

**Ward** Sidmouth Town

**Reference** 21/2875/VAR

**Applicant** Mr Spencer Brinton (East Devon Estates Ltd)

**Location** 55 Peaslands Road Sidmouth EX10 9BE

**Proposal** Variation of Condition 2 (approved plans) and Condition 4 (landscaping) of planning application 21/1148/FUL (Construction of a two-storey dwelling).



**RECOMMENDATION:**

- 1. Approve the Appropriate Assessment forming part of this report;**
- 2. Approval with conditions**

Crown Copyright and database rights 2022 Ordnance Survey 100023746



		<b>Committee Date:14<sup>th</sup> June 2022</b>
<b>Sidmouth Town (Sidmouth)</b>	<b>21/2875/VAR</b>	<b>Target Date: 27.12.2021</b>
<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Mr Spencer Brinton (East Devon Estates Ltd)</b>	
<b>Location:</b>	<b>55 Peaslands Road Sidmouth</b>	
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b>Variation of Condition 2 (approved plans) and Condition 4 (landscaping) of planning application 21/1148/FUL (Construction of a two-storey dwelling).</b>	

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. **Approve the Appropriate Assessment forming part of this report;**
2. **Approval with conditions**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**This application is before Planning Committee as the officer recommendation differs from that of a Local Ward Member. The application went before Committee on 16<sup>th</sup> February 2022 and was deferred to assess whether the construction of the dwelling at 55 Peaslands Road had been carried out in accordance with the approved plans and to consult with the Local Authority's Landscape Architect over the suitability of the Landscaping Scheme. Members requested that it was explored whether a replacement hedge around the boundary of the site could be secured as part of the works in place of the proposed fence.**

**Amended plans have been submitted consisting of a revised Landscaping Scheme, sections of the proposed boundary treatment and a Planting Specification. Additionally, a set of elevations have been submitted seeking consent for various aspects of the build to date that do not accord with the plans approved under 21/1148/FUL. The application is therefore seeking retrospective consent.**

**The main issue for consideration is the impact of the revised Landscaping Scheme and the alterations to the design of the build on the character and appearance of the area.**

**Since the application last went before Planning Committee in February revisions to the landscaping scheme include removal of tree planting along the southern boundary and inclusion of replacement hedging to enclose the site on its boundaries. The submitted sections communicate the planting of Escallonia 'Crimson Spire' hedging supported by hazel hurdles to enable the planting to establish.**

After the current application was originally submitted an enforcement investigation identified various discrepancies with the build to the approved plans listed on the decision notice for 21/1148/FUL and these have also been brought to officers attention by neighbouring residents. The most noticeable physical change relates to the increase in height from the eaves to the ridge which has subsequently altered the proportions of the roof pitch, including the turret on the north-western corner. Other changes have also been made to the design of the dormer on the east elevation and the type of render and bricks used.

With regards to the landscaping scheme, having reviewed Policy 7 (Local Distinctiveness) of the Sid Valley Neighbourhood Plan and the supplementary Place Analysis, it is considered that refusing the application on grounds that the revised landscaping scheme is 'visually intrusive' would be unreasonable. The proposed replacement Escallonia hedging would help to soften the appearance of the site.

The proportions of the build, most noticeably the roof, no longer mimics that of 55 Peaslands Road, which was the design approach communicated on the approved drawings submitted with 21/1148/FUL. A number of third parties have expressed concerns over the changes to the design and the subsequent impact to the character and appearance of the Peaslands Road. It is acknowledged that what has been built on site does not as closely reflect the appearance of 55 Peaslands as communicated within application 21/1148/FUL, however, this is not a reason to withhold planning permission unless material harm to the character and appearance of the area can be identified from the revised design.

The build is still considered to be of a scale and form that is acceptable and, taking into consideration the findings of the Inspector in assessment of the original consent for the site allowed on appeal, despite being forward of the arched building line of Peaslands Road, the development would not appear cramped or unduly harmful to the street scene.

Concerns from the Local Ward Member regarding the loss of habitat due to the removal of the hedging are also duly acknowledged. However it is not thought that the Local Authority could insist on the submission of an ecological appraisal or request mitigation measures be implemented. The extent of hedging and shrubbery removed along the south and northern boundaries is considered modest and the ecological value fairly low. Despite this, it is reasonable to assume that the boundary that bordered Highfield in particular could have been a potential nesting site for birds. In this case the developer would have been subject to the legal requirements of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and therefore prior to removal of any hedging an assessment into the presence of any nesting birds should have been made.

Overall it is the opinion of officer's that the proposed alternative boundary treatment and design alterations would be sympathetic to the prevailing character of the area. As such the application is recommended for approval subject to adoption of the appropriate assessment and compliance with conditions listed below.

## **CONSULTATIONS**

### **Local Consultations**

#### **Parish/Town Council**

**19.11.21**

UNABLE TO SUPPORT

The proposed height and design of the wall and fence would not be in keeping with the character of the area creating a visually intrusive and unnatural barrier, tantamount to over development which would be contrary to Policy 7 (Local Distinctiveness) of the Sid Valley Neighbourhood Plan. Members also wished to express their regret at the removal of the original hedge.

Further comments:

**19.04.22**

SUPPORT

#### **Sidmouth Town Ward - Cllr Denise Bickley**

I am absolutely against any removal of hedging. We need to be planting more hedges, knowing what we know now about climate and ecological breakdown. Past removals of hedges, and walls being built to replace them, cannot be the basis of future applications being approved - the precedent must largely be ignored and current thinking regarding nature recovery networks, biodiversity gains, habitat improvement be the most important incentive to effective planning applications being approved. We must start taking a firm stance on all applications which will contribute to habitat loss.

#### **Sidmouth Town Ward - Cllr Cathy Gardner**

I am concerned about habitat loss more than the visual effect. We are losing yet more dense cover for small birds, when we need to increase this. However if this is not sufficiently strong planning grounds for refusal then I will have to accept the recommended approval.

#### **Landscape Architect**

I have looked over the plan and sections sent by Spencer in his email below. I confirm these are generally in accordance with my previous advice. Just a couple of points I would note on the landscape plan:

- a) The plan includes an image of panel fencing with bow top trellis. I think this is probably a relic from the previous version but is no longer relevant and should be omitted to avoid confusion.
- b) Hazel hurdle fencing should be supported on driven timber posts and noted as temporary to be removed once hedging has established.

Additionally a specification should be provided covering soil specification, preparation, planting and maintenance details together with a plant schedule showing numbers, planting density and supply form and size of proposed plants.

A suggested specification is provided below:

Soft landscape areas should be made up with a minimum of 300mm depth topsoil conforming to BS3882, 2015 Multi-purpose grade, on clean, de-compacted subsoil. Prior to planting any weeds should be removed by hand digging or spot application systemic herbicide, allowing time for leaf symptoms to develop prior to cultivation. Cultivate and rake soil to even grade. Plants to be set in excavated holes at depth to match nursery growing depth. Apply mycorrhizal powder to base of pits prior to planting in accordance with manufacturer's recommendations.

Trees should be set in excavated holes sufficient to accommodate the depth and spread of the roots. Base of pit to be forked over to relieve compaction. Back fill to comprise excavated soil placed in layers to match surrounding soil horizons. Trees to be staked with two well driven 50mm dia. stakes set to either side of root-ball with horizontal cross rail securely fixed between at approx. 450-600mm above ground level. Tree to be secured to cross rail with proprietary adjustable tie and spacer.

Plants to be well watered at time of planting and planting beds spread with 75mm depth bark mulch. Planting beds to be kept weed free and adequately watered during establishment period. Check and adjust plant ties regularly and prune out damaged, diseased, dead growth.

Escallonia hedging should be supplied as 450-600mm high , bushy container grown plants. Proposed cherry (Prunus Pandora) should be containerised, sized 8-10cm girth.

The works are to be undertaken in accordance with the approved drawings and details and shall be completed in the first available planting season following completion of building works. Any plants which die or fail to make adequate growth within the first 5 years following planting shall be replaced with species of similar size to the satisfaction of the LPA.

### **Other Representations**

8 third party comments have been received. Summarised below are the main material planning issues raised.

4 objections have been received raising concerns over the following:

- Visual Impact of the dwelling.
- Increase in surface water run-off
- Increase in traffic
- Increase in noise disturbance.
- Incongruous appearance of the fencing.
- Loss of habitat for birds.

4 Representations have been made that have raised the following issues:

- The applicant shall need to apply to the County Highway Authority to drop the curb.

### **Planning History**

18/2280/FUL - Construction of two storey dwelling within garden and provision of additional parking space. Refused but subsequently allowed at appeal.

19/2142/FUL - Construction of two storey dwelling within garden and provision of 2no. parking spaces (amendment to 18/2280/FUL to amend the ground floor plan to facilitate the formation of a parking space in front of the new dwelling). Approved

20/1616/FUL - Construction of dwelling within garden (amendment to 19/2142/FUL to include a studio/bedroom within the loft space). Approved.

21/1148/FUL - Construction of a two storey dwelling. Approved.

## **POLICIES**

### Adopted East Devon Local Plan 2013-2031 Policies

Strategy 5B (Sustainable Transport)

Strategy 6 (Development within Built-up Area Boundaries)

Strategy 26 (Development at Sidmouth)

Strategy 48 (Local Distinctiveness in the Built Environment)

D1 (Design and Local Distinctiveness)

D2 (Landscape Requirements)

EN19 (Adequacy of Foul Sewers and Adequacy of Sewage Treatment System)

EN22 (Surface Run-Off Implications of New Development)

TC2 (Accessibility of New Development)

TC9 (Parking Provision in New Development)

### Sid Valley Neighbourhood Plan (Made)

Policy 7 (Local Distinctiveness)

Policy 9 (Residential Development)

## **Site Location**

San Remo, also known as 55 Peaslands Road, is a large detached house on a corner plot at the junction of Peaslands Road and Brewery Lane. The existing dwelling of San Remo is detached whereas the remaining properties along this southern side of Peaslands Road form a terrace. The site is located within the Built-up Area Boundary of Sidmouth.

## **Proposed Development**

This application seeks permission to vary condition 2 (approved plans) and condition 4 (landscaping) of application 21/1148/FUL to make various alterations to the previously approved landscaping scheme and external appearance of the dwelling.

Revisions to the landscaping scheme include removal of tree planting along the southern boundary and inclusion of replacement hedging to enclose the site. The submitted sections communicate the planting of Escallonia 'Crimson Spire' hedging supported by hazel hurdles to enable the planting to establish.

After the current application was submitted an enforcement investigation also identified various discrepancies with the build to the approved plans listed on the decision notice for 21/1148/FUL. The most noticeable physical change relates to the increase in height from the eaves to the ridge which has subsequently altered the

proportions of the roof pitch, including the turret on the north-western corner. Other changes have also been made to the design of the dormer on the east elevation and the type of render and bricks used.

With regard to the removal of the hedging, the original application stated the following as justification:

*The boundary with Highfield comprises of a dilapidated dwarf wall topped with a mixture of rotten screen fencing and overgrowth of Laurel, Bamboo and other unsuitable species of plants. Over the years this has been a source of annoyance to the residents of Highfield who reside in the properties on the opposite side of the road. Although these properties all have their own parking spaces they choose to park their vehicles adjacent to the boundary with San Remo, now the building plot. These residents have often complained about the state of this boundary.*

*What we propose is to remove the overgrown hedge, fencing and wall and replace it with a new dwarf brick wall topped with vertically boarded screen fence.*

*Appropriate trees will be planted behind the fence to soften the visual impact.*

*Similarly along the boundary with Peaslands Road we wish to remove the existing hedge and again replace this with a dwarf wall topped with vertically boarded screen fencing with appropriate planting behind. After an inspection by our landscaping contractor it is considered that the existing hedge is of poor quality having become neglected and somewhat out of control. This hedge if retained will present a serious problem to any purchasers of the new dwelling and would we feel become a significant sale deterrent.*

Further plans were received prior to the publication of the report showing an amended the internal layout and r-measured building showing it a few mm larger than the plans that were consulted on. Given that the building has been construct on site and can be assessed, given the very small change in millimetres, and given that the interval layout cannot be controlled through the planning system, there was no need to re-consult on these plans.

### **Analysis**

As the principle of development and form of the dwelling have been granted on appeal, these matters cannot be revised under this applications the main issues for consideration are the impact of the alterations made to the external appearance of the build and the changes made to the landscaping scheme on the character and appearance of the area. Owing to the removal of the existing hedge, the ecological impact of the works shall also be considered.

### **Impact to Character and Appearance of the Area**

The application details that retention of the existing hedging that borders Peaslands Road and Highfield, as indicated on the previous landscaping scheme approved 21/1148/FUL, is no longer possible. And in fact has already been removed.

Concerns have been raised by third parties and ward members regarding removal of the existing hedge and the subsequent visual and ecological harm this has caused.

In response the applicant has provided a statement explaining that retaining the existing hedgerow annotated on plan SR.20.01, submitted with application 21/1148/FUL along the southern boundary that borders Highfield was not possible. Additionally it was also stated that reducing the bramble, bamboo and laurel hedging to the width shown on the plan would not be possible without replacing it.

The developer has therefore applied to vary the landscaping scheme. The revised scheme includes the construction of a boundary wall with Escallonia hedging. The height of the brick wall that runs adjacent to Highfield increases in height from west to east owing to changes in levels. The existing palm tree shall be retained with a cherry planted just north.

Removal of the hedging has altered the character of the application site which has historically always been enclosed with a privet hedge running parallel to Peaslands Road and a mix of shrubs and hedging along Highfield. The site is also located on a prominent corner adjacent to a junction between Peaslands Road and Highfield and the removal and replacement of the boundary would be particularly noticeable upon approaching the site from the west. The wider area is also characterised by intermittent spots of greenery, hedging and trees that enclose garden areas. Some local trees of particular significance are those that front Halwell, 52 and 54 Peaslands Road, a number of which are protected under a preservation order. Loss of the hedging at the site on prominent corner is unfortunate and as such there is sympathy with comments made from Local Ward Members and third parties.

The Town Council and Ward Members, in addition to a number of third parties, have expressed concerns over the visual impact of the replacement boundary. As already alluded to above, it is acknowledged that the proposed removal of the existing hedging would lead to a change in character at the site that would be visible from adjacent highway and private property. However in this case the change in boundary treatment, whilst different, is not considered to amount to significant visual harm. It is also important to highlight that the use of brick and timber has been used throughout Peaslands Road, particularly along the frontages of a number of the properties on the northern side of the road. The applicant has also submitted photos of a number of photos that has sought to identify properties that are enclosed using similar boundary treatments.

Policy 7 of the Sid-Valley Neighbourhood Plan states that development proposals will be expected to have regard to the character of the immediate area as set out in the Place Analysis. Peaslands Road and Highfield are addressed at section 6.3 of the Place Analysis and falls within the Elysian Fields catchment area. The frontage along Peaslands Road is identified as one of a number of roads that have a defined street frontage characterised by varied and distinctive interfaces between buildings and streets. Despite objections, the replacement hedging, tree planting and low brick wall are both features that are considered sympathetic to the character of Peaslands Road and Highfield. The amended proposed landscaping scheme has also received verbal support from the Local Authority's Landscape Architect and Town Council.

The application also proposes a number of retrospective changes to the design of the build. These can be summarised as follows;

- Overall height of the build has been increased by approximately 800mm and this is reflected within the distance between eaves and ridge level.
- This increase in overall height has resulted in the pitch of the roof being altered and proportions of the turret.
- Changes to the width and depth of the dormer window on the east elevation.
- Smooth render and smooth red brick used for the exterior.

Changes to the materials aside, the discrepancies with the plans approved under 21/1148/FUL appear to have been made in an attempt to provide further headspace for the accommodation within the roof space. Subsequently the increase in the expanse of roof has increased the size of the eastern hip, reduced the length of the central ridge and altered the gradient and overall height of the turret's roof on the north eastern corner. To accommodate the increase in the overall height of the build the dwelling has been dug into the site and therefore the ground floor level sits below that of the ground level of Peaslands Road and San Remo.

The proportions of the build, most noticeably the roof, does not mimic that of 55 Peaslands Road, which was the design approach communicated on the approved drawings submitted with 21/1148/FUL. A number of third parties have expressed concerns over the changes to the design and the subsequent impact to the character and appearance of the Peaslands Road. It is acknowledged that what has been built on site does not as closely reflect the appearance of 55 Peaslands as communicated within application 21/1148/FUL, however, this is not a reason to withhold planning permission unless material harm to the character and appearance of the area can be identified.

Owing to the topography and the positioning at the road junction with Brewery Lane, the build is particularly visible when approaching along Peaslands Road from the higher ground to the west. From this direction, despite the increase in the expanse of roof from eaves to ridge and height of the turret, the subsequent impact on the street scene of Peaslands Road is not evident as the build largely screens 55 Peaslands Road. The relationship with the other properties on the southern side of the road and the stepping forward of the building line here is not be overtly evident as its viewed within the context of the angular built form that leads down the road, and thereby the development appears similar to these properties.

However the variations to the appearance of the building are more noticeable immediately forward of the application site and to the east along Peaslands Road. The Planning Inspectorate, in assessing APP/U1105/W/19/3222734, highlights the importance of these views of the application building and that the subservience of the scheme, compared to No55., was a factor, amongst others, in leading to the development being considered acceptable. At paragraphs 12, 13 & 15 the inspector states;

*“The proposed dwelling would follow the general design characteristics of 55 Peasland Road but at a lesser overall scale and mass. It would be sited forward of the building line of other properties along the road, including that of no. 55.*

*This differentiation in the siting of the proposed development would be most noticeable from Peasland Road leading upwards, whereby the proposed side elevation would be visible as a step forward from the buildings approaching up to the site. However, this step forward would not appear out of context due the subservient scale of the proposal, the different form of the nearby buildings leading up to the site and the existing physical development behind, which already presents built form from this direction.*

*As a consequence, whilst this siting of the development would represent a variation from the building line along the street, to my mind it would not appear intrusive or incongruous as a result. This would be due to the vantage points from which the proposal would be visible, the angled build line along the road, the variations in building form, the backdrop to the site and the design of the development itself.”*

In this case it is considered appropriate to refer back to the Inspector’s approach in assessing the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area. Despite the increase in the extent of roof between eaves level and ridge, the dwelling still appears subservient to 55 Peaslands and this is largely due to build’s overall scale which is less to that of no.55. The overall extent and gradient of the eastern hip results in the form of the roof varying from that of no.55. However the immediate area, including properties along Highfield, are characterised by properties with a mix of hipped and gable end roofs. It is acknowledged that the properties along the southern side of Peaslands Road, which are largely terraced, have roofs with lower pitches and together provide a degree of rhythm. Notwithstanding this, the form of the roof is not considered unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the area and, despite exhibiting a slightly different form to that of n0.55, is still subservient and sympathetic to the street scene of Peaslands Road.

The dormer located on the eastern elevation has been made wider than the details submitted to discharge condition 3 of 21/1148/FUL with the window now breaking the eaves line of the dwelling. Although the dormer is partially visible on your approach from the east, the shallow pitch ensures that the window is not a particularly prominent feature.

The build has been finished with a smooth red brick and off white render both of which are sympathetic to the character and appearance of the area.

## **Ecological Impact**

A Ward Member has objected with concerns over ecological impact of changes to the landscaping scheme due to the loss of the hedging that formerly enclosed the site.

Upon submission of the current application all hedging had already been removed from the site. In this case it is hoped that the developer carried out the hedge removal works in accordance with the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and that trees were checked for nesting birds.

However, due to the hedge removal works, conducting an investigation into the presence of potential nesting birds is no longer possible. Despite this, due to the extent of the hedging removal works, and as the works do not include the removal of trees or demolition of an existing building, it is unlikely that the Local Planning Authority would

have insisted on the completion of a full survey to support the application even if the hedging was still present upon submission.

Overall, despite concerns raised from the Local Ward Member, it is the opinion of officers that the ecological impact of the hedge removal works are not significant enough to warrant refusal of the application.

### **Appropriate Assessment**

The nature of the application and its location close to the Pebblebed Heaths and their European Habitat designation is such that the proposal requires a Habitat Regulations Assessment. The Appropriate Assessment is 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**

In light of the most recent amendments to the proposed landscaping scheme, most notably the reintroduction of hedging along the perimeter of the site, variation to condition 4 is considered acceptable.

The proposed variation to condition 2 in order to retrospectively secure permission for a number of design alterations is also considered acceptable. The form of the roof and turret, whilst not mirroring the exact proportions of that found at no55, are considered acceptable. Having referred back to the Inspector's findings with regards to the impact of the original proposals under application 18/2280/FUL, the build still appears as a subservient addition to Peaslands Road and incorporates a design and palette of materials that are sympathetic to and clearly taken inspiration from the existing character and appearance of the area.

Concerns from the Local Ward Member regarding the loss of habitat due to the removal of the hedging are also duly acknowledged. However, for reasons given above it is not thought that the Local Authority could insist on the submission of an ecological appraisal or request mitigation measures.

The application has received a number of third party comments who have taken issue with the number of discrepancies with the former application 21/1148/FUL and, from a procedural point of view, the way in which the application has been processed.

In this case the findings of the inspector during the assessment of APP/D0840/W/21/3285697 has been considered where it was concluded that changes proposed under a Section 73 application must be minor albeit material. For context the appeal decision at Portwrinkle concerned the redesign of a single dwelling and the appeal was dismissed on the grounds that the proposed alterations would be substantially different to that allowed by the existing permission. Consequently, the appeal scheme went beyond the parameters of a minor material amendment and could be considered under section 73. This is also reflected within the Planning Practice Guidance which states;

*“There is no statutory definition of a ‘minor material amendment’ but it is likely to include any amendment where its scale and/or nature results in a development which is not substantially different from the one which has been approved.”*

Whilst it is acknowledged that the current application proposed a number of material changes to the landscaping scheme and external appearance of the dwelling, these are not considered so substantially different to the proposals approved under 21/1148/FUL to warrant the need for a separate planning application to be made.

As such the application is recommended for approval subject to the list of conditions below. The submitted elevations adequately detail the dormer to be constructed on the eastern elevation and therefore condition 3 of 21/1148/FUL is no longer required.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

1. Adopt the Appropriate Assessment
2. APPROVE subject to the following conditions:
  1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the 22nd July 2024 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 occupation of the dwelling, the submitted Landscaping Scheme (SR-22-01) and Planting Specification shall be implemented in full and maintained for a period of 5 years. Any trees or other plants which die during this period shall be replaced during the next planting season with specimens of the same size and species unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.  
(Reason - In the 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 D2 - Landscape Requirements of the Adopted East Devon Local Plan 2013-2031.)

4. The dwelling hereby approved shall be constructed using smooth red facing brick as per the sample submitted to the Local Planning Authority on the 29.10.21 and Villa Del Rey Spanish Natural Slate unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.  
(Reason - In the 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 D2 - Landscape Requirements of the Adopted East Devon Local Plan 2013-2031.)

#### NOTE FOR APPLICANT

Informative: Confirmation - No CIL Liability

This Informative confirms that this development is not liable to a CIL charge.

Any queries regarding CIL, please telephone 01395 571585 or email [cil@eastdevon.gov.uk](mailto:cil@eastdevon.gov.uk).

The historical planning application is referenced under 21/1148/FUL for which the approved plans were as follows:-

Location Plan	20.05.21
---------------	----------

This decision notice for the variation should be read in conjunction with these previously approved plans.

#### Plans relating to this application:

	Sections	07.01.22
	Sections	07.01.22
SR-20-01 A	Landscaping	01.11.21

#### List of Background Papers

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