employment development. Although the East Devon AONB and Sidford Conservation Area extend close to the site, it lies outside of both designations and they are not a constraint to development.

The site lies outside the fluvial flood zones, which extend into the property to the north, but Environment Agency data indicates that the site is at risk of surface water flooding.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a detached dwelling in the garden at the rear of Trow View, a property which was formerly subdivided into two flats but is now a single dwelling. The existing and proposed properties would share the same access.

When it was originally submitted the proposal was for two more modest dwellings but the applicant has revised the scheme and now proposes only one larger dwelling.

ANALYSIS

The main issues for consideration are: whether the development is compatible with the character and appearance of the area; whether the proposal would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, including the occupants of Trow View; and the risk of flooding from surface water.

The principle of development being acceptable as the site is located within the Built-Up Area Boundary for Sidmouth.

Character and appearance

The surrounding area comprises a mix of detached and semi-detached dwellings, some terraced housing and flats. Most have a frontage onto a road but the layout of flats and houses has some irregularity in the vicinity of the site.

Trow View and its neighbour, Purbeck Cottage, have unusually large rear gardens and the application site has sufficient space to accommodate a dwelling without appearing cramped when compared with the density of surrounding development.

Although backland development is not prevalent in the area, this site and its neighbour provide the only opportunities for such development and therefore it would not detract from the prevailing character to a harmful degree.

Having regard to the space available, the density of surrounding development and the future development of the field opposite Trow View, infill development on this site would be compatible with the character of the area. It is also noted that the Town Council is not opposed to the principle of development on this site, although they have a preference for the original scheme for two houses.

The design of the dwelling would be traditional and entirely compatible with the mix of styles in the local area.

Living conditions

The proposed substantial 5-bed dwelling would have accommodation on two levels and, by virtue of being back garden development, would introduce a physical presence and changes in privacy which the occupants of neighbouring dwellings are not accustomed to. This does not make the proposal unacceptable in principle but careful consideration of the amenity impacts is required.

The western boundary of the proposed plot would border a shared path which itself borders the edge of the long garden at the rear of 2 Brook Lane. Relative to the rear of no. 2, the proposed dwelling would be about 14m to the north, and the nearest first floor clear-glazed window would be about 18.5m to the north. This would ensure that a substantial area of garden immediately at the rear of no.2 would remain private, even if more distant parts of the garden would be subject to new overlooking. Although there

would be some shading in the early morning in the winter when the sun is low, the main amenity space would be unaffected. This relationship is therefore acceptable.

Moving in an anti-clockwise direction around the plot, the next property is 2B Brook Lane. The rear garden of this property adjoins the southern boundary of the plot. There are trees within the garden of 2B which provide some screening but at least one tree within the proposed plot has been felled. The distance between the rear windows in 2B and the side elevation of the proposed house would be just under 20m. The distance from the garden boundary to the new dwelling would be about 8.5m at the closest point. These distances would be sufficient to prevent an overbearing impact on the neighbour's garden and harm to the outlook from their windows. In the south elevation at first floor level there would be a window serving a bathroom and a secondary window serving a bedroom. This bedroom window would introduce a more direct and much closer level of overlooking than any other existing window that has a view towards the back garden of 2B. At only 8.5m from the back garden and facing directly towards the amenity area, this window would appear intrusive. However, the intrusion could be remedied by obscure glazing the window and this would not compromise the bedroom because it would retain a main outlook to the east. The obscure glazing can be secured by condition. A further south facing window in the northern 'wing' of the proposed dwelling (to Bedroom 3) would be at a greater distance and only have a glimpsed view and therefore would not appear intrusive.

The neighbour to 2B Brook Lane is 2A but this property is separated from the site by the garden of Brookfield and would not be detrimentally affected by the proposal with the obscure glazing mentioned above.

Brookfield is the southern neighbour to Trow View on Two Bridges Road. It has a shorter and narrower plot than Trow View but has a generous garden. Owing to the separation distance the dwelling would not appear overbearing and the nearest first floor bedroom window would not appear intrusive, particularly having regard to the existing level of overlooking from surrounding properties.

Trow View itself would have a substantially reduced garden and this would be further reduced if the extensions that have recently been granted planning permission are constructed (see 21/0910/FUL). These are not shown on the drawings submitted for the new dwelling but even if the extensions are built, Trow View would still retain a good sized garden. The front of the proposed dwelling would face the rear elevation and the rear garden of Trow View. The closest windows would be at least 21m apart which would be sufficient to ensure privacy within the dwellings. Overlooking of the garden of Trow View from the first floor windows in the proposed dwelling would be at quite close range, just over 9m at the closest point. However, this would be mitigated by the approved extension and overall this relationship is considered acceptable. The applicant also has the ability to introduce new landscaping within his garden to protect his privacy. There would be some impact from shading in the evenings but the separation distance would prevent this being excessive or harmful.

The next property to consider is the neighbour on the north side of Trow View, which is Purbeck Cottage. Although the proposed dwelling would be closer to the boundary of this property than to any other neighbour, Purbeck Cottage has a large garden and there would be distance of about 15 metres between the two storey part of the

proposed dwelling and Purbeck Cottage. The combination of these factors means that the proposed dwelling would not appear unduly dominant or overbearing. The only first floor window facing the garden of Purbeck Cottage would be a bathroom window and this would be obscure glazed. Whilst the dwelling would cause shading of the neighbour's garden during parts of the day (particularly in the winter), the effect on the rear facing rooms in Purbeck Cottage would be acceptable owing to the distance and layout. Given these factors the relationship is acceptable.

An objection has been received from the occupant of Sandylands, which lies to the north of the garden of Purbeck Cottage. This property would not be affected by dominance or overlooking given the distances and relationship.

Having reviewed the relationship with all surrounding properties it is concluded that there would be no adverse amenity impacts, provided the bedroom windows in the south elevation and bathroom windows are obscure glazed.

Flood Risk

The site is in flood zone 1 but Environment Agency data shows that it is at risk from surface water flooding. The guidance accompanying the surface water flooding map states:

"The map does not contain sufficient information for it to be used to determine flood risk to individual properties, but it does give you an indication of whether your area may be affected by surface water flooding and to what extent."

Therefore it provides a starting point for an assessment rather than conclusive evidence that there is a risk. On the basis that the risk of flooding from all sources must be considered a flood risk assessment has been undertaken.

After detailed consideration and refinement, making use of all of the available information, including the detailed assessment provided for the employment site at Sidford, the applicant has been able to demonstrate that the risk of flooding to the site is 'very low', which is equivalent to flood zone 1. This has been confirmed by the Environment Agency and it means that there is no requirement to apply the sequential test. Although the risk is considered to be very low, the FRA recommends a precautionary approach to ensure that any surface water that does reach the site is appropriately managed and does not affect the proposed house or any neighbours. Subject to implementing the measures described in the flood risk assessment, the proposal is acceptable from a flooding perspective.

Other matters

Access is proposed via the existing driveway which would be extended along the southern boundary to the new dwelling. Although the driveway would be adjacent to the rear garden of Brookfield, the level of use associated with a single dwelling would not give rise to an adverse amenity impact. The first part of the driveway would be widened to 4.2 metres, which would comply with the minimum requirement of 4.1 metres. Adequate turning and parking space would be provided for both dwellings. Visibility at the access would be 60m to the north and 28m to the south. The boundary

between the 20mph zone in Sidford and the 30mph zone towards Sidbury is at the southern edge of the driveway and therefore the splays are considered to be adequate. Moreover, the Highway Authority has not raised an objection.

There are some trees around the site and although they are unlikely to be affected by the dwelling in the long term they are valued landscape features and would help to integrate the development within its setting. It is therefore appropriate to secure a buffer zone around the trees during construction to ensure that they are not harmed by machinery or storage of materials.

Habitats Regulation Assessment and Appropriate Assessment

The nature of this application and its location close to the Pebblebed Heaths and their European Habitat designation is such that the proposal requires a Habitat Regulations Assessment. This section of the report forms the Appropriate Assessment required as a result of the Habitat Regulations Assessment and Likely Significant Effects from the proposal. In partnership with Natural England, the council and its neighbouring authorities of Exeter City Council and Teignbridge District Council have determined that housing and tourist accommodation developments in their areas will in combination have a detrimental impact on the Pebblebed Heaths through impacts from recreational use. The impacts are highest from developments within 10 kilometres of the designation. It is therefore essential that mitigation is secured to make such developments permissible. This mitigation is secured via a combination of funding secured via the Community Infrastructure Levy and contributions collected from residential developments within 10km of the designations. This development will be CIL liable and the financial contribution has been secured. On this basis, and as the joint authorities are working in partnership to deliver the required mitigation in accordance with the South-East Devon European Site Mitigation Strategy, this proposal will not give rise to likely significant effects.

CONCLUSION

Although attempts to gain permission for two dwellings on this site have not been successful, this proposal for one dwelling, albeit a large dwelling, has demonstrated that it would be compatible with the character and appearance of the area and would not harm the living conditions of any neighbour. Furthermore, the applicant has carried out a robust assessment of the risk of flooding and has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency that the risk would be 'very low'. Given that there is no lower category of risk, there is no need to apply the sequential test and therefore the development can be carried out and occupied safely.

Finally the proposal would provide a safe access and would give rise to no material change in the volume of traffic. Having regard to all of these considerations the proposal is acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION

- 1. That the Habitat Regulations Appropriate Assessment outlined within the Committee Report be adopted; and,**
- 2. That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:**

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission and shall be carried out as approved.
(Reason - To comply with section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed at the end of this decision notice.
(Reason - For the avoidance of doubt.)
3. Prior to commencement of any works on site (including demolition), tree protection details, to include the protection of hedges and shrubs, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. These shall adhere to the principles embodied in BS 5837:2012 and shall indicate exactly how and when the trees will be protected during the site works. Provision shall also be made for supervision of tree protection by a suitably qualified and experienced arboricultural consultant and details shall be included within the tree protection statement. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the agreed details.

In any event, the following restrictions shall be strictly observed:

(a) No burning shall take place in a position where flames could extend to within 5m of any part of any tree to be retained.

(b) No trenches for services or foul/surface water drainage shall be dug within the crown spreads of any retained trees (or within half the height of the trees, whichever is the greater) unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All such installations shall be in accordance with the advice given in Volume 4: National Joint Utilities Group (NJUG) Guidelines For The Planning, Installation And Maintenance Of Utility Apparatus In Proximity To Trees (Issue 2) 2007.

(c) No changes in ground levels or excavations shall take place within the crown spreads of retained trees (or within half the height of the trees, whichever is the greater) unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

(Reason - A pre-commencement condition is required to ensure retention and protection of trees on the site during and after construction. The condition is required in interests of amenity and to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policies D1 - Design and Local Distinctiveness and D3 - Trees and Development Sites of the Adopted East Devon Local Plan 2013-2031.)

4. No development above foundation level shall take place until a schedule of materials and finishes, and, where so required by the Local Planning Authority, samples of such materials and finishes, to be used for the external walls and roof of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

(Reason - To ensure that the materials are sympathetic to the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policy D1 - Design and Local Distinctiveness of the East Devon Local Plan 2013-2031.)

5. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the Drainage Strategy described in section 4 of the Flood Risk Assessment prepared by Tumu Consulting (revision 2, dated 12 June 2021, file reference 19415-R03-03).
(Reason - To ensure that surface water is managed appropriately in accordance with Policy EN22 - Surface Run-Off Implications of New Development of the East Devon Local Plan 2013-2031.)
6. The development hereby permitted shall be constructed in accordance with the final finished floor levels and finished ground levels shown in drawing BD2027:09.
(Reason - In the interests of neighbour amenity and to ensure that surface water is managed appropriately in accordance with Policies D1 - Design and Local Distinctiveness and EN22 Surface Run-Off Implications of New Development of the East Devon Local Plan 2013-2031.)
7. The dwelling hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the means of vehicular access has been constructed in accordance with the approved plans.
(Reason - In the interests of highway safety in accordance with the requirements of Policy TC7 - Adequacy of Road Network and Site Access of the East Devon Local Plan 2013-2031.)
8. Before the dwelling hereby permitted is occupied the first floor windows serving Bedroom 1 and En suite 1 on the south elevation, the first floor window serving En suite 2 on the west elevation and the first floor window serving the bathroom on the north elevation shall have been glazed with obscure glass and the obscure glazing of these windows shall thereafter be retained at all times.
(Reason - To protect the privacy of adjoining occupiers in accordance with Policy D1 - Design and Local Distinctiveness of the East Devon Local Plan 2013-2031.)
9. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the roof of the dwelling hereby permitted, including the roof of the garage, shall not be enlarged, additional storeys shall not be constructed and no windows, dormer windows or other openings shall be constructed in any roof slope without the prior express consent of the Local Planning Authority.
(Reason - To protect the outlook and privacy of adjoining occupiers in accordance with Policy D1 - Design and Local Distinctiveness of the East Devon Local Plan 2013-2031.)

NOTE FOR APPLICANT

Informative:

In accordance with the requirements of Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 in determining this

application, East Devon District Council has worked positively with the applicant to ensure that all relevant planning concerns have been appropriately resolved.

Plans relating to this application:

BD2027: 03 Rev B	Proposed Site Plan	28.05.21
BD2027:04 Rev B	Proposed Combined Plans	28.05.21
BD2027:05 Rev B	Proposed Combined Plans	28.05.21
BD2027:06 Rev B	Proposed Combined Plans	28.05.21
BD2027-08B	Proposed Combined Plans	24.06.21
BD2027-09	Proposed Combined Plans	24.06.21
BD2027:01	Location Plan	20.04.21

List of Background Papers

Application file, consultations and policy documents referred to in the report.