

Application Report

Strategic Development & Planning

Place Services

North Devon Council

Lynton House, Commercial Road,

Barnstaple, EX31 1DG



Application No:	71537	Application Expiry:	13 August 2020
Application Type:	Reserved Matters	Ext Of Time Expiry:	
		Publicity Expiry:	24 February 2021
Parish/Ward:	Ilfracombe/Ilfracombe East		
Location:	Land East of Old Barnstaple Road Ilfracombe Devon		
Proposal:	Phase A: Reserved matters application for erection of 347 dwellings and erection of community building together with associated works (outline planning permission 56675 as amended by 70654) (amended plans and documents)		
Agent:	PCL Planning Ltd		
Applicant:	Inox Homes (Ilfracombe) Ltd		
Planning Case Officer:	Mr R. Pedlar		
Departure:	N		
EIA Development:		EIA Conclusion:	An environment statement has been submitted.
Decision Level/Reason for Report to Committee: This is a 'Major' application in respect of a strategic allocation in the Local Plan.		Committee	

Site Description

The site covered by the original planning permission is approximately 74 hectares in size and is located on the south side of the town, beyond the Tesco supermarket, John Fowler holiday camp and cemetery.

The site is principally made up of farmland comprising Bowden, Channel and Winsham farms and stretches across elevated land, from Score Valley in the west to the upper Hele Valley in the east.

Old Barnstaple Road bisects the overall site and provides the principal access to the land, whilst the A361 and New Barnstaple Road are located west and east of the site respectively.

This application relates only to the land based on Channel Farm, on the east side of Old Barnstaple Road.

The application site is not within any designated landscape area, but the AONB boundary adjoins the application site to the east. Woodland is present on the east side of the site, which also contains a system of both species rich and species poor hedgerows.

Recommendation:

Approved

Legal Agreement Required:- No

Planning History

Planning	Decision	Decision Date
71532		
Address: Land East of Old Barnstaple Road Ilfracombe Devon		
Proposal: Reserved matters application for use of land for outdoor sports provision (Use Class D2) (outline planning permission 62544) (amended plans and documents)		
71582		
Address: Land to the east of Old Barnstaple Road Ilfracombe Devon		
Proposal: (Duplicate application to 71537) Reserved matters consent for access, layout, appearance, scale and landscaping for Phase A comprising proposed community use building (Use Class D1), 347 residential dwellings and associated green infrastructure, together with the discharge/partial discharge of outline conditions (outline planning permission 56675)		

71583		
Address: Land to the east of Old Barnstaple Road, Ilfracombe Devon		
Proposal: (Duplicate application to 71532) Reserved matters consent for access, layout, appearance, scale and landscaping of proposed playing pitches, MUGA, car parking and associated landscaping (outline planning permission 62544)		
77/0631/34/03	Approve - With Conditions	17 June 1977
Address: Channel Farm, Ilfracombe, Devon, EX34 8PQ		
Proposal: Proposed siting of caravan for use in connection with cream making		
77/0632/34/03	Approve - With Conditions	17 June 1977
Address: Channel Farm, Ilfracombe, Devon, EX34 8PQ		
Proposal: Proposed alteration to existing access		
77/0197/34/03	Withdrawn	30 August 1977
Address: Channel Farm, Old Barnstaple Road, Ilfracombe, Devon, EX34 8PQ		
Proposal: Proposed conversion of holiday accommodation to form self contained units.		
15740	Withdrawn	8 July 1992
Address: Channel Farm, Old Barnstaple Road, Ilfracombe, EX34 8PQ		
Proposal: Section 64 application to determine whether planning permission is required in respect of alterations and extension to dwelling.		
15825	Full Planning Approval	31 July 1992
Address: Channel Farm, Old Barnstaple Road, Ilfracombe, EX34 8PQ		
Proposal: Proposed alterations and extension to dwelling.		
23285	Full Planning Refusal	9 May 1997
Address: Land adj. Francis Cottages (OS 3714), New Barnstaple Road, Ilfracombe, EX34 9RH		
Proposal: Application for a Certificate of Lawfulness in respect of an existing use of land for siting of residential caravan and various works to form domestic curtilage		

27647	Full Planning Approval	29 September 1999
Address: Channel Farm, Two Potts, Ilfracombe, EX34 8PQ		
Proposal: Erection of sheep shed		
56675	Outline + S106 Approval	24 May 2017
Address: Land Between A361 & B3230, South Of Ilfracombe, , , Ilfracombe, Devon, EX34 8PQ		
Proposal: Outline application for 750 dwellings together with a mixed use centre (the hub) comprising 250m2 retail (a1); financial services (a2); restaurants, pubs & takeaways (a3, a4, a5); up to 3250m2 of business uses (b1); community uses (including health centre) (d1); a community pavilion (d2); access from Old Barnstaple Road; extra care housing/facility; primary school; green infrastructure including formal & informal open space & amenity space; sustainable drainage systems; infrastructure (including highways & utilities (including gas, electric, water, sewerage & telecommunications); highway, cycle & pedestrian routes; site reclamation (including the demolition & removal of structures (including channel farm)); & engineering works (including ground remodelling) (amended documents - location plan, parameters plan, environmental statement addendum, ecological appraisal & flood risk assessment)		
62544	Outline Approval	24 May 2017
Address: Land East of Old Barnstaple Road, Ilfracombe, Devon EX34 8PQ		
Proposal: Outline application for use of land for outdoor sports provision (use class d2).		
70654	Approved	18 November 2019
Address: Land between A361 & B3230, South of Ilfracombe Devon		
Proposal: Application for non-material amendment to planning permission 56675 in respect of amendments to conditions 6-10		

Constraints/Planning Policy

Constraint / Local Plan Policy

Advert Control Area Area of Special Advert Control
Chivenor Safeguard Zone Consultation Any Development
Chivenor Safeguard Zone Consultation Structure or works exceeding 10.7m
Class II Road
Class III Road

Distance (Metres)

Within constraint
Within constraint
Within constraint

Critical Drainage Area	Within constraint
Historic Landfill Buffer	Within constraint
Land is potentially contaminated, site was used for:General quarrying, Is ranked:LOW, Year:1891	Within constraint
Land is potentially contaminated, site was used for:Unknown Filled Ground (Pit, quarry etc), Is ranked:MEDIUM, Year:1989	Within constraint
Landscape Character is: 4C Coastal Slopes and Combes with Settlement	Within constraint
Landscape Character is: 5C Downland	Within constraint
Within 50m of Adopted Proposed Footpath/Cycle Route:ILF01 Ilfracombe Southern Extension	Within constraint
Within Adopted Coast and Estuary Zone	Within constraint
Within adopted Development Boundary: Ilfracombe Development Boundary ST06	Within constraint
Within Adopted Unesco Biosphere Transition (ST14)	Within constraint
Within Surface Water 1 in 1000	Within constraint
SSSI Impact Risk Consultation Area	Within constraint

- DM01 - Amenity Considerations
- DM02 - Environmental Protection
- DM04 - Design Principles
- DM05 - Highways
- DM06 - Parking Provision
- DM07 - Historic Environment
- DM08 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity
- DM10 - Green Infrastructure Provision
- ILF - Ilfracombe Spatial Vision and Development Strategy
- ILF01 - Ilfracombe Strategic Southern Extension
- ST02 - Mitigating Climate Change
- ST03 - Adapting to Climate Change and Strengthening Resilience
- ST04 - Improving the Quality of Development
- ST05 - Sustainable Construction and Buildings
- ST06 - Spatial Development Strategy for Northern Devon's Strategic and Main Centres
- ST09 - Coast and Estuary Strategy
- ST10 - Transport Strategy
- ST14 - Enhancing Environmental Assets
- ST15 - Conserving Heritage Assets
- ST17 - A Balanced Local Housing Market
- ST18 - Affordable Housing on Development Sites

Consultees

Name	Comment
Arboricultural Officer	No response.

Arboricultural Officer	No response
<p data-bbox="199 309 443 376">Arboricultural Officer</p> <p data-bbox="199 421 443 524">Reply Received 12 January 2021</p>	<p data-bbox="466 309 1380 636">1) Trees and Hedgerows: The Arboricultural report provided, whilst appropriate as a tree constraints plan (TCP) is not an arboricultural impact assessment (AIA) and associated tree protection plan (TPP) and (AMS) that addresses the specific measures that will be taken to ensure that 'retained' trees and hedges will be adequately protected during the course of construction and demonstrate that the long term retention and management of the trees and hedgerows can be successfully achieved in light of the proposed site layout and design.</p> <p data-bbox="466 674 1428 965">Of particular importance in the context of the development proposed will be the retention, protection and future management of the existing and 'retained' hedgerows that run North South. This will be of particular significance due to the potential / likely engineering works and terracing that will be required to address site levels. As you are aware this matter was specifically raised and asked to be addressed by the applicant at the design review panel meetings.</p> <p data-bbox="466 1003 1396 1144">More detail in respect of the TPP and AMS to address this will be required before we can have any confidence in the successful retention and management of these features in the post development context.</p> <p data-bbox="466 1182 1420 1509">I would also state that BS5837 – sets out minimum root protection areas and larger buffers should be provided where possible. BS5837 also advises that provision should be made to protect future landscape areas and it would be useful to see this achieved. (i.e. having a clear TPP showing new landscape areas fence off and avoided during the course of construction – although I would accept/expect some of these areas for example the POS to the south of the site to be used during construction for construction compounds ect.</p> <p data-bbox="466 1592 1428 2022">2) Landscape Framework: The submission provides some general detail of the overall indicative framework but significant reliance appear to be given to avenue planting within highway verges – does the applicant have any evidence to demonstrate that the highways authority are happy with the level of tree planting proposed within the highway and will be willing to accept and maintain the long term management of this planting and do we have any detail in respect of the soil volumes that will be necessary to support this tree planting to maturity and how this will be delivered. (I suspect that the soils may be relatively thin above the bedrock at this site and that extensive soil stripping/ engineering works and compaction of soils to enable the construction of the</p>

	<p>proposed housing will necessitate engineered tree pits and provision of sufficient soil volumes and appropriate soils will be required to enable the successful establishment of the proposed planting.)</p> <p>3) Biodiversity Management Plan: I'm broadly content with the overall submission but I believe that there are a number of areas where clarification should be sought and where additional information could be provided that would demonstrate policy compliance with the current local plan as opposed to merely addressing the condition requirements of the earlier consent. In particular I would wish to see further detail in relation to;</p> <p>a. the % species mix of the proposed new woodland and hedgerows</p> <p>b. the proposed planting densities / spacing and varieties of malus species for the proposed new orchard</p> <p>c. details in respect of the proposed ecological monitoring and means of reporting to the local authority and means of seeking written agreement to the BMP in order to ensure that its delivers the stated aims and objectives</p> <p>d. details in regard to how the proposed works will deliver biodiversity net gain as required through current local plan policies – i.e. use of the DEFRA metric to assess the existing habitat value and proposed habitat value in order to demonstrate / quantify the increase in biodiversity value of the existing and post development habitat.</p>
Councillor D Turton	No response
Councillor D Turton	No response
Councillor J Campbell	No response
Councillor J Campbell	No response
Councillor P Crabb	No response
Councillor P Crabb	No response
DCC - Childrens Services	No response

<p>DCC - Childrens Services</p> <p>Reply Received 18 June 2020</p>	<p>Further to the above application, please note that I am trying to seek re-assurance on the school site – as detailed in the email below to David Seaton. This is taking a while to sort as we all continue to work remotely.</p> <p>In the interim if any issues are brought to your attention that could impact the school site I would very much appreciate an update. DCC's position remains unchanged – i.e we still need to safeguard the entire school site of 1.72ha's for future primary school delivery.</p> <p>Any related issues please do let me know.</p>
<p>DCC - Development Management Highways</p>	<p>Response awaited</p>
<p>DCC - Development Management Highways</p> <p>Reply Received 22 July 2020</p>	<p>22/07/2020 15:06 - The proposals have been considered further and the following needs to be provided:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A coloured plan clearly identifying all roads, footways, footpaths and cycleways intended to be adopted; 2) As submitted, there are private roads within the layout that will serve more than 3 no. dwellings which is contrary to the Advance Payments Code Policy of Devon County Council; 3) There are 2 no roads that branch to form a 'Y' shape central to the layout. Where each terminate within the vicinity of plots 245 and 276 respectively, no turning is provided for a refuge type vehicle or fire appliance. 4) There should be footways or grass verges both sides of the carriageways. This does not appear to be the case, or unclear. As an example, the roads serving/fronting plots 245-252, 271-276 and 164-181 are not shown to be of sufficient width nor are suitable grass verge margins indicated; 5) Is there an intended cycle link between plots 163 and 164?
<p>DCC - Historic buildings Officer</p>	
<p>DCC - Historic buildings Officer</p> <p>Reply Received 17 June 2020</p>	<p>I can confirm that the programme of archaeological works as described in the revised Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) prepared by AC Archaeology - (document ref: ACD2264/1/1 and dated: 9th June 2020) and submitted in support of this planning application are acceptable to the Historic Environment Team.</p> <p>I would therefore advise that any consent that may be granted by the Planning Authority should be conditional upon the following worded condition:</p>

	<p>'The development shall proceed in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation prepared by AC Archaeology (document ref: ACD2264/1/1 and dated: 9th June 2020) and submitted in support of this planning application. The development shall be carried out at all times in accordance with the approved scheme, or such other details as may be subsequently agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.'</p> <p>Reason 'To ensure, in accordance with Policy DM07 of the North Devon and Torridge Local Plan 2011 - 2031 and paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), that an appropriate record is made of archaeological evidence that may be affected by the development'</p> <p>The applicant should ensure that the archaeological works are implemented as described in order to avoid breach of the Condition. Please do contact me if you have any queries.</p>
<p>DCC - Lead Local Flood Authority</p>	<p>No response</p>
<p>DCC - Lead Local Flood Authority</p> <p>Reply Received 2 July 2020</p>	<p>Recommendation: At this stage, we object to the above planning application because the applicant has not submitted sufficient information in order to demonstrate that all aspects of the surface water drainage management plan have been considered. In order to overcome our objection, the applicant will be required to submit some additional information, as outlined below.</p> <p>Observations: The applicant has proposed to manage surface water via infiltration. The applicant has proposed to drain some dwelling's to individual soakaways located within rear gardens and some dwelling's to permeable paving (located within driveways). Some of the access roads are proposed to drain to soakaways (under public space). The northern access roads are proposed to drain to an infiltration basin located within the north of the site.</p> <p>We would not recommend managing surface water via infiltration at this site due to the sites gradient. This site is very steep and the areas immediately downhill from the site are very steep. Steep sites are considered at high risk of re-emerging water (re-emerging from the infiltration devices). The applicant should reassess the proposed surface water drainage system.</p> <p>The applicant has submitted MicroDrainage model outputs to indicate the performance of the proposed individual soakaways. The applicant has also submitted MicroDrainage model outputs to indicate the performance of the proposed infiltration basin and the proposed soakaway D. However, the dimensions for soakaway D in the model outputs are not the same as the dimensions noted on the Foul & Surface Water Drainage Strategy (drawing No. 0488.101; dated 29th April 2020). The applicant must submit</p>

	<p>MicroDrainage model outputs for the entire proposed surface water drainage system.</p> <p>The applicant should include maintenance details for the proposed highway surface water drainage system.</p> <p>The applicant has not submitted any details to demonstrate the proposed exceedance routes for this site.</p>
<p>DCC - Lead Local Flood Authority</p> <p>Reply Received 22 December 2020</p>	<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>At this stage, I am unable to withdraw our objection, but would be happy to provide a further substantive response when the applicant has formally submitted the additional information requested below to the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Observations:</p> <p>Following my previous consultation response (FRM/ND/71537/2020; dated 15th June 2020), the applicant has submitted additional information in relation to the surface water drainage aspects of the above planning application, for which I am grateful.</p> <p>The applicant has revised the surface water drainage proposals for some of the site, however, the whole site should be reconsidered. The applicant has split the site into two catchments, but the southern catchment is surrounded by steep land. Therefore, we do not recommend managing surface water via infiltration.</p> <p>The applicant must consider long-term storage.</p> <p>The applicant has confirmed that a sewer requisition will be required to construct an outfall to the watercourse to the north. The applicant must clarify whether they have liaised with the landowner regarding this requisition as it is understood that the applicant will need to confirm with South West Water that the outfall location is acceptable to the landowner.</p> <p>The applicant must assess suitable features to form a SuDS Management Train.</p> <p>The applicant should include maintenance details for the proposed highway surface water drainage system.</p> <p>The applicant must consider exceedance routes at this stage.</p>
DCC - Public Health	No response
<p>DCC - Public Health</p> <p>Reply Received 3 July 2020</p>	<p>Public Health's intelligence:</p> <p>The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment Headline Tool (1) provides the following information about Ilfracombe:</p> <p>Ilfracombe's population consists of working age adults, who own their own homes, self-report their health as good and who prefer to communicate via</p>

email.

The following aspects of the Ilfracombe population performs better than Devon:

Rate of dementia in Ilfracombe is 5.3 per 100,000 population compared to 5.8

for the whole of Devon.

Ilfracombe performs less well than Devon for the following aspects:

Lower incomes

Employment- the claimant count is 2.24% compared to 1.47% for Devon

GCSE Education attainment 28% compared to 41% for Devon

Special Educational Needs 19.9% compared to 17.2% for Devon

Self-Harm admissions for those aged 10-24years 5,022 compared to 3017 per

100,000 for Devon

Living in fuel poor homes 15.9% compared to 11.6% for Devon

A development that would help to address some of the inequalities referenced

above would include:

- Energy efficient homes
- Access to education and employment
- Access to internet
- Access to community facilities that promote physical health and mental wellbeing

Positive aspects of the application:

The application includes the provision of a community building that enables

multiple uses for the community. The nearby sports pitches and childrens play

area enables access to green spaces for physical activity and relaxation.

The provision of community orchard, allotments and garden promote social

connectivity and access to food sources.

The design guide promotes the accessibility of coastal views and reduces

densities inline with the local topography which can also contribute to positive

mental wellbeing.

The location of the sports pitches, primary school and community building being

in proximity is encouraging as this should mean the facilities are accessible to

children of all ages providing them with purposeful activities to engage with.

Considerations for future documents in the application process

We would encourage the inclusion of a health impact assessment as the

application process develops, using a toolkit such as HUDU (2). It

	<p>would be helpful to understand how the development will achieve the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Energy efficient homes that contribute towards reducing the risk of fuel poverty and help the community contribute towards achieving a net zero carbon Devon. 2. An explanation as to the quality of broadband infrastructure available to the site. 3. We would recommend that a Travel plan be completed to demonstrate how the development connects the community to the wider town, supermarket, schools and employment sites. The shared car parking arrangements for the primary school, sports pitches and community building seem to encourage motorised transport. It would be helpful to understand how active travel modes will be promoted in future stages of the planning process and what cycle parking/storage will be made available. 4. The design of the community building includes consultation with those living with disabilities in order to ensure it is fully accessible. 5. The wider development includes reference of a health facility. We would recommend that the Clinical Commissioning Group is added to the list of consultees and that a facility that enables multi professions such as public health nursing, substance misuse, lifestyle support, sexual health and domestic abuse support agencies, in line with the needs of the town and to enable delivery of joined up services. 6. In order to help promote healthy living amongst the population we would recommend that the wider development includes features recommended in the Public Health England Healthy Weight Supplementary Planning Document toolkit (3).
DCC - Public Rights Of Way	
DCC - Public Rights Of Way	No response

Designing Out
Crime Officer

Reply Received
9 June 2020

Thank you for this reserved matters application, Police have no objections in principle to the proposal. The general layout proposed will provide both active frontages and good overlooking to the new internal streets which is welcome.

Residential - Building Regulations – Approved Document Q - Security.

The security element within the Building Regulations, namely Approved Document Q (ADQ) creates security requirements in relation to all new dwellings, including those resulting from a change of use, for example commercial, warehouse or barns undergoing conversion into dwellings. It also applies to conservation areas.

All doors at the entrance to a building, including garage doors where there is a connecting door to the dwelling and all ground floor, basement and other easily accessible windows, including roof lights, must be shown to have been manufactured to a design that has been tested to an acceptable security standard i.e. PAS 24 (2016) or equivalent.

To assist the process in ensuring compliance with the requirements of ADQ it is recommended that all doors and windows are sourced from a Secured by Design (SBD) member company. SBD requires that doors and windows are not only tested to meet PAS 24 (2016) standard by the product manufacturer, but independent third-party certification from a UKAS accredited independent third-party certification authority is also in place, thus reducing much time and effort in establishing the provenance of non SBD approved products.

SBD also incorporates a bespoke element to assist in the crime prevention approach with regard to listed buildings and heritage status.

Secured by Design (SBD) is a crime prevention initiative managed by Police Crime Prevention Initiatives Ltd (PCPI) on behalf of the UK police services. SBD aims to reduce crime, the fear of crime and opportunities for antisocial behaviour and conflict within developments by applying the attributes of Environmental Design in conjunction with appropriate physical security measures.

Crime, the fear of crime and nuisance behaviour can have a detrimental impact on people's lives and are less likely to occur if for all developments the principles of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) are incorporated into the design and layout as follows:-

Access and movement:

Places with well-defined and well used routes with spaces and entrances that provide for convenient movement without compromising security – Footpaths should be appropriate and designed so they do not encourage crime, disorder and nuisance behaviour. Paths situated to the rear of

properties are actively discouraged as these are proven crime generators. Care should be taken with regard to permeability as too much will also provide ease of movement and means of escape for those with criminal intent or unwanted trespassers.

Structure:

Places that are structured so that different uses do not cause conflict - Active frontages are encouraged and access to private space should be limited. Affordable housing should not be distinguishable from market housing in terms of location, appearance, build quality and materials. They should be in small clusters and pepper potted throughout a development to promote community cohesion and inclusion.

Surveillance:

Places where all publicly accessible spaces are overlooked – A balance needs to be struck in the careful location of publicly accessible places like play areas and MUGA's so as to not to disadvantage nearby residents with noise pollution and nuisance against being well overlooked, not just by dwellings but also by well used pedestrian and vehicular routes.

Rear parking courts are actively discouraged as they are proven generators for car crime and burglary due to general lack of surveillance by active rooms. Blank gable ends should be avoided as they reduce surveillance opportunities.

Ownership:

2

Places that promote a sense of ownership, respect, territorial responsibility and community - There should be clear definition as to where public space ends and private space begins, encouraging people to take ownership of their surroundings and environment.

Physical protection:

Places that include necessary, well-designed security features – to deter and prevent crime - Cul-de-sacs that are not linked by footpaths are a key feature in designing out crime as they provide self-policing communities where the individual with criminal intent feels vulnerable at being noticed and therefore less likely to venture there. Good boundary treatments increase security for householders.

Activity:

Places where the level of human activity is appropriate to the location and creates a reduced risk of crime and a sense of safety at all times.

Management and maintenance:

Places that are designed with management and maintenance in mind to discourage crime and disorder – If places are well looked after they are likely to stay that way.

Site specific comments:

It is now widely accepted that a key strand in the design of a

'sustainable' development is its resistance to crime and anti-social behaviour. With this and the above guidance in mind, the general layout proposed will provide both active frontages and good overlooking to the new internal streets which is welcome. The use of back to back gardens is noted and supported .

However, I have concerns from a crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour perspective which will require addressing.

Perimeter security is one the basic principles of crime prevention, being the first line of defence against unwanted trespassers, as such all rear boundary treatments must be 1.8m high, as a minimum requirement, and be solid and robust to prevent being breached. Close boarded fencing or walls would be deemed appropriate. If more surveillance is required or 1.8m would feel too closed in for smaller gardens then a 1.5m solid structure with a .3m trellis topping would be acceptable. It is accepted that on some occasions gradients of land or other permanent solid structures can have an impact on the need, choice and height of boundary treatments but these should be assessed on their own merits to ensure the boundary treatment is appropriate to any potential risk of trespass.

Whilst gates to the rear gardens provide a barrier to the private space of the dwelling, their effectiveness can be enhanced by moving the gates forward (as close to the front elevation building line as is possible) to remove accessibility to sides of dwellings where surveillance opportunities are limited.

In terms of practical parking, the 'tandem' parking design, is not always considered a practical or convenient method of parking and can lead to the space not being used as intended. It is likely that the 2nd vehicle will be parked elsewhere e.g. to the front of the dwelling, in the front garden, on the pavement or any available space just to make life easier. The negative impact of this is that it will greatly reduce the stated number of intended parking spaces and the potential to introduce a source of conflict as a result of vehicle dominated street scenes and inconsiderate or obstructive parking.

Vehicles should either be parked in locked garages or on a hard standing within the dwelling boundary.

Where communal parking areas are necessary, bays should be sited in small groups, close and adjacent to homes, be within view of active rooms, and allocated to individual properties. Rear parking courtyards, such as those proposed for the flats, are discouraged for the following reasons:

- They introduce access to the vulnerable rear elevations of dwellings where the majority of burglary is perpetrated;
- In private developments such areas are often left unlit and

therefore increase the fear of crime;

- Un-gated courtyards provide areas of concealment which can encourage antisocial behaviour.

Community Hub/Changing Facilities

The final layout and identified user groups would appear to yet to be decided, this will require careful management to avoid, in a worse-case scenario, possible conflicts between groups.

It would appear the proposed design has minimised any recesses which could provide shelter for gatherings or those intent on criminal and anti-social activity. Any external pillars and rainwater pipes must be designed in such a way as to not aid climbing, thus providing access to the roof itself.

The south and in particular west elevation, which houses the plant room, are potentially vulnerable to crime and anti-social behaviour. Given the lack of natural surveillance to these elevations, consideration should be given to the installation of grilles and shutters, certified to at least LPS1175 or STS202 to provide additional protection to doors and windows.

3

In general, all external doors and windows are recommended to be independently security tested and certificated products to an appropriate nationally recognised standard such as PAS24:2012 / 2016 or similar.

All ground floor and easily accessible glazing must incorporate glass successfully tested to BS EN 356:2000 Glass in building. Security glazing—resistance to manual attack to category P1A.

Roof lights should also be independently security tested to an appropriate standard such as LPS 1175 or STS 202.

Places that the public have access to which are isolated and lack natural surveillance can create vulnerable locations for criminal activity or attract the antisocial to gather. As a deterrent and in the detection and prevention of crime and ASB it is recommended that a monitored CCTV system is considered to cover both internal and external areas, including the carpark.

The building must be protected by a monitored intruder alarm with a zonal capability to allow 'selective' opening.

The provision and use of CCTV fits well within the overall framework of a security management plan but it should not be relied upon as a panacea to all criminal and anti-social behaviour.

Access beyond the reception area to offices/staff facilities, store rooms, plant rooms, cleaning and chemical stores must be limited to 'staff' only.

I can see no provision, either internally or externally, for a bin store. This again, will require careful consideration, as poorly placed and left unprotected could potentially increase ASB

or lead to more serious criminal activity such as arson. Any wheelie bins must be secured as they can be used as climbing aids and the contents used to start fires. As graffiti tends to attract further graffiti, police will always advise that it is removed as soon as possible. Designers should therefore consider wall finishes that make this task easier to perform, particularly when the risk of graffiti is high. Surfaces should be coated with either an anti-graffiti glaze or sacrificial coating, or alternatively be designed for ease of maintenance e.g. painted in the event of a graffiti attack. Alternative measures for reducing or eradicating graffiti may also be considered such as growing an appropriate non-invasive climbing plant up the wall.

Broken windows theory - Academic theory proposed by James Q. Wilson and George Kelling in 1982 that used broken windows as a metaphor for disorder within neighbourhoods. Their theory links disorder and incivility within a community to subsequent occurrences of serious crime - Consider a building with a few broken windows, if the windows are not repaired, the tendency is for vandals to break a few more windows, eventually, they may even break into the building, and if it's unoccupied, perhaps become squatters or light fires inside. Or consider a pavement, some litter accumulates, soon more litter accumulates, eventually people start leaving bags of rubbish from take-away meals etc.

Equipped play area

Communal areas, such as playgrounds, toddler play areas, seating facilities have the potential to generate crime, the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour.

Play areas should ideally be designed so that they can be secured at night. This is to reduce the amount of damage and graffiti that occurs after dark, the type of fencing and security measures will need to vary to suit the particular area. As a minimum requirement, fencing at height of 1200mm must be included to discourage casual entry, provide a safe clean play area and reduce damage to the equipment. The 3 entry/exit points to the proposed play area are noted. However, consideration should be given to a single dedicated entry and exit point to ease parental/guardian control and supervision.

Any planting in or around the play area must not reduce surveillance opportunities or provide hiding places.

Community allotments

Consideration must be given to their security with the inclusion of robust perimeter security and gates. There must be sufficient parking provided to prevent inappropriate on street parking leading to conflict with residents.

<p>Designing Out Crime Officer</p> <p>Reply Received 17 November 2020</p>	<p>Re Land East of Old Barnstaple Road Ilfracombe (further information/amended plans) – 17th November 2020 Thank you for this application.</p> <p>The proposed site wide boundary treatments are noted. I am assuming the indicated play fencing is at a minimum height of 1200mm? Whilst this would be suitable for the equipped play area, as it can discourage casual entry, provide a safe clean play area and reduce damage to the equipment, it is unlikely, with ball games in mind, to be suitable for the proposed MUGA. I refer back to my comments of 28th May 2020 regarding this area. "Multi-use games areas and artificial playing surfaces, usually with lighting for night time use, are expensive facilities that are often targets for intrusion, vandalism and misuse. They need to be carefully planned, managed and protected using all appropriate guidelines and specifications. It is recommended consideration is given to fully enclosing the playing surface with 3m fencing." A higher fence will not only afford the afore mentioned safety and security benefits, but will also reduce incidents of having to leave the enclosure to retrieve stray balls etc.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact me if any clarification is sought or I can assist further.</p> <p>17/2/21 Re Land East of Old Barnstaple Road Ilfracombe Devon (further information/amended plans) 17th February 2021 Thank you for this application, Police have no further comments at this time.</p>
<p>Devon Wildlife Trust</p>	<p>No response</p>
<p>Devon Wildlife Trust</p>	<p>No response</p>
<p>Economic Regeneration Officer</p>	<p>No response</p>
<p>Economic Regeneration Officer</p> <p>Reply Received 3 July 2020</p>	<p>I can confirm that Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) has been secured for this site to deliver the junction, internal spine road, drainage, community building and sports pitched/MUGA.</p> <p>I note that the mixed use land will be provided in phase 2 and would be interested to understand how that will be marketed etc. It would appear to be a missed opportunity if connections cannot be made between that part of the site and the adjacent foodstore.</p> <p>The acceptability of the detailed design of the application falls outside of our remit.</p>

Environment Agency	No response
Environment Agency	No response
Environmental Health Manager Reply Received 28 May 2020	<p>I have reviewed this application in relation to Environmental Protection matters and comment as follows:</p> <p>1 Outline Application 56675 A number of issues were highlighted at outline application stage as needing to be addressed at reserved matters stage. I have included details on some specific points raised at outline stage below.</p> <p>2 Air Quality Chapter 6 of the Environment Statement submitted at outline stage concluded that all receptor locations would be below the air quality objective levels based on a 2012 air quality assessment. However, the assessment identified some locations where a "large change in air quality" would occur as a result of increased traffic flows during the operational phase of the development. I recommend the applicant submit a review of the 2012 air quality assessment, undertaken by a suitably qualified air quality specialist. The aim of the review will be to clarify whether the findings and conclusions set out in Chapter 6 of the Environment Statement remain sound having regard to the latest relevant air quality standards and guidance and the detailed proposals set out in this application. The review should have regard to the EPUK & IAQM document: Land-use Planning and Development Control: Planning for Air Quality - January 2017 and include recommendations for any further assessment and / or mitigation measures where appropriate.</p> <p>3 Noise Details of noise mitigation measures recommended in Chapter 7 of the outline application Environmental Statement should be provided. Block Plan Sheet 1 shows a "mixed use hub land" in the northwest corner of the site. This location may form a useful buffer / screening zone between the existing Tesco Superstore deliveries and plant area and proposed dwellings at the application site. However, the mixed use area may introduce risks of noise impacts itself, depending on what uses are proposed. I would wish to be consulted on detailed proposals for the mixed use hub land in due course.</p> <p>4 Water Resources A number of private water supplies have been identified on or close to the development site. These sites should be protected having regard to the recommendations set out in Chapter 12 of the outline application Environmental Statement. I have included mention of protection of water resources in my recommended Construction</p>

Environmental Management Plan condition below.

5 Contaminated Land

Chapter 13 of the outline application Environmental Statement stated that a detailed assessment of ground conditions would be undertaken to confirm preliminary findings in relation to land contamination risks.

I recommend the following condition be included on any permission:

- Contaminated Land Condition

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a land contamination investigation and risk assessment report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced competent person and have regard to relevant standards and guidance. For the avoidance of doubt and where relevant, the report shall include:

a) A phase 1 assessment including a site walkover to establish the potential extent, scale and nature of any contamination and an assessment of potential risks to human health, controlled waters, ecological systems, property, archaeological sites or the wider environment.

b) Recommendations for any further site investigation works required based on the relevant information discovered by the Phase 1 study.

(c) The results of any intrusive site investigation, detailing all investigative works and sampling on site, together with the results of analysis, risk assessment to potential receptors and remediation measures required. Where remedial measures are recommended, the Local Planning Authority shall approve such remedial works and any post remediation verification measures prior to remediation works commencing on site. The works shall be of such a nature as to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end-use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters.

Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted:

(d) Approved remediation works shall be carried out in full on site under a Quality Assurance scheme to demonstrate compliance with the proposed methodology and best practice guidance.

(e) If during the works contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified then the additional contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate supplementary remediation scheme shall be agreed with the Local Planning Authority in writing.

(f) A verification report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The verification report shall include details of the proposed remediation works and Quality Assurance certificates to show that the works have been carried out in full in accordance with the approved methodology. Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis or other verification works to show the site has reached the required clean-up criteria shall be

included in the completion report together with the necessary waste transfer documentation detailing what waste materials have been removed from the site.

(g) A certificate signed by the developer shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority confirming that the agreed works have been undertaken as detailed in the completion report.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other off-site receptors in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

6 Construction Phase Impacts

In order to ensure that nearby residents and businesses are not unreasonably affected by dust, noise or other impacts during the construction phase of the development, I recommend the following conditions be included on any permission:

- Construction Environmental Management Plan Condition
Prior to the commencement of development, including any site clearance, groundworks or construction within each sub-phase (save such preliminary or minor works that the Local Planning Authority may agree in writing), a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to manage the impacts of construction during the life of the works, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

For the avoidance of doubt and where relevant, the CEMP shall include:

- a) measures to regulate the routing of construction traffic;
- b) the times within which traffic can enter and leave the site;
- c) the importation and removal of spoil and soil on site;
- d) the removal /disposal of materials from site, including soil and vegetation;
- e) the location and covering of stockpiles;
- f) details of measures to prevent mud from vehicles leaving the site and must include wheel-washing facilities
- g) control of fugitive dust from earthworks and construction activities; dust suppression
- h) a noise control plan which details hours of operation and proposed mitigation measures;
- i) details of any site construction office, compound and ancillary facility buildings
- j) specified on-site parking for vehicles associated with the construction works and the provision made for access thereto;
- k) proposals for protecting water resources in the vicinity of the development site;

	<p>l) a point of contact (such as a Construction Liaison Officer/site manager) and details of how complaints will be addressed The details so approved and any subsequent amendments as shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall be complied with in full and monitored by the applicants to ensure continuing compliance during the construction of the development.</p> <p>Reason: To minimise the impact of the works during the construction of the development in the interests of highway safety and the free-flow of traffic, and to safeguard the amenities of the area. To protect the amenity of local residents from potential impacts whilst site clearance, groundworks and construction is underway.</p> <p>- Construction Times Condition</p> <p>During the construction phase no machinery shall be operated, no process shall be carried out and no deliveries taken at or dispatched from the site outside the following times: a) Monday - Friday 08.00 - 18.00, b) Saturday 08.00 - 13.00 c) nor at any time on Sunday, Bank or Public holidays.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the amenity of local residents</p>
<p>Environmental Health Manager</p> <p>Reply Received 20 November 2020</p>	<p>I have reviewed the amended information for this application in relation to Environmental Protection matters and refer you to comments I made by email on 28 May 2020.</p> <p>My email of 28 May included reference to air quality issues and the need for a review of a previous air quality assessment. Since I commented the Council has adopted an Air Quality SPD. You may wish to request that this SPD is referred to in the update review I recommended.</p> <p>My comments of 28 May 2020 stand.</p>
<p>Heritage & Conservation Officer</p> <p>Reply Received 2 June 2020</p>	<p>2/06/2020 13:57 - I do not consider that this proposal will harm the significance of designated heritage assets.</p>
<p>Heritage & Conservation Officer</p> <p>Reply Received 1 December 2020</p>	<p>1/12/2020 14:20 - I have no further comments to make on this application.</p>

<p>Housing Enabling Officer</p>	<p>11/06/2020 14:45 - Thank you for your consultation regarding the above.</p>
<p>Reply Received 11 June 2020</p>	<p>The Section 106 Agreement dated 6th June 2017 states in "Schedule 1: Affordable Housing: Part 1: Affordable Housing Scheme" paragraph 1.1 "In respect of any Housing Phase the Owner covenants not to Commence the Development in the Housing Phase until it has agreed with the District Council the Affordable Housing Scheme for that Housing Phase". I should therefore be grateful if the applicant would please contact me so that I may send them the Council's Affordable Housing Scheme template for them to complete and return.</p> <p>The Section 106 Agreement states that the Affordable Housing Percentage "shall mean 11% of the Dwellings to be provided as Affordable Housing to be constructed on the Eastern Land comprising: 1-bed - 10% 2-bed houses - 60% 3-bed houses - 24% 4-bed houses - 6% Or such other percentages as may be amended by the Review Mechanism from time to time or otherwise as agreed in writing with the Proper Officer".</p> <p>The Section 106 requires under the definition of "Affordable Housing Scheme" in paragraph 5 that each written Affordable Housing Scheme shall include "Details of the timing of the delivery of the Affordable Dwellings within a Phase including the number of Open Market Dwellings that can be Occupied prior to the Completion of the Affordable Dwellings".</p> <p>The applicant's Site Layout Plan Drawing Number 9344-L-05 dated April 2020 states the proposed affordable housing as 38 units @ 11% of the total of 347 units. 11% of 347 is 38.17 units. I also understand that the affordable housing requirement may actually be 11.4%. I would therefore ask for clarification from Planning on this. Due to the very low affordable housing percentage, we would urge for rounding up regarding the number of units.</p> <p>The proposed property sizes stated on the Site Layout Plan are:-</p> <p>1 bed - 4 units 2 bed - 23 units 3 bed - 9 units 4 bed - 2 units</p> <p>In the case of 38 units, this would be in accordance with the percentages stated in the Section 106 Agreement. I would, however, wish to comment further as appropriate dependent upon Planning's advice regarding % and total affordable housing</p>

numbers.

Property sizes for affordable housing should aim to meet or exceed the "Technical housing standards - nationally described space standard", which can be accessed at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/technical-housing-standards-nationally-described-space-standard> (see "Table 1 - Minimum gross internal floor areas and storage (m2)" of the Department for Communities and Local Government document).

Registered providers require housing to be built to National Space Standards; these are indicated on the table attached.

The Section 106 Agreement states under "Definitions"; "Affordable Housing Scheme"; Paragraph 10 that "The tenure of the Affordable Dwellings shall subject to the Review Mechanism be provided as at least 75% Social Rent and the balance as Shared Ownership Units and/or Intermediate Rent (as may be adjusted by the Review Mechanism from time to time or as may be otherwise agreed in writing with the Proper Officer)".

The Site Layout Plan does not detail the tenure of the affordable dwellings. In the case of 38 dwellings, in order to meet the requirement, at least 29 of the dwellings shall be for Social Rent and the remainder Shared Ownership and/or Intermediate Rent. This again is dependent upon Planning's advice regarding % and total affordable housing numbers.

The affordable homes should be pepperpotted throughout the site in clusters of no more than 6-10 units. The Site Layout Plan shows that the proposed siting of the affordable dwellings is in accordance with this.

The properties, for rent and sale, would need to be advertised to those persons with a local connection to North Devon Council's area.

The affordable homes should be designed and of the same material and construction as the open market - including car parking.

The Section 106 Agreement requires under "Definitions: Affordable Housing Scheme" Paragraph 9 that at least 2 (two) of the Affordable Dwellings shall be adapted for disabled use. Disabled parking spaces are shown on the Site Layout Plan at the front of plots 1-9. I should be grateful if the applicant would please confirm on their Affordable Housing Scheme which are the disabled adapted dwellings. I will advise further once I have researched the highest bed-size need for fully disabled adapted housing in Ilfracombe.

(18/6/20)

Further to my response dated 11/06/20 to the planning consultation for the above, I wish to add the following comments please.

Thank you for confirming that the required affordable housing percentage is 11%, in accordance with the Section 106 Agreement. The applicant's Site Layout Plan Drawing Number 9344-L-05 dated April 2020 states the proposed affordable housing as 38 units @ 11% of the total of 347 units. 11% of 347 is 38.17 units. Due to the very low affordable housing percentage, we would urge for rounding up the number of affordable dwellings to 39.

The proposed property sizes stated on the Site Layout Plan are:-

1 bed - 4 units

2 bed - 23 units

3 bed - 9 units

4 bed - 2 units

In the case of 38 units, this would be in accordance with the percentages stated in the Section 106 Agreement. For 39 affordable dwellings we would seek the following property size mix:-

1 bed – 4 units

2 bed – 24 units

3 bed – 9 units

4 bed – 2 units

The Section 106 Agreement states under "Definitions"; "Affordable Housing Scheme"; Paragraph 10 that "The tenure of the Affordable Dwellings shall subject to the Review Mechanism be provided as at least 75% Social Rent and the balance as Shared Ownership Units and/or Intermediate Rent (as may be adjusted by the Review Mechanism from time to time or as may be otherwise agreed in writing with the Proper Officer)".

In the case of 38 dwellings, in order to meet the requirement, at least 29 of the dwellings shall be for Social Rent and the remainder Shared Ownership and/or Intermediate Rent. In the case of 39 dwellings the requirement would be that at least 30 of the dwellings shall be for Social Rent and the remainder Shared Ownership and /or Intermediate Rent.

The Section 106 Agreement requires under "Definitions: Affordable Housing Scheme" Paragraph 9 that at least 2 (two) of the Affordable Dwellings shall be adapted for disabled use. We would seek 1 x two bedroom and 1 x three bedroom dwellings. These should be built to comply with the requirement M4 (3) (2) b of the Building Regulations 2010 Approved Document M: Access to and use of buildings. These should be provided as Social Rent. We have a specific family that require a 3 bedroom wheelchair accessible

	<p>house in Ilfracombe. We will need a design/floor plan based on their needs, which we will share as soon as we are able to.</p>
<p>Housing Enabling Officer</p> <p>Reply Received 27 November 2020</p>	<p>27/11/2020 10:48 - Thank you for your consultation.</p> <p>The applicant's "Building for a Healthy Life Assessment" dated October 2020 states that the percentage of affordable homes required by the Section 106 agreement is provided within the scheme.</p> <p>The Section 106 Agreement dated 6th June 2017 states that the Affordable Housing Percentage "shall mean 11% of the Dwellings to be provided as Affordable Housing to be constructed on the Eastern Land comprising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1-bed - 10% 2-bed houses - 60% 3-bed houses - 24% 4-bed houses - 6% <p>Or such other percentages as may be amended by the Review Mechanism from time to time or otherwise as agreed in writing with the Proper Officer".</p> <p>Site Layout Plan drawing number 9344-L-05 Revision A dated October 2020 states in the Key the proposed number of affordable units as 38 out of a total of 347 units. 11% of 347 is 38.17 units. There should therefore be 38 affordable units and an off-site financial contribution equivalent to 0.17 of a unit. The formula we use to establish an off-site financial contribution figure is (Open Market Value - Registered Provider price) x % of affordable housing required.</p> <p>The proposed affordable property sizes stated in the Key on the drawing are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1-bed - 4 units 2-bed - 23 units 3-bed - 9 units 4-bed - 2 units <p>For 38 units the proposed property sizes are in accordance with the percentages stated in the Section 106 Agreement. The proposal is for 6 x 2-bed flats and 17 x 2-bed houses. The Section 106 Agreement states 2-bed houses. I can confirm Proper Officer discretion to accept a smaller percentage of 2-bed houses to accommodate 6 x 2-bed flats.</p> <p>The plan appears to show 43 proposed affordable units. I should</p>

therefore be grateful if the applicant would please confirm the proposed affordable units. The Section 106 Agreement states in "Schedule 1: Affordable Housing: Part 1: Affordable Housing Scheme" paragraph 1.1 "In respect of any Housing Phase the Owner covenants not to Commence the Development in the Housing Phase until it has agreed with the District Council the Affordable Housing Scheme for that Housing Phase". I should therefore be grateful if the applicant would please contact me so that I may send them the Council's Affordable Housing Scheme template for them to complete and return.

The applicant's "Building for a Healthy Life Assessment" states:- "A mix of housing tenures are provided. The agreed s106 provides an agreed mix of affordable homes that meet the needs of the community. This agreed percentage of affordable homes is provided within the scheme."

The Section 106 Agreement states under "Definitions"; "Affordable Housing Scheme"; Paragraph 10 that "The tenure of the Affordable Dwellings shall subject to the Review Mechanism be provided as at least 75% Social Rent and the balance as Shared Ownership Units and/or Intermediate Rent (as may be adjusted by the Review Mechanism from time to time or as may be otherwise agreed in writing with the Proper Officer)".

The drawing does not detail the tenure of the affordable dwellings. In the case of 38 dwellings, in order to meet the requirement, at least 29 of the dwellings shall be for Social Rent and the remainder Shared Ownership and/or Intermediate Rent.

Property sizes for affordable housing should aim to meet or exceed the "Technical housing standards - nationally described space standard", which can be accessed at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/technical-housing-standards-nationally-described-space-standard> (see "Table 1 - Minimum gross internal floor areas and storage (m²)" of the Department for Communities and Local Government document). Registered providers require housing to be built to National Space Standards; these are indicated on the table attached.

The "Building for a Healthy Life Assessment" states:- "In accordance with best practice, the affordable homes are provided in small groups and spread throughout the site. The design of homes and streets make it difficult to determine the tenure of properties through architectural, landscape or other differences."

The affordable homes should be pepperpotted throughout the site in clusters of no more than 6-10 units. The drawing shows that the proposed siting of the affordable dwellings is in accordance with

	<p>this.</p> <p>The affordable homes should be designed and of the same material and construction as the open market - including car parking.</p> <p>The "Building for a Healthy Life Assessment" states:- "In addition, the needs of two disabled units have been identified by the LPA, one 2 bed and one 3 bed, and both are provided within the scheme, within close proximity to the bus stop and 'community hub'.". Housing Enabling accepts the two proposed units and the proposed location of those units (units 215 and 216 as shown on the drawing) as being the provision of the two affordable dwellings adapted for disabled use that are required by the Section 106 Agreement. These should be provided as Social Rent. The dwellings to be built to comply with the requirement M4 (3) (2) b of the Building Regulations 2010 Approved Document M: Access to and use of buildings. I wish to reiterate my comments in my e mail dated 4 November 2020:- Is there a way of ensuring the 2 wheelchair user dwellings are secured in phase one before planning approve the RM? This will allow us to meet the needs of specific families more cost-effectively because it is more efficient to work with the developer to think about layout at the start. The dwellings shall be of the necessary size to meet the need.</p> <p>The properties, for rent and sale, would need to be advertised to those persons with a local connection to North Devon Council's area.</p>
<p>Ilfracombe Town Council</p> <p>Reply Received 16 June 2020</p>	<p>Recommendation - members felt that there was no information or references relating to Eco build standards and had concerns with drainage, density, and the lack of connectivity to the town, therefore, this application was moved for REFUSAL and with all members in favour the motion was carried. Cllrs P Crabb and G Fowler declared an interest in this application and did not vote. 1 member of public left the meeting after this application had been discussed.</p>
<p>Ilfracombe Town Council</p> <p>Reply Received 18 December 2020</p>	<p>We are writing to respond to the latest documents filed for applications 71532 and 71537.</p> <p>There is obviously a need for sports pitch provision in Ilfracombe but there appears to have been little or no consultation with either the football or rugby clubs. The proposed provision also falls short of the original intention.</p> <p>The site is very special and is in a sensitive position, being adjacent to AONB land and within sight of the Exmoor dark skies zone. As Local Plan policy ILF01 states the new development must</p>

integrate within the existing landscape setting and minimise its impact on these areas.

The development does look as if it is being placed onto the landscape rather than integrated: it appears from the plans that some of the buildings may affect the sky line; in their response to questions from the Local Planning Authority on this the developer refers to a photomontage showing that the skyline is not broken by built form. This photomontage is identical to the one produced in July 2014, which was a very different layout, so makes one wonder why it was referenced at all in this plan (the earlier plan had a wide expanse of green space, including the playing fields, in the centre of the site whereas the playing fields in this plan have been moved south and reduced in size with building in the centre).

Policy ILF01 looks for a distinctive, safe, sustainable, and high quality development. The development should also reflect and complement the character of Ilfracombe. There is no attempt to reflect the terraces, albeit in a modern vernacular, and the driver for this appears to be accommodating parking at individual properties. Some of the best designs in the country have designed the development for people first, with a more imaginative approach to car parking, e.g. Norwich where the streets are free of parked cars, except for loading and unloading, and cars are parked in purpose-built spaces close by.

The buildings themselves lack imagination and could be found in any town anywhere in the country: this is not distinctive nor would it be seen as high quality design.

There is no indication in the plans of what measures are being incorporated to reduce energy demand and improve energy efficiency. There are no schemes mentioned to utilise renewable energy, or to take the opportunity to create a district heating scheme.

We welcome the approach to landscaping with the stress on planting for wildlife and biodiversity. The sustainable drainage strategy looks adequate but does not appear to incorporate additional water storage areas, e.g. soil bunds, ponds, rain gardens as per ILF01 "a sustainable water strategy that reduces water usage, incorporates additional water storage areas compared to normal sustainable drainage systems": these also help to improve biodiversity.

What consideration has been given to waste and recycling storage and collection: access for vehicles as well as space in the housing units?

In terms of connection with the rest of the town, ILF01 supported by the Ilfracombe Transport Master Plan expects to see a "permeable and connected network of streets, footpaths and cycleways...that connect to and safeguard future linkages to adjoining parts of the town". It is quite important that the development feels connected to the town even though it is outside

	<p>the current built zone. It is unclear to see if the footpath and cycle path that runs parallel to New Barnstaple Road connects to the roundabout above Tesco. It would also be helpful to have a bus stop located within the development itself rather than just on New Barnstaple Road.</p> <p>The town council is not averse in principle to the development but we remain to be convinced that the current plan meets the expectations outlined in ILF01.</p>
<p>Ilfracombe Town Council</p> <p>Reply Received 16 February 2021</p>	<p>Recommendation - Members felt this application does not meet the requirements of ILF01 of the Local Plan, therefore this application was moved for Refusal and with all members in favour, the motion was carried.</p>
<p>North Devon AONB Service</p>	<p>No response</p>
<p>North Devon AONB Service</p> <p>Reply Received 19 October 2020</p>	<p>The AONB Partnership has decided not to make a representation with regard to these applications.</p>
<p>Open Space Officer</p> <p>Reply Received 29 May 2020</p>	<p>Please can a schedule of accommodation for the 347 houses be provided to ensure the correct quantum and mix of informal open space is provided on site generated by this phase of the development. I note formal sport is dealt with via RM application 71532. In order to review the open space provision, I also require the exact quantum's of each element of public open space and green infrastructure proposed, broken down into informal, allotments, equipped play, orchard etc</p> <p>LEAP</p> <p>The LEAP is centrally located with good natural surveillance from footpaths and properties. The LEAP needs to provide 5 pieces of play equipment, seating litter bin and fencing. These elements have been provided in the proposal. Can you confirm the square meterage, it should be no less than 400sq.m.</p> <p>In terms of safety surfacing, grass matting has been proposed. This can prove to be problematic in terms of future maintenance. Preference would be for wet pour safety surfacing and this would reduce the ongoing requirements for the management company.</p> <p>Equipment should be in galvanised footings to ensure longevity, particularly in this sea air exposed environment.</p> <p>Item A is limited in use, can an alternative piece of 'climbing' equipment be added to complement, the swinging, balance and sliding play experience provided as part of items B C</p>

	<p>D & E. Please also confirm what the surface of the access paths will be?</p> <p>Allotment Please confirm the square meterage and how many allotment sites are proposed. These should be a minimum of 0.25 hectares. Will these be managed by the management company?</p> <p>Allotments required supporting facilities, please confirm whether storage sheds, water feed, vehicle access to loading unloading heavy goods will be provided to make these allotments fit for purpose.</p> <p>Orchard Note the orchard is provide, and assume maintenance falls to the management company and species suitable for sea air location.</p> <p>Layout Paths are indicated around the perimeter of the site, can you confirm the proposed surface.</p> <p>Maintenance Please identify the open space and green infrastructure maintenance by typology. I note landscaping plans have been provided but I have not seen maintenance schedules with frequency and responsibility address, please can confirm where this is location in the submission. In summary, I am not satisfied adequate information has been provided at this stage and request further information and a response to these requests.</p> <p>Further to my comments above, clarification is also sought on the community hall. Discussions at the time of the outline application recognised the importance for use of indoor tennis. Dimensions required for this to comply would be: 668m² (36.57 x 18.29m) with 9m height.</p>
<p>Open Space Officer</p> <p>Reply Received 23 November 2020</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Broadly speaking, the two pitches delivered to the dimensions outlined meet the policy requirements expected for this development. It is my view that these would support youth rugby and youth football, depending on the management model that is decided for the site. 2) The applicants drainage engineer has confirmed that the playing fields wouldn't need any surface water drainage. To support the level of usage expected at this site I disagree with this view. Whilst water will eventually percolate, this doesn't mean it is a suitable solution for a sports pitch. 3) The orientation of the pitches means it is unlikely that both could be used at the same time without installation of a ball net. 4) We are awaiting details relating to the MUGA, including specification and dimensions. 5) We are awaiting information on access paths to link the community building/changing rooms and the Sports pitches and

	<p>MUGA.</p> <p>6) In regards the community building, there is a lack of storage to serve the pitch uses. This should be accessible from outside.</p>
<p>Open Space Officer</p> <p>Reply Received 18 February 2021</p>	<p>18/2/21 Parks – Having reviewed the updated documentation for application 71532 and 71537, which are intrinsically linked, I have the following comments:</p> <p>1) We believe the developer has addressed our concerns regarding the equipped play area and we believe this to be acceptable.</p> <p>2) We recognise the change in pitch orientation to allow both to run side by side. We believe this to be acceptable.</p> <p>3) The applicant is suggesting that the sports pitch will not need a formal drainage system. Considering the cross sections provided which show steep banking that will in effect cause water to move toward the pitch we believe the pitch should have a primary and secondary drainage as part of the design in-line with Sport England’s guidance of natural turf pitches.</p> <p>4) The inclusion of two storage containers at the pitch site is a positive step. May we suggest this be increased to three so that one each can be provided for the school, rugby club and football club.</p> <p>5) We recognise that the changing rooms have been increased in size to cater for rugby and we believe this to now be acceptable. However with only one set of changing rooms provided and two pitches to serve we recommend the community building/changing rooms have the addition of bag storage space that can be accessed from outside so that changing rooms can be used on a staggered arrangement and left clear for the next users. In effect the bag storage will need to be big enough to be divided into 4 lockable areas, each area big enough for approximately 20 bags.</p> <p>6) In regards to the official changing room in the community building. This should be accessible from outside. Could the location of the officials room be swapped with the first aid office and an external door added?</p>
<p>Planning Policy Unit</p> <p>Reply Received 3 June 2020</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting the Planning Policy team concerning the above reserved matters applications for the erection of 347 dwellings, associated infrastructure and outdoor sports provision. From a policy perspective, apart from this first phase of development requiring to be in accordance with the adopted Local Plan in terms of the proposed layout and design, it must also adhere to condition 9 of outline planning permission 56675. As you are aware, policy officers have contributed extensively to the progression of this site and I would wish to ensure that this response is considered alongside other previous responses. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that if regard is to be had to the development plan in the determination of a planning application</p>

then the determination must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. As you are aware, the Council have a recently adopted Local Plan (October 2018) which was considered by the Inspector to be 'Sound' and in general conformity with the NPPF; therefore, policies in the Local Plan are up to date. The NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions.

However, following the Burwood appeal decision in Torridge, the Councils recognise that they are currently unable to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing land sufficient to meet their housing requirements; with the appeal determining there to be a 4.23 year supply as of 1st April 2019, based on the application of a 20% buffer and the use of the 'Liverpool' method to distribute any backlog of under-delivery since the beginning of the plan period in 2011, over the remainder of the plan period up to 2031. Therefore, National planning policy (Footnote 7, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)) establishes that when a local planning authority is unable to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites, for the purposes of triggering the presumption in favour of sustainable development, it should consider the policies which are most

2

important for determining the application to be out-of-date. Accordingly, the presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 11(d), NPPF as a material consideration), should be applied for decision-taking involving applications for housing.

Whilst this current application, which as you are aware is on an allocated housing site within the Local Plan and therefore not considered to be a challenge against the Council's 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites, I would wish to fully understand how this development will contribute to the Council's housing trajectory.

Firstly, I welcome the fact that this project may be finally moving forward and the community's vision within Policy ILF01 can start to be realised and delivered over the coming years.

However, I would caution that this development must deliver a high quality mixed-use development, including the necessary infrastructure that integrates within the existing landscape setting and contributes to the town's economic regeneration. Policy would not wish to support a solely housing focussed development on the southern edge of Ilfracombe, which in my opinion would not deliver a sustainable form of development and would not achieve the vision and spatial strategy for Ilfracombe. Policy must therefore question how and when the mixed-use hub will be delivered which I assume will also include the 50-bed extra care housing scheme although I accept that this, as well as

delivery of the new primary school may be issues for DCC to confirm.

Phase A (Channel Farm) was considered by a DRP meeting and site visit in February 2020 and subsequent panel recommendations dated April 2020. Paragraph 129 of the NPPF (February 2019) makes it clear that all necessary tools and processes should be used in order to improve the design of development including having regard to any recommendations made by the design review panel. The DRP also recommends that due regard is afforded to the 'National Design Guide' on character, climate, connectivity and community even though it was published post 2017 but should be a material consideration for the Reserved Matters. As you are aware, the panel welcomed the overall design principles for site delivery and these should be at the forefront of delivering a sustainable new community for Ilfracombe :-

- A new gateway to the town, giving a positive impression;
- A sustainable mixed-use neighbourhood;
- A well connected network of transport modes;
- A diverse framework of landscape and open space; and
- Designing for Ilfracombe in terms of its character and distinctiveness

As I set out previously, there were concerns as to how the proposed layout has evolved following the DRP recommendations so I welcome the developers commentary to the panel's comments. From a policy perspective, there was some concern with the lack of information / detail presented to the DRP so may I suggest that a further presentation is made to the panel either as a full meeting or as a desktop report although there would not be an in principle objection if you do not consider this to be necessary. However, this greenfield site is within the defined development boundary for Ilfracombe where the principle of housing is acceptable in accordance with Policy ST06 of the Local Plan. As an allocated housing site, Policy ILF01 has a clear vision for the Ilfracombe Strategic Southern Extension as to how it should be delivered and how it should contribute to Ilfracombe's economic regeneration. In total, the site seeks to deliver approximately 750 dwellings subject to the delivery of specific development principles as set out in Policy ILF01.

As Phase I of development, I note the developer is proposing 347 homes which equates to approximately 35 dph (19.5ha x 50% gross to net site size ratio within a critical drainage area = 347/9.79) across the whole site, a density that is not considered unreasonable for a strategic urban extension as guided by the SHLAA Methodology although it is accepted the assumptions applied to individual sites will be subject to a flexible application, to take account of any

specific local circumstances. I also note that a slightly lower density is proposed for the area to the north 'High Villas' which is up to 33 dph although I do not fully understand the statement within the 'Design Principles Document' as to how the density has decreased along the eastern edges in order to transition with the green infrastructure, in my opinion the site layout still proposes mainly semi-detached homes of a similar density to that proposed further west. However, there is no policy objection in principle to the density proposed so long as it works in planning and highway terms.

3

Policy ST18(1a) of the Local Plan will expect housing developments over the threshold to provide on-site delivery of affordable housing equal to 30% of the total number of dwellings (gross) although I do accept that outline planning permission 56675 only managed to secure 11% affordable housing due to concerns around viability subject to a viability review. I accept the agreed s106 seeks a viability review prior to the occupation of the 150th dwelling although I would question whether such a review mechanism could be re-considered in recognition that Phase A has the benefit of substantial up-front Government funding to help deliver some of the critical infrastructure and in recognition that Ilfracombe has a relatively high need for affordable housing.

In this instance there should be an on-site requirement of at least 38 affordable dwellings with the .17 of a dwelling being collected through a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value to that which would have been required on site (ST18, criterion 3). Also, you must be assured that the proposed housing mix will meet the identified housing need in accordance with Policies ST17 and ILF01. I do accept that the affordable housing mix proposed does reflect the percentages required within the s106 agreement attached to application 56675.

Policy ILF01 seeks to deliver approximately 750 dwellings on land at Channel, Winsham and Bowden Farms over a number of phases with an emphasis on providing a mix of house types, tenures and sizes to reflect local need. It would appear from the proposed site layout that the developers are seeking to deliver the following:

- 1 bed – 6 units (2% of total)
- 2 bed – 158 units (46% of total)
- 3 bed – 149 units (43% of total)
- 4 bed – 34 units (10% of total)

Clearly there is a potential imbalance here with an obvious emphasis on delivering 2 and 3 bed units on this site.

Clause (1) of policy ST17 provides a mechanism to influence the mix of housing on proposals. The HEDNA can be

used for evidence of need - including house sizes. More localised evidence, such as housing needs surveys, can be used if they are available and up-to-date. The policy is intended to influence both market and affordable tenures. On smaller schemes, the mix should generally be taking account of local character and context, on larger schemes such as this however, a more 'proportionate mix' should generally be the starting point. Page 180 of the HEDNA (CE21) provides guidance on the mix of bed sizes by tenure that would be appropriate to help meet identified housing needs. I have provided an extract from the HEDNA (Table 114: Recommended Housing Mix – page 214) which identifies the recommended housing mix across the Plan area.

1 – bed	2 – bed	3 – bed	4 – bed
Market	5-10%	30-35%	40-45%
Affordable	30-35%	35-40%	20-25%
All Dwellings	15%	35%	15%

15-20%

Whilst the evidence is clear, the latent demand for 2 and 3 bed units is relatively high (35% of all dwellings) although it is accepted that this figure could increase or decrease accordingly based on the specific settlement need. Whilst the provision of 2 and 3 bed units is higher than the perceived local need, I am slightly concerned with the current mix although there is no fundamental policy objection in principle to a slightly higher number of 2 and 3 bed units being proposed in Ilfracombe albeit you may wish to seek a balance that is more in line with the evidence. You must be assured that this proposed housing mix will meet the numbers, type, size and tenure to meet the identified local housing needs in accordance with Policies ST17 and ILF01(2g). Although not specifically set out within Policy ILF01 and therefore not a requirement, the Government are committed to increase the supply of housing whereby local authorities are required to keep a register of those seeking to acquire serviced plots in the area for their own self-build and custom house building. This approach is also recognised at paragraph 7.19 of the Local Plan which states 'the Government is seeking to increase the supply of housing through self-build schemes (including individually built properties, custom built developer schemes and the provision of self-build housing through co-operatives and community land trusts). The Councils will support construction of self-build schemes where they accord with the wider spatial strategy and will keep under review how to provide appropriate support for such development'. If such an opportunity would exist on part of this site then, during the decision making process could this be explored with the developer. Although evidence from the North Devon register would suggest that demand is relatively low, there is some demand for self/custom

4

housebuilding in this area and if opportunities were to exist for part of this site to be safeguarded for an element of self-build then this would be fully supported by policy. The design and layout of the development should be considered against Policies ST02, ST03, ST04, ST05(1), ILF, ILF01, DM01, DM04 of the local plan and the National Design Guide. It is also worth noting that criterion 2 of DM04 will expect all major residential proposals such as this, to be supported by a Building for Life 12 assessment where the developer must minimise 'amber' scores and avoid 'red' scores. It would appear the developer has not submitted a BfL12 assessment therefore, for this current layout and design to be acceptable in policy terms the reserved matters application must be accompanied by an appropriate BfL12 assessment. From a policy perspective, it would have been encouraging to see the 'Design and Access' Statement having a specific section as to how the development is dealing with issues around sustainability and climate change although I do accept that passing references have been made throughout the document. Once a BfL12 assessments has been submitted, you must ensure the report and analysis is critically examined in order to achieve the policy objectives.

As set out previously, critical to the success of achieving a high quality design on this particular part of the site is ensuring it integrates within the existing landscape setting of the town whilst minimising impact on the adjoining AONB and dark night skies over Exmoor National Park (ILF01(2b)). This concern was also picked up at the DRP where it was recognised that this part of the town is set apart from the town and runs the risk of becoming isolated and could effectively be a 'hilltop community' and it was therefore essential that homes were built 'in the landscape' as opposed to 'on the landscape'. Consequently a landscape-led approach to development is required. The DRP felt that such an approach to design and layout will assist with mitigating the wider visual impact of the scheme from many sensitive viewpoints around the site. It should also be noted that the site is within the Coastal and Estuarine Zone where Policy ST09 will apply although paragraph 4.39 makes it clear that this site forms part of the developed coast as it is within the defined settlement of Ilfracombe. From a policy perspective, I am not convinced that this is a landscape-led approach to developing this site but rather a housing-led approach in terms of delivering numbers. Therefore, you must ensure that the current proposal achieves the objectives as set out within policy as well as the recommendations of the DRP.

As set out in paragraph 6.5 of the Local Plan, 'all development will

be expected to provide a net gain in biodiversity where feasible. Where biodiversity assets cannot be retained or enhanced on site, the Councils will support 'biodiversity offsetting' to deliver a net gain in bio-diversity off-site'. If there is some loss of existing habitat then this should be mitigated against by providing additional planting on or off site. The Defra metric should be used to ensure there is an overall net gain in biodiversity. I welcome the increased landscaping and planting on the eastern boundary that should complement and also enhance existing woodland at Warmscombe Woods and the TPO at Chambercombe Manor but I would wish to ensure that appropriate connections are made between existing and proposed planting in order to provide suitable networks and habitats for wildlife to move through the site and provide the necessary net gain in biodiversity. I would also wish to ensure that such provision is provided along the western boundary to ensure integration with the remaining part of the allocation. Also, in accordance with paragraph 10.316 of the Local Plan you must ensure the development is designed to complement its sensitive landscape setting and that it will provide a transitional boundary between the development and adjacent countryside that reflects the local landscape character (ILF01(2c)). All issues around ecology should be considered against ST14, ILF01 and DM08 including the response from Mark Saunders / Andrew Jones.

Paragraph 13.68 of the adopted Local Plan clearly sets out that new development will be required to make provision for public open space, recreation, sports facilities and green infrastructure and where possible, such facilities should be provided on site as an integral part of the development. Policy ILF01(1d) requires the development to deliver formal and informal open spaces together with recreational facilities. Again, I welcome the proposed green space (LEAP) on the site's plateau but would question whether the size and type of space is sufficient to meet the needs of the development proposed and the DRP response for 'an opportunity for a flexible village green like open space on the plateau' as well as the sports provision to the south. I also welcome the inclusion of allotments as part of the green infrastructure on the eastern side of the development. I would however provide comment on the triangular piece of land to the SE of the proposed sports pitches adjacent the proposed landscape bund/tree planting. I note the land is outside of the red line but within the land ownership of the developer and therefore I would question whether there was an opportunity in this area to provide additional sports provision or tree planting for example rather than the inclusion of a new boundary. I would also request

5

further details of any lighting scheme proposed for the development including the sports pitches in order to help safeguard the dark night skies as required by policy. You must ensure the proposal delivers green infrastructure in accordance with Policies ILF01 and DM10 and the standards as set out in Table 13.1 together with guidance from the consultation response of Lucinda Wheeler.

I also welcome the network of footpaths/cycleways within the site and I note how these will connect to the wider site allocation to the west as well as achieving connections to the existing network of footpaths/cycleways adjoining the site boundaries as required by criterion (3a) of Policy ILF01. The DRP correctly pointed out that Tesco will be used extensively by the new community. Therefore, I would just question whether there is a more direct route through the site in to Tesco at the NW corner which is safeguarded for the mixed-use hub. In my opinion good footpath and cycle links are essential from this site to avoid unnecessary car journeys whilst accepting that such links are challenging. It needs to be clear as to how people will move within and through all parts of the site (Phase A) as well as out of the site in to the adjoining development to the west, the town and surrounding countryside.

Policy DM06 does not specify particular parking standards but provides a flexible criteria based approach to parking provision that enables development proposals to respond to local circumstances. It will however require development proposals to provide an appropriate scale and range of parking provision to meet anticipated needs having regard to accessibility and sustainability of the site; availability to public transport; and provision of safe walking and cycling routes. Paragraph 13.51 recognises that in order to transition to a low carbon economy and a move to lower emission transport, regard should be given, as part of the provision of an appropriate range of parking, to providing electric vehicle charging infrastructure. You should ensure the development includes adequate provision for electric vehicle charging infrastructure.

From a policy perspective, the site is on the southern edge of the town where opportunities for safe cycling and walking exist, albeit severely limited by topography, linkages to the west not being available and distance to the town centre. The site is served by a frequent public transport route between Ilfracombe and Barnstaple but may require further enhancement as I understand the route does not operate during the evening. I note there is no vehicular access to the sports pitches to the south which is generally supported in principle. I also note that the proposed community building and associated car parking is

	<p>intended to provide the necessary changing and parking facilities for those who wish to have use of the new sports provision, again this multi-functional use is welcomed. I would also wish to ensure there is appropriate pedestrian and cycle access in to the new primary school, community building and sports facilities for all users. You must therefore be satisfied that the level of proposed off-street car parking, including cycle parking to serve the development will meet the needs of the intended occupants.</p> <p>All highway matters should be considered against Policies ST10, ILF(l), ILF01(3), DM05 and DM06 together with the response of the local highway authority.</p> <p>Ilfracombe is within a 'critical drainage area' where you must ensure that development incorporates additional water storage areas compared to normal urban drainage systems in accordance with Policies ST03, ILF(n) and ILF01(2h) of the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>On balance, the principle of housing on this site is acceptable subject to the above policy considerations being satisfactorily addressed, including those recommendations set out by the DRP. I trust the above policy advice is of assistance to you but should you wish to discuss the matter further then please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>
<p>Planning Policy Unit</p> <p>Reply Received 23 November 2020</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting the Planning Policy team concerning the above reserved matters applications for the erection of 347 dwellings, associated infrastructure and outdoor sports provision (71532). From a policy perspective, apart from this first phase of development requiring to be in accordance with the adopted Local Plan in terms of the proposed layout and design, it must also adhere to condition 9 of outline planning permission 56675 and 62544.</p> <p>As you are aware, policy officers have contributed extensively to the progression of this site and I would wish to ensure this response is considered alongside other previous responses as the content of which is still considered relevant to the determination of these applications.</p> <p>Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that if regard is to be had to the development plan in the determination of a planning application then the determination must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. As you are aware, the Council have a recently adopted Local Plan (October 2018) which was considered by the Inspector to be 'Sound' and in general conformity with the NPPF; therefore, policies in the Local Plan are up to date. The NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions.</p> <p>This greenfield site is within the defined development boundary for</p>

Ilfracombe where the principle of development is acceptable in accordance with Policies ST06, ILF and ILF01 of the adopted Local Plan.

Firstly, I welcome that the developer has now submitted a BfL12 assessment which I note has been considered as achieving 12 'greens' which would be accredited as being 'Outstanding'. For information, I understand BfL12 has been re-launched as 'Building for a Healthy Life' (BHL), although the principle remains that its aim is to improve the design of new and growing neighbourhoods. Whilst this initial score is clearly welcomed and supported from a policy perspective, I would wish to ensure the report and analysis is critically examined and challenged where considered appropriate in order to achieve the policy objectives. To support you in this validation, you may wish to seek an independent analysis of the BfL12 assessment by the South West Design Review Panel similar to that carried out on other housing developments in North Devon.

From a policy perspective, there was concern with the lack of information/detail presented by the developer to the Design Review Panel in February 2020. The proposed layout needs to take on board the issues raised as part of the Design Review Panel's initial feedback. I understand there is some local concern regarding the layout and design of Phase I (Channel Farm) as currently proposed. In my opinion, this concern is based on the community being offered a very different proposal for the southern extension to Ilfracombe and in particular at Channel Farm, albeit this only considered to be indicative and submitted from a different agent/developer which as far as I am aware was not conditioned as part of the outline permission 56675. However, the community were actively involved in the site's transition at the pre-application stage through extensive public engagement and generally supportive of the development proposed so I can fully understand the concerns that are now being expressed. It is vitally important that the delivery of Phase I is successful in terms of its overall design, layout and how it integrates with the existing town because if this development gets it wrong then it will potentially have adverse implications for the delivery of critical infrastructure for the town and subsequent phases to the west (approximately 400 dwellings). Phase I and subsequent phases need to be creating a new neighbourhood within the town, not just a residential extension bolted on to the southern edge. There is some concern with the development of four storey (including roof) apartment blocks on a relatively prominent part of the site especially when viewed from Old Barnstaple Road and would question whether this is an appropriate design solution for this part of the site? Therefore, may I encourage you to suggest the site is re-considered by the DRP with this additional information (layout, design, landscaping etc.) either as a full meeting or as a desktop report although there would not be an in principle objection if you do not consider this to be

necessary or appropriate.

The design and layout of the development should be considered against Policies ST02, ST03, ST04, ST05(1), ILF, ILF01, DM01, DM04 of the local plan, the National Design Guide as well as the recommendations set out by the South West Design Review Panel (Creating Excellence) in their report dated 6th April 2020.

In terms of the proposed use of land south of the new housing for outdoor sports provision (Use Class D2), I make the following comments. You will recall I mentioned in previous responses that 'you must ensure the proposal delivers green infrastructure in accordance with Policies ILF01 and DM10 and the standards as set out in Table 13.1 together with guidance from the consultation response of Lucinda Wheeler'. I note further detail has been submitted with the planning application 71532 around the proposed uses for the sports provision which includes a MUGA and two junior rugby pitches.

The following table sets out the open space requirements for the proposed development of up to 750 homes, assuming an average of 2.2 persons per dwelling.

Housing Development of 750 Dwellings :- 750 x 2.2 persons per household = 1,650 persons / 1,000 (= 1.65)

Typology	Requirement from New Development ha/1000 population	
	Total for Open Space Requirement (ha)	
Allotments	1.65 x 0.15 ha	0.24 ha
Amenity / Natural Green Space	1.65 x 2.0 ha	3.3 ha
Play Space (Children)	1.65 x 0.05 ha	0.08 ha
Play Space (Youth)	1.65 x 0.02 ha	0.03 ha
Parks, Sport & Recreation	1.65 x 1.3 ha	2.14 ha

Paragraph 10.339 of the Local Plan recognises that Ilfracombe has a substantial deficiency of existing sports facilities within the town. Therefore, land at Channel Farm which forms part of the strategic southern extension has been recognised as the most suitable area to deliver a sports hub for the new neighbourhood as it offers the only relatively flat area. Whilst there is no policy objection in principle to this proposed provision, I am concerned the development is only delivering two junior rugby pitches and a MUGA. I am also concerned that part of this flat land is being safeguarded for future changing facilities and a car park. As flat land in the town is very limited to provide additional sports pitches for the local community, I would suggest any new car park/changing facilities should be developed in association with the new community building and not on land that should be developing sports pitches. In my opinion, it cannot be argued Phase I should

only be providing a proportion of the total requirement for the sport and recreation provision as this flat land needs to deliver the sports provision for the whole strategic site allocation (ILF01), as well as open space in associated with the new school. Some of the other open space requirements from the development as a whole could be accommodated on other (sloping) parts of this wider site allocation. The policy is clear in that the sports provision should be delivered at Channel Farm as set out above and it is important for all the different types to be provided, with appropriate accessibility for the proposed residents. It would appear the proposed sports pitch provision is approximately 1ha (pitch space only - excluding run-off areas & pitch separation) across a proposed site area of approximately 5 hectares. The breakdown from pitch provision alone is as follows - MUGA: 685m²; Rugby Pitch 1: 7,000m²; Rugby Pitch 2: 2,580m². Clearly, the focus on formal sports and recreation provision to serve the development, wider Ilfracombe and surrounding rural catchment is on the delivery of rugby pitches only.

I accept that Policy ILF01 does not specify a particular form of sport for those 2.14 hectares of formal and informal sport and recreation facilities and there is a clear recognition in the town that Ilfracombe is substantially deficient in all existing sports facilities. However, the 'Northern Devon Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) – Executive Summary August 2017' recognises a particular concern to meet the future demand for football in northern Devon which can only be met through new provision, either grass and/or artificial grass pitches, including Ilfracombe. Paragraph 5.11 of the NDPPS states: 'the total number of additional football teams expected in 2031 in the Ilfracombe sub area, taking into account aspirations, latent demand and trends in participation is: 1.9 senior teams, 0.1 women's teams, 2.2 junior boys' teams, 0.7 girls' teams and 2.2 mini teams. There is no spare capacity at peak time in Ilfracombe itself; existing pitches are being overplayed and there is no room to accommodate growth. There is a junior pitch on school land which is currently not being used'. The report concluded that there would be a need for 'a minimum of one adult pitch, one junior and one mini pitch will be required in Ilfracombe to meet demand generated by the proposed new housing within the Southern Extension. I note these concerns have also been expressed by Sport England and Lucinda Wheeler. The response from Sport England of the 11th June sets out 'the Football Foundation (FF) on behalf of the FA and Devon FA advise that the North Devon Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) confirms that there is no spare grass pitch capacity in Ilfracombe and that existing pitches are being overplayed and there is currently no room to accommodate growth. The Playing Pitch Strategy also suggests that a need of 1x11v11 adult pitch, 1x11v11 junior pitch and 1x mini pitch would support future demand in the area'. The PPS also recognised that another cricket pitch was required in the town as a shared facility with football pitches. In

terms of rugby, the PPS recommended 'building in capacity to Ilfracombe RFC at Brimlands, to ensure that rugby will be able to expand as juniors develop up through the age bands. This includes safeguarding land alongside the main pitch'.

In recognition of this evidence, I am therefore very surprised the principal focus for the provision of formal sport and recreation facilities at the proposed new sports hub is for rugby only. Based on the published evidence, I would suggest the principal focus should be on additional pitch provision for football and not rugby. However if it was felt appropriate, a mix of formal sports pitches could be provided to serve the development, wider Ilfracombe and surrounding rural catchment. It does not appear from the submitted plans that the MUGA or formal sports and recreation provision is proposing floodlighting. If such provision is required then any floodlighting will need to be designed to minimise light pollution and any harm to the amenities of proposed residential properties in accordance with Policy DM01 and protecting the dark night skies over Exmoor and the AONB.

I welcome the increased landscaping and planting on the southern and eastern boundary but again, I would wish to ensure it complements and also enhances existing woodland at Warmcombe Woods and the TPO at Chambercombe Manor. Appropriate connections should be made between existing and proposed planting in order to provide suitable networks and habitats for wildlife to move through the site and provide the necessary net gain in biodiversity. I would also wish to ensure that such provision is provided along the entire western boundary to ensure integration with the remaining part of the allocation. Also, in accordance with paragraph 10.316 of the Local Plan you must ensure the development is designed to complement its sensitive landscape setting and that it will provide a transitional boundary between the development and adjacent countryside that reflects the local landscape character (ILF01(2c)). All issues around ecology and landscaping should be considered against ST14, ILF01 and DM08 including the response from Mark Saunders.

I would appreciate evidence from the developer as to when housing will be delivered in order for that information to inform the Council's housing trajectory.

Phase I of this strategic urban extension to Ilfracombe is welcomed and there is no policy objection in principle to the submitted proposals subject to the above policy considerations being adequately addressed. However as I have set out previously, policy would not wish to support a solely housing focussed development on the southern edge of Ilfracombe, which in my opinion would not deliver a sustainable form of development and would not achieve the vision and spatial strategy for Ilfracombe.

	<p>Policy must again question how and when the mixed-use hub will be delivered which I assume will also include the 50-bed extra care housing scheme although I accept that this, as well as delivery of the new primary school may be issues for DCC to confirm. I must also question whether the amount and type of land proposed for formal sport and recreation is policy compliant in terms of Policy ILF01 and DM10 of the Local Plan. Also, you may wish to question whether the proposed layout and design of development is the most appropriate for this site having due regard to its landscape setting and visual prominence in the wider landscape including the AONB.</p> <p>I trust the above comments are of assistance to you but should you wish to discuss the matter further then please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>
<p>Planning, Transportation & Environment</p> <p>Reply Received 26 May 2020</p>	<p>I'm responding as the WPA in relation to the above application. The outline permission associated with this development is 56675. Condition 50 of the decision notice for that application states "no development of any Phase shall take place until a Waste Audit Statement for waste arising from construction of the development within that Phase has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority". I cannot see that such a statement has been submitted with the reserved matters documents, although a 'Refuse Strategy Plan' has been provided. Ideally this statement should have been provided as part of the reserved matters application and this is still our preference. However, if not, any reserved matters permission should incorporate an appropriate precommencement condition.</p>
<p>Planning, Transportation & Environment</p> <p>Reply Received 17 November 2020</p>	<p>We've been reconsulted on this. I am responding in the County's role as WPA. I cannot see that a Waste Audit Statement has been submitted with the updated/additional information and therefore my earlier comments of 23 May 2020 still apply.</p>
<p>Recycling & Commercial Services</p>	<p>No response.</p>
<p>Recycling & Commercial Services</p>	<p>No response</p>
<p>South West Water</p> <p>Reply Received</p>	<p>I refer to the above application and would advise that South West Water has no objection. The intention to requisition an offsite foul sewer to the public network is noted and a suitable point of connection</p>

28 May 2020	will be determined as a part of that process in accordance with Section 98 of The Water Act.
South West Water Reply Received 13 November 2020	<p>I refer to the above application and would advise that whilst there are objections the foul drainage strategy proposes the requisitioning of a new offsite foul sewer (to be provided by South West Water) the final point of connection to the existing public sewer network may not be as proposed in that strategy but will rather be determined by South West Water upon receipt of a formal requisition under Section 98 of The Water Act.</p> <p>17/2/21 Regarding the further plans submitted in respect of the above application I would advise that South West Water has no comment.</p>
Sport England	No response
Sport England Reply Received 22 May 2020	<p>Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above application. I can confirm that the consultation has been received and was accepted on 22/05/2020.</p> <p>In accordance with Paragraph 011 of NPPG (Article 22 of the Development Management Procedure (England) Order 2015), Sport England will respond to this consultation within 21 days of the date of acceptance.</p> <p>However, if insufficient information is received in order to allow us to make a substantive response to the consultation, Sport England will contact you to request further information. The 21 day deadline will not commence until receipt of the additional information.</p> <p>As a public body, Sport England is subject to the terms of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, which gives members of the public the right to access the information we hold. In the event of a request being received, we will be obliged to release information relating to the application and our response unless an exemption in the Act applies. You should therefore inform us if you believe any elements of your submission to be confidential or commercially sensitive so that we can take your concerns into account.</p> <p>If you would like any further information or advice please contact the undersigned at the address below</p>
Sustainability Officer	No response
Sustainability Officer	I discussed this pair of applications with Andy Jones some time ago and it was decided that he would handle all elements of the response given his existing involvement

Reply Received 1 July 2020	with the site. Please let me know if you discussions with Andy leave any further work that I can be of assistance with.
Sustainability Officer	No response
Reply Received 5 February 2021	

Neighbours

Comments	No Objection	Object	Petition	No. Signatures
7	<u>0.00</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>

Affect on water mains pipe to Francis House.
Not eco-friendly (just to building regs standards) or landmark buildings.
Insulation, solar panels, electric charging points, heating?
Doesn't demonstrate high quality sustainable development. Passing reference to sustainability.
BfL12 not submitted.
Meeting local housing needs?
Failure to quantify Biodiversity Net Gain.
Lack of sustainable transport provision. Additional traffic and lack of cycle connection.
Difficult to consider properly during Covid.
Lack of architectural merit.
Impact on appearance of the area.
Loss of privacy (to 4 Kneller Close).
Clarification of document content required.
Will houses be carbon neutral, have heat pumps/solar panels/water reclamation etc?
Insufficient infrastructure e.g. medical/educational facilities.
Loss of greenfield site.
Impact on dark skies.
Needs to be cut into the hillside, not sit on top.
Dreadful looking houses and flats. No innovative design. Soulless.
Inadequate access roads (B3230), particularly during construction.
Boundary of ISE moved through location of sports pitches further south.
Lack of clarity on primary school and medical centre.
Ffl's don't take account of exposed nature of site/lack of screening.
AH should be 30%.
Impact on wildlife.
Undemocratic decision making process.
What safeguards are in place for other facilities to be provided?
Driven by developer greed.
Need for traffic calming.
How will use as second/holiday homes be controlled?
Lack of related employment.
Need for bat boxes.
Density.
Planting proposals.

Considerations

Proposal Description

This application seeks approval of reserved matters in respect of access, layout, appearance, scale and landscaping for phase A, comprising community building and residential development of 347 units and associated green infrastructure.

Additionally, consent is sought for discharge/partial discharge of certain conditions attached to the outline planning permission, particularly where they relate to reserved matters. These are conditions 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 27, 28, 31, 32, 43 and 51. Other outline conditions will be discharged at a later date. A copy of the outline planning permission 56675 is attached to this report for reference at **Appendix B**.

This reserved matters application is submitted pursuant to outline planning permission ref. 56675 issued on 24th May 2017 (and the subsequent non-material amendment application ref 70654) in respect of land to the east of Old Barnstaple Road south of Ilfracombe, which established the principle of this development.

That planning permission was subject to a comprehensive Section 106 Agreement that controls the provision of: affordable housing; on-site public open space and its maintenance/management; mixed use hub land; community building; contribution to youth and health services; cemetery contribution; education contribution; school site; and, highway contribution.

In December 2019 North Devon Council entered into a funding agreement with Homes England to forward fund roads, drainage, a community building, a Mixed Use Games Area (MUGA), and a serviced primary school site. The HIF funding loan commitment amounts to £6.5 million and is in two tranches. The first £619,242 was for planning and design related fees and has been drawn down already by Inox. The second tranche of monies will be used to deliver the infrastructure listed above.

It should be noted that a deed of variation is required to reflect changes brought about by HIF funding requirements for infrastructure provision in connection with the development and this is currently being dealt with separately. This Deed of Variation will act as the repayment mechanism for these HIF monies (excluding first tranche payment - £619,242 and part of the Community building - £848,185). In addition, North Devon Council have entered into a separate contract with Inox Homes (Ilfracombe) Ltd, which sits behind the Deed of Variation. This requires repayment of the first tranche and also secures repayment of the monies secured by the DoV should that fall away.

Inox were never required to construct the Community building as part of the outline planning application, only to provide the land and contribute towards its delivery. It is however considered an important piece of infrastructure to deliver upfront, alongside the sports pitches. The HIF monies used to deliver the building, which cannot be secured back from Inox is £848,185. This will be sought back from the wider allocation.

The Funding agreement with Homes England is dependent upon a number of milestones and failure to adhere to these milestones can be treated as an 'Event of

Default' to the contract. The first milestone is securing reserved matters approval for the scheme. Homes England have already entered into a variation to the agreement to extend this milestone to the 31st March 2021. The remaining milestones relate to start on site of wider project (30th November 2021), first completions of housing (31st May 2022) and completion of HIF infrastructure (31st March 2023). Even if Homes England would agree to extend the planning milestone again (which we would have to agree with them) any further slip to the programme puts the remaining milestones in doubt and the infrastructure must be delivered by March 2023.

Whilst a number of objectors raise issues relating to the principle of this development, the reserved matters application now for consideration seeks only approval of details of access, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping and is not intended to revisit the principle.

Following discussions with the applicant, a series of amended plans have been submitted for consideration since the application was first submitted in May 2020.

A related, but separate application (71532) has been submitted in respect of land for outdoor sports provision on a site immediately to the south.

It should also be noted that a duplicate application 71582 has also been received.

Planning Considerations Summary

- Principle Planning Policy
- Reserved Matters (Condition 3)
- Discharge/Partial Discharge of Conditions

Planning Considerations

In the determination of a planning application Section 38 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 is relevant. It states that for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts, the determination is to be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan for this area includes the Devon Waste Plan and North Devon and Torridge Local Plan.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material consideration.

Principle Planning Policy

The site is allocated in the Local Plan as part of Policy ILF01.

Policy ILF01: Ilfracombe Strategic Southern Extension

(1) Land to the south of Ilfracombe, (about 63 hectares) as identified on Policies Map 7, will deliver a sustainable, high quality, mixed use development that includes:

(a) approximately 875 dwellings over two separate sites, the size and tenure of which will be reflective of local needs;

- (i) approximately 750 dwellings on land at Channel, Winsham and Bowden Farms; and
 - (ii) approximately 125 dwellings on land off Worth Road (Worth Meadows).
 - (b) approximately 1 hectare of land for economic development;
 - (c) a neighbourhood hub to include an additional 420 place primary school, medical facility and extra care housing scheme of approximately 50 bedspaces;
 - (d) formal and informal sport and recreation facilities; and
 - (e) provision within the sites for physical infrastructure, community facilities, and green infrastructure required by the development.
- (2) The sites will be developed in a comprehensive manner to deliver the following site specific development principles:
- (a) create a distinctive, safe, sustainable, high quality urban extension and new neighbourhood for Ilfracombe;
 - (b) integrate new development within the existing landscape setting of the town enhancing its character, minimising impacts on the adjoining North Devon Coast Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and safeguarding the dark night skies over Exmoor National Park;
 - (c) provide an appropriate transitional boundary between the development and adjacent countryside;
 - (d) provide a neighbourhood hub that forms a focus to meet the community's needs, establishes a new 'gateway' into Ilfracombe and makes provision for new space for business opportunities as well as complementary services and facilities rather than replacing those available elsewhere, particularly in the town centre;
 - (e) enhance and make connections to the existing network of local and strategic green infrastructure through and around the site including the provision of new footpaths, cycleways, public open spaces, wildlife corridors, formal and informal sport and recreation facilities;
 - (f) safeguard land immediately to the south of the cemetery for a future extension to the existing burial ground;
 - (g) provide a mix of house types, tenures and sizes of open market and affordable homes contributing towards the identified local needs; and
 - (h) provide a sustainable water strategy that reduces water usage, incorporates additional water storage areas compared to normal sustainable drainage systems and does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere in the town.
- (3) The transport and connectivity strategy for the southern extension, as supported by the Ilfracombe Transport Master Plan will:
- (a) establish a permeable and connected network of streets, footpaths and cycleways across the site that connect to and safeguard future linkages to adjoining parts of the town;
 - (b) facilitate connections for motor vehicles, cycles and pedestrians between the proposed development, the town centre and key employment areas including increased opportunities for public transport links and sustainable travel choices within and around Ilfracombe to reduce reliance on the private motor car; and
 - (c) contribute towards improving strategic access into Ilfracombe along New and Old Barnstaple Roads.

With regard to consideration of the details of the development, another significant NDTLP policy is:

Policy DM04: Design Principles

(1) Good design seeks to guide overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials, access and appearance of new development. It seeks not just to

manage land use but support the creation of successful places and respond to the challenges of climate change. Development proposals need to have regard to the following design principles:

- (a) are appropriate and sympathetic to setting in terms of scale, density, massing, height, layout appearance, fenestration, materials and relationship to buildings and landscape features in the local neighbourhood;
 - (b) reinforce the key characteristics and special qualities of the area in which the development is proposed;
 - (c) are accessible to all, flexible to adaptation and innovative;
 - (d) contribute positively to local distinctiveness, historic environment and sense of place;
 - (e) create inclusive environments that are legible, connected and facilitate the ease of movement and permeability through the site, allowing everyone to easily understand and find their way around;
 - (f) retain and integrate existing landscape features and biodiversity to enhance networks and promote diversity and distinctiveness of the surrounding area;
 - (g) provide public and private spaces that are well designed, safe, attractive and complement the built form, designed to minimise anti-social and criminal behaviour;
 - (h) provide safe and appropriate highway access and incorporate adequate well-integrated car parking, pedestrian and cycle routes and facilities;
 - (i) ensure the amenities of existing and future neighbouring occupiers are safeguarded;
 - (j) incorporate appropriate infrastructure to enable connection to fast ICT networks;
 - (k) optimise the efficient use of land, and provide well-designed adaptable street patterns and minimise functionless open spaces;
 - (l) create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses and support local facilities and transport networks;
 - (m) consider opportunities for public art; and
 - (n) provide effective water management including Sustainable Drainage Systems, water efficiency measures and the reuse of rainwater.
- (2) All major residential proposals will be expected to be supported by a Building for Life 12 (BfL12) (or successor) assessment. High quality design should be demonstrated through the minimisation of "amber" and the avoidance of "red" scores.

Following the grant of outline planning permission, the details are required to comply with: Parameters Plan (1133-F-103 Rev E - received 12th May 2017); Design Statement (July 2014); Framework Plan; and, Strategic Landscape and Infrastructure Plan.

Since the grant of outline planning permission, the development of this first phase has also been the subject of assessment by the Design Review Panel. Their comments and the applicant responses are attached at **Appendix C**.

In terms of consideration of Design Principles, officers would have expected a Building for Life Assessment to have been provided with submission of the application and in fact even before that at the pre-application stage would have been desirable. A Building for a Healthy Life Assessment as it is now known has since been submitted.

The general principle is that this development must deliver a high quality mixed-use development, including the necessary infrastructure that integrates within the existing landscape setting and contributes to the town's economic regeneration.

The applicant states generally in terms of the 'Identity' of the development – *'The Community Building, centrally located at the heart of Phase A, will act as a focal point to the new community. The surrounding uses will be designed to complement this, and allow flexibility to sustain its use in the long term, and create a 'Community Hub'.*

A mixed use hub will also be created in the north western corner, maximising the footfall from residents traveling to the superstore and beyond into Ilfracombe to the north.

The remaining development, comprising residential land, will have two distinct character areas; High Villas and Hilltop Hamlets. These are expanded upon further on the following pages'.

Reserved Matters (Condition 1)

Dealing with each reserved matter in turn:

Access - this covers accessibility to and within the site for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians in terms of the positioning and treatment of access and circulation routes and how these fit into the surrounding access network.

The principal means of access to the site is to be provided from the Old Barnstaple Road. Phase A will be served by two vehicular access points connected by a looped Main Street from which a network of interconnecting streets and paths will provide legible and permeable routes around the development.

The initial response from the Local Highway Authority (which also applies to condition 17) raised a number of technical issues.

Amended plans have been submitted to address those concerns.

The further comments of DCC are awaited at the time of writing this report.

The applicant states that pedestrian links to the Tesco store to the north, will be via the footpath along the main road. Due to significant level differences and third-party land ownership, an access point directly into the rear of Tesco cannot be provided.

This is disappointing and an issue that has been raised both by the Design Review Panel and in consultation replies. Whilst it is understood that there are land ownership issues, the applicant was asked to reconsider this point to see what is possible along the northern boundary of the site, to provide a pedestrian only access.

Whilst a further response was that this is not possible for the reasons set out previously, officers have suggested showing an indicative footpath through the mixed-use hub to the northern boundary, which is now reflected on the plans and can be explored further as part of that separate reserved matters submission.

Following receipt of details of a planned bus shelter, a consultation response from the Town Council questioned whether an additional bus shelter might be provided. In response, the applicant advises that *'we are not running a bus route through the site. We would suggest that we look to incorporate a bus stop at both entrance points and would suggest the one nearest to the school land incorporates the shelter, the other*

could have a simple post stop and we can show this on an updated plan. All dwellings would be within acceptable walking distance of these bus stops. Updated plans have been received'.

Layout - the way in which buildings, routes and open spaces are provided within the development and their relationship to buildings and spaces outside the development.

The supporting Design Principles Document explains:
'Community Building, centrally located at the heart of Phase A, will act as a focal point to the new community. The surrounding uses will be designed to complement this, and allow flexibility to sustain its use in the long term, and create a 'Community Hub'.

A mixed use hub will also be created in the north western corner, maximising the footfall from residents traveling to the superstore and beyond into Ilfracombe to the north.

Block Layout & Addressing the Topography

The urban design principles adopted for development block and plot design are as follows:

1. To arrange blocks so that they overlook and form an appropriate transition to the public realm (including streets, retained landscape features, dedicated footway / cycleways and green space).
2. To ensure that streets and blocks allow for housing density ranges.
3. To ensure that blocks are practical and efficient in arrangement and allow delivery of attractive plot designs.
4. Seeking, wherever practical, to maximise solar gain and light penetration through building orientation.
5. To use 'closed blocks' as the preferred approach, as this will allow for secure private rear gardens.
6. Streets and block design should aim to 'work' with the site topography by following the contours. Well-designed retaining walls, earth banks and split level properties will need to be considered.

The development, comprising residential land, will have two distinct character areas:

Residential - Hilltop Hamlets Character Area

The Hilltop Hamlets residential character area should respond to the Community Hub at the centre of the scheme, actively addressing frontages and forming a logical movement framework to allow residents to access and encourage the use of the facilities.

This character area should have its own identity, and should respond to the different characteristics of the site.

The principles of the built form include:

- The creation of a series of housing 'clusters' around the Community Hub, that help to shelter and provide micro-climates for the residents in the winter weather.
- The internal space of the 'cluster' could take to the form of courtyards that are prevalent in the farm vernacular that was originally on the site and its surroundings. The reduced wind speed within the clusters will allow large stature trees to grow as focal points within a central 'green'.
- The external perimeter of the 'cluster' could be higher in density and form a more continuous frontage that can help shelter the back gardens.
- The built form should also respond to the key views out of the site to the north and east. More continuous frontages in these areas will define the space and frame the views.
- Where key views are framed by the built form, these should also create nodes of incidental public open space that can encourage people to congregate and socialise as part of a community. The additional planting within these green spaces will help to slow the wind and create shelter.
- If possible, additional secondary glimpsed views should be framed through the built form from the courtyards and out the landscape beyond.
- Building detailing could further respond to the farm courtyard, with timber cladding and detailing. The natural materials used will also help to set it apart from the rest of Ilfracombe, while taking cues from the surrounding landscape.

Residential - High Villas Character Area

Relating more with Ilfracombe, the High Villas residential character area needs to respond to the steep slopes that face the town.

This character area should take its design cues of layout and building detailing from the existing settlement of Ilfracombe, in a modern vernacular.

The principles of the built form include:

- Streets to diagonally traverse the steep contours to allow users to move through the site along accessible gradients.
- Longer back gardens to accommodate retaining structures where necessary.
- Lower density due to the steeply sloping nature of this part of the site.
- Frontages to positively address the northern entrance to the site, with more continuous frontages and higher built form making two sides of the entrance 'square' with the third side bring formed by the mixed use hub.

- To encourage social interaction in the community, smaller scale incidental areas of public open space should be designed into the scheme. Opportunity for feature spaces / public realm, and corner buildings in the triangular areas where two diagonal roads meet.
- Semi-detached houses with side parking will allow residents continuous opportunities of views out toward the coastline through between buildings.

Officer comment was that the layout of the site in terms of roads and the arrangement of buildings essentially follows the contours of the land, although perhaps less so with the Hilltop Hamlets area, where buildings to the east and west of the play area are to be built on the highest part of the site, with consequent impact on the surrounding area. This has been identified as an area of concern, particularly because one of the design objectives is to avoid skyline development.

The applicant response is *'We have reflected the information provided and considered acceptable at outline stage for the Hilltop Hamlets. We had originally shown more planting around this area to help soften the scheme, however the DRP wanted more of an emphasis on views out of the site so the planting was reduced. The photomontage provided at outline stage shows that the skyline is not broken by built form, with the sports pitch land located higher up the slope. Our additional woodland planting further up the slope than the sports pitches help further in this regard'*.

A further criticism levelled at the proposed development is that it is being placed on the landscape, rather than in it. This opinion rather tends to be supported when looking at proposed finished floor levels compared to existing ground levels for instance. For example, plots 42 eastwards, appear to have finished floor levels (ffl) around 2 or 3 metres above ground level.

In response, the applicant states *'The site is clearly steep in the northern half of the site. The roads that traverse these contours are placed approximately at ground level, which means there will be cut on side of the road and fill on the other. Plots 42 eastwards are on the side that requires fill, but if these were at ground level then there would be excessive cut on the other side of the road, together with large volumes of material to be unsustainably carted off site. We have shown a carefully balance earthworks design'*.

The urban design principles that are adopted for density are as follows:

1. Density ranges from 33 dph to 35 dph. Building height is influenced by density.
2. As outlined in the character areas section earlier, higher density areas will be predominantly in the Hilltop Hamlets character area, with slightly lower density in the High Villas to the north.
3. Density will decrease along the eastern edges and transition towards the Green Infrastructure.

There is no policy objection in principle to the density proposed.

Initial concerns were raised by the Fire Service concerning an apparent number of dead end conditions with a lack of turning facilities. The applicant has submitted amended plans with additional tracking information to demonstrate turning for fire service vehicles along private drives.

This is being considered by the Local Highway Authority and at the time of writing the report a further response is awaited.

The Crime and Disorder officer is generally supportive of the detail, but raised issues concerning the use of appropriate perimeter fencing and in terms of parking provision, the use of 'tandem' parking and rear parking courtyards.

In response the applicant comments '*Boundary treatments are shown to heights specified by the Crime and Disorder Officer on drawing 9344-L-07 External Works Plan.*

The alternative to tandem parking is either frontage parking (which will create a more car dominated environment), or by side parking (that will create much less street frontage and also reduce unit numbers) which are not considered desirable outcomes. Similarly, the alternative to courtyard parking would be to provide frontage parking and hence a car dominated environment. The proposed parking arrangement is considered most suitable for the site in order to provide an appropriate level of provision, with opportunities to provide feature spaces and street planting to create an attractive public realm. Where communal parking areas are necessary, these have been sited in groups close and adjacent to homes and would benefit from natural surveillance being within view of active rooms'.

Scale - the height, width and length of each building proposed in relation to its surroundings

In terms of Key Frontages, Keynote Buildings & Building Heights the Design Principles Document explains:

The urban design principles that are expected to be adopted for development block and plot design are as follows:

1. Ensure that building frontages positively address the public realm (including streets, retained landscape features, dedicated footway / cycleways and green space).
2. The use of feature spaces, keynote buildings and plots / buildings 'turning' corners will be introduced.
3. Building heights are influenced by the scale of the development. Scale, itself, is informed by the site's context in terms of its relationship with the surrounding landscape and topography.
4. Higher buildings (2.5 to 3 storeys) should be considered fronting feature spaces e.g. in the North West part of the site, with the remainder of the development being predominantly 2 storey (approx 8.5m - 9.5m in height).

Initial concern was expressed to the applicant that the 3 storey blocks of flats at the entrance to the estate will be quite imposing even though located halfway down the steeply sloping north side of the site, more attempt to reduce that impact is required.

The applicant response was that the 3 storey buildings have been chosen for this location to form a 'square' with the larger scale mixed use hub opposite.

Officer reservations remained regarding the scale of the 3 storey apartment building at the entrance to the site and the applicant agreed to review this. Consequently, the apartment block on the south side of the northern access to the site, has been reduced to 2 storey.

Another issue raised was that the predominant arrangement of dwellings throughout the layout takes the form of semi-detached houses or short terraces of no more than three houses. A feature of the town is the use of terraces utilising the contours and it would have been expected to see more use of this form in the scheme. Whilst the desire to retain views out from the site through gaps in the layout was understood, it was thought that there is scope for some longer terraces, particularly lower down the sloping ground to the north of the site. This may have the added bonus of creating more green space, an issue identified by the Design Review Panel as a potential consequence of areas of higher density.

In response the applicant states *'We have introduced terraces in the Hilltop Hamlets character area as the levels here are flatter. By proposing terraces on the steeply sloping land to the north, car parking will be required to the frontage of the units, widening the area required to be level, and exacerbating the cut and fill requirements still further (see previous comment regarding plots 42 eastwards). We are unable to put parking to the rear due to the steep contours. Detached and semi-detached units have the advantage of having side parking. We have already provided more greenspace than was shown as part of the outline permission plans/ supporting information.'*

You questioned whether more terraced units could be incorporated. Whilst long terraces of housing are prevalent in the town centre, this is reflective of their higher density, town centre location. However, with terraces comes an abundance of on-street and frontage parking which can create a car dominated environment. As an edge of settlement development, this scheme has taken on board the local design cues in the southern, flatter half of the scheme, with runs of terraces (predominantly in shorter terraces of 3 properties) but has also sought to include the planted and tree lined frontages that can be afforded by tucking some parking to the side of the units as well as some to the front. This creates a far more attractive and diverse streetscape for residents to live and thrive. If the scheme were to introduce long runs of terracing, not only would this be out of character in the location of the town, but the majority of street trees in these areas would be removed to make way for frontage parking, which in turn would create car dominated environment. We feel the current design successfully balances the use of local vernacular design with a modern, green and attractive environment that is in keeping with its edge of settlement location and overall design vision. The additional benefits of using runs of 3 terraces on an undulating topography is that the development can be sensitively incorporated into the landscape, and not placed upon on it, reducing the need for retaining walls that further urbanises and fragments the streetscape. Within the northern half of the scheme, terraces are unsuitable as the additional frontage

parking creates a deeper development plateau and exacerbates the height of retaining walls in back gardens’.

Appearance - the aspects of a building or place which determine the visual impression it makes, excluding the external built form of the development.

The Design Principles Document states in terms of Architectural Principles & Materials: ‘Buildings should exhibit simplicity in their form and demonstrate a good sense of scale and proportion and considered use of materials and colours. Over-elaboration and pastiche should be avoided. Page 27 of the Design and Access Statement that accompanied the outline application states that the design approach needs to understand local vernacular form and building materials and have an obvious modern and contemporary quality’.

In terms of materials, it was noted that this was initially proposed as render to walls in various colours with some additional detail provided by timber cladding, under grey roof tiles. In terms of the cladding, the question was raised as to how this is likely to weather in such an exposed location and that this type of cladding is not particularly typical of the Ilfracombe urban area, other than on larger agricultural buildings outside the town. It was suggested that greater use of slate cladding would be preferable. It was further pointed out that the proposed buildings are simple rather ‘boxy’ structures, making the use of feature panels and other decorative features such as brick banding essential. A material that does not feature in the development but is widely used in the area including the town is natural stone and it was felt that this should also be used both in detailing and walling (particularly in publicly visible areas of the site).

The applicant response is *‘We have used grey tile hanging on feature buildings. The DRP expressed a preference to see the use of natural materials including natural timber. We will review the materials palette further and would be happy to discuss this further with you’.*

It was recognised that features found on buildings in and around the town such as, pitched roofs, prominent gables and varying height bays have been taken on board, in a contemporary manner. One feature that is common to Ilfracombe and the surrounding area but has not been used is dormer windows and it was felt that this could have been used to reduce the height of certain dwelling types.

The applicant response is *‘We only have one house type that is 2.5 storeys, and is modelled on the Victorian terraces in Ilfracombe. These are not used on the highest parts of the site so, changing them to dormer windows will make little difference to the scale of the development, and will lose the features that will make the design of its place’.*

In response to the above issues, amended drawings of dwellings have now been received detailing the materials to be used.

This includes a wider variety of finishes to the range of dwellings (including 22 new variations), as follows:

High Villas Character Area

Materials Rationale

Apartments / Northern Entrance

- Stone to select elevations facing street
- Hanging slate to select elevations facing street
- Buff brick to all other elevations
- Buff colour render features
- Slate roof

Main Loop Road

- Buff render to all elevations (north side)
- Buff brick to all elevations (south side)
- Buff render features (south side)
- Dark grey box feature windows

Secondary Streets

- Render to all elevations (mix of three colours)
- Timber box feature windows
- Slate Roof

Hilltop Hamlets Character Area

Materials Rationale

South West Prevailing Winds

- Stone to ground floor elevations facing street
- Hanging slate to first floor elevations facing street
- Slate roof

Bristol Channel Prevailing Winds & Main Loop Road

- Red brick detailing to prominent units
- Buff brick all other elevations
- Dark grey box feature windows
- Slate roof

Streets Approaching Play Area

- Buff brick to all elevations
- Timber box feature windows
- Slate Roof

Sheltered Internal Streets

- Buff brick to ground floor elevations
- Vertical timber first floor elevations
- Timber box feature windows
- Red plain tile roof

Policy ST05 of the NDTLP relates to Sustainable Construction and Buildings and encourages all new major development be built to a standard which minimises the consumption of resources during construction and thereafter in its occupation through:

- (a) incorporating passive design measures to reduce overall energy demand and improve energy efficiency through the design and layout of the site;
- (b) connecting to any existing or proposed decentralised energy scheme or developing a scheme individually or jointly within a specified time frame;
- (c) maximising opportunities for renewable and low carbon technologies; and
- (d) using locally sourced and/or recycled materials in construction where they are available and represent a viable option.

This approach is re-iterated in the National Design Guide in sections on Resources and Lifespan for instance. It was pointed out to the applicant that little information is contained in the application other than a couple of paragraphs in the Planning Statement and this needed to be elaborated on. There is a need to explain in more detail how it was intended to address this issue which is becoming increasingly relevant. In terms of the appearance of buildings, the question was put whether there is any proposal for external renewable energy provision that would have a visual impact? Solar panels to roofs for instance would change the appearance of dwellings and require the submission of amended plans to assess impact.

In response, an Energy and Sustainability Statement has been submitted. In brief, this includes a consideration of various low carbon and renewable energy systems. Recognising that policies ST01, ST03 and ST05 are of principle relevance to sustainable construction strategies and in accordance with national guidance require the homes to be constructed to meet Building Regulations standards with respect to energy and carbon dioxide performance, and also build in resilience to a changing future climate. Consequently, the applicant has taken a 'fabric first' approach.

The Sustainability Officer comments 'I understand Andy Jones is still leading ecology and landscape on this one so I will only provide a very brief comment on the Energy and Sustainability Statement. The document is largely indicative but provides a building efficiency framework which would improve upon mandatory standards defined by Building Regulations. A renewable energy feasibility assessment is included but no renewable energy installations are proposed at this stage. It is disappointing the document does not cross refer to Building for Life and the measures employed to achieve the necessary standards'.

In response the applicant states *'The only comment that you set out in your letter from the sustainability officer related to the not referring to Building for Life - however a separate Building for Life Assessment has already been submitted. Therefore, we didn't consider we needed to submit further information given this document forms part of the application'*.

Paragraph 13.51 of the NDTLP recognises that in order to transition to a low carbon economy and a move to lower emission transport, regard should be given, as part of the provision of an appropriate range of parking, to providing electric vehicle charging infrastructure.

The applicant was asked to ensure the development includes adequate provision for electric vehicle charging infrastructure. Electric vehicle charging points are shown on the submitted External Works Plan.

Landscaping - this is the treatment of private and public space to enhance or protect the site's amenity through hard and soft measures, for example, through planting of trees or hedges or screening by fences or walls.

The applicant describes the Landscape Framework as a 'ground-up' approach will be adopted, where existing features of note are retained as a basis for a landscape framework into which built development will be sensitively integrated.

This landscape framework will be linked through the site to the landscape beyond to maximise habitat, biodiversity, and amenity connectivity, as well as assimilating the development proposals into the landscape.

The proposals seek to provide long term environmental enhancements and, in particular, maximise site wide biodiversity and recreational benefits.

The application is accompanied by detailed landscape planting plans, planting details, a tree schedule, external works plan and illustrative long site section & retaining structure evolution drawing.

The Arboriculturalist initially commented:

'1) Trees and Hedgerows: The Arboricultural report provided, whilst appropriate as a tree constraints plan (TCP) is not an arboricultural impact assessment (AIA) and associated tree protection plan (TPP) and (AMS) that addresses the specific measures that will be taken to ensure that 'retained' trees and hedges will be adequately protected during the course of construction and demonstrate that the long term retention and management of the trees and hedgerows can be successfully achieved in light of the proposed site layout and design.

Of particular importance in the context of the development proposed will be the retention, protection and future management of the existing and 'retained' hedgerows that run North South. This will be of particular significance due to the potential / likely engineering works and terracing that will be required to address site levels. As you are aware this matter was specifically raised and asked to be addressed by the applicant at the design review panel meetings.

More detail in respect of the TPP and AMS to address this will be required before we can have any confidence in the successful retention and management of these features in the post development context.

I would also state that BS5837 – sets out minimum root protection areas and larger buffers should be provided where possible. BS5837 also advises that provision should be made to protect future landscape areas and it would be useful to see this achieved. (i.e. having a clear TPP showing new landscape areas fence off and avoided during the course of construction – although I would accept/expect some of these areas for example the POS to the south of the site to be used during construction for construction compounds etc.

2) Landscape Framework: The submission provides some general detail of the overall indicative framework but significant reliance appear to be given to avenue planting within highway verges – does the applicant have any evidence to demonstrate that the highways authority are happy with the level of tree planting proposed within the highway and will be willing to accept and maintain the long term management of this planting and do we have any detail in respect of the soil volumes that will be necessary to support this tree planting to maturity and how this will be delivered. (I suspect that the soils may be relatively thin above the bedrock at this site and that extensive soil stripping/ engineering works and compaction of soils to enable the construction of the proposed housing will necessitate engineered tree pits and provision of sufficient soil volumes and

appropriate soils will be required to enable the successful establishment of the proposed planting.)

3) Biodiversity Management Plan: I'm broadly content with the overall submission but I believe that there are a number of areas where clarification should be sought and where additional information could be provided that would demonstrate policy compliance with the current local plan as opposed to merely addressing the condition requirements of the earlier consent. In particular I would wish to see further detail in relation to;

- a. the % species mix of the proposed new woodland and hedgerows
- b. the proposed planting densities / spacing and varieties of malus species for the proposed new orchard
- c. details in respect of the proposed ecological monitoring and means of reporting to the local authority and means of seeking written agreement to the BMP in order to ensure that it delivers the stated aims and objectives
- d. details in regard to how the proposed works will deliver biodiversity net gain as required through current local plan policies – i.e. use of the DEFRA metric to assess the existing habitat value and proposed habitat value in order to demonstrate / quantify the increase in biodiversity value of the existing and post development habitat'.

The applicant has submitted a response to these comments, an Arboricultural Assessment & Method Statement and amended landscaping plans.

A further response from the Arboriculturalist is awaited at the time of writing this report.

Discharge/Partial Discharge of Conditions

The following information is submitted to discharge/ partially discharge conditions attached to the outline planning permission:

Condition 5 (Statement to show consistency with master planning/ urban design material)

The applicant has submitted a Planning Statement (PCL Planning) and Design Principles Document, Rev E (FPCR), referred to above and see Condition 9 below.

Condition 6 (Framework Plan)

The applicant has submitted plan 9344-L-04 B which is a culmination of the Design and Access Statement for the outline application, a preceding Design Review Panel, and the Design Principles document.

Condition 7 (Structural Landscaping Scheme)

See comments above in respect of condition 3 – Landscaping.

Condition 8 (Overarching site wide sustainable drainage system scheme)

In response to the drainage statement relating to surface water, DCC as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) objected to the proposals.

In response, the applicant submitted: Technical Memo - Surface Water Drainage (response to LLFA comments); Typical Pumping Station Information; and, 0488.101 Rev B - Drainage Strategy.

Following consideration, the LLFA officer advised 'At this stage, I am unable to withdraw our objection, but would be happy to provide a further substantive response when the applicant has formally submitted the additional information requested below to the Local Planning Authority' and made a series of observations about where the proposals were deficient.

The applicant response is '*Our drainage engineers have been in direct contact with the LLFA (Joshua Lewis) and have responded to the questions raised in their response - see attached correspondence*'. This includes a revised Technical Memo, including drawing 0488.101 Rev C - Drainage Strategy, plus Surface water drainage plan for the community building and sports pitches (ref. 0488-104) HCE0488 Surface Water Drainage Strategy.

A further response to this information from LLFA is awaited at the time of writing the report.

In terms of foul drainage South West Water has no objection, commenting 'The intention to requisition an offsite foul sewer to the public network is noted and a suitable point of connection will be determined as a part of that process in accordance with Section 98 of The Water Act'.

Condition 9 (Site wide design principles document)

The purpose of this document is to set out the design objectives and principles for a mixed use development on the southern edge of Ilfracombe, North Devon. These will inform and underpin the subsequent reserved matters applications.

For clarity, this document addresses Phase A only, encompassing land to the east of Old Barnstaple Road.

Elements of this document are referred to in preceding sections of this report.

One of the issues that has been raised is the question of how and when the mixed-use hub will be delivered which will also include the 50-bed extra care housing scheme although it is accepted that this, as well as delivery of the new primary school may be issues for DCC to confirm.

Planning Policy officers make the point that 'Policy would not support a solely housing focussed development on the southern edge of Ilfracombe, which would not deliver a sustainable form of development and would not achieve the vision and spatial strategy for Ilfracombe'.

It is understood that the applicants have instructed commercial agents and are looking at interest in the mixed-use hub land, which will inform any subsequent reserved matters submission in due course.

The applicant confirms that marketing agents have been instructed to ascertain interest from end users. This is an on-going exercise and will feed into the design and layout of the area once completed and before details for this area is submitted for planning approval.

Although the primary school is not included in Phase A, DCC's position remains unchanged – i.e. they still need to safeguard the entire school site of 1.72ha's for future primary school delivery.

Condition 10 (Phasing Plan)

This shows that in terms of Phase A of the overall development (land to the east of Old Barnstaple Road), there will be 4 sub phases, with the HIF funded infrastructure delivered at the start of the scheme.

Condition 11 (Detail regarding surface water drainage)

(See comments in respect of Condition 8 above)

Condition 12 (Details of quantity and location of affordable housing)

The submitted plans show the proposed quantity and location of affordable housing in Phase A in compliance with the outline planning permission.

The provision of affordable housing is controlled by the Section 106 Agreement which requires the submission of an Affordable Housing Plan. The applicant accepts that an Affordable Housing Scheme is a pre-commencement requirement and will therefore be submitted and agreed with the Council prior to commencement.

The Section 106 Agreement requires under "Definitions: Affordable Housing Scheme" Paragraph 9 that at least 2 (two) of the Affordable Dwellings shall be adapted for disabled use. Housing Enabling 'seek 1 x two bedroom and 1 x three bedroom dwellings. These should be built to comply with the requirement M4 (3) (2) b of the Building Regulations 2010 Approved Document M: Access to and use of buildings. These should be provided as Social Rent. We have a specific family that require a 3 bedroom wheelchair accessible house in Ilfracombe. We will need a design/floor plan based on their needs, which we will share as soon as we are able to'.

Housing will ask the Council's specialist to assess the proposed plans for the wheelchair user dwellings and will advise of his comments as soon as possible. They also seek confirmation that the two dwellings will be secured in phase one, with some forecasted dates. There is also a reminder that the applicant is required by the S106 to submit an Affordable Housing Scheme. More detail of the tenure of the affordable dwellings on the drawings is requested.

Amended drawings and comments have now been received from the applicant which confirm that:

- Plot 215 & 216 are wheelchair accessible dwellings.
- Wheelchair user dwellings clarified as social rent and shown on drawing 9344-L-05 rev D.
- Wheelchair user dwellings provided in phase 1 shown on 9344-L-32 rev D. Approx' dates for delivery of the first phase in 2022/23.
- I have contacted the housing enabling officer directly asking for a copy of the template as requested. However, the s106 trigger for the affordable housing scheme

to be agreed is pre-commencement and therefore this could be agreed post-approval of the RM.

- % split shown on drawing 9344-L-05 rev D.

Condition 14 (Details of siting, design and materials of construction of all walls/ fences and other forms of enclosure)

Drawing 9344-L-07 C details this provision across the site, which includes suggestions from consultees.

Further information was requested in terms of details of proposed retaining works which judging from the initial drawings, appeared likely to be significant structures.

The applicant has submitted further detail including a section plan drawing to show how they have reduced the retaining wall heights through the use of soft embankments tied into existing hedgebanks used to minimise the use of engineered retaining structures.

Condition 15 (Scaled drawings, including cross and long sections, proposed FFL and ridge heights)

A series of plans have been submitted to satisfy this condition.

Condition 16 (Written Scheme of Investigation)

Devon County Council's Historic Environment Team confirm that the programme of archaeological works as described in the revised Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) prepared by AC Archaeology - (document ref: ACD2264/1/1 and dated: 9th June 2020) and submitted in support of this planning application are acceptable to the Historic Environment Team. Any consent that may be granted by the Local Planning Authority should be conditional in terms of implementation.

Condition 17 Highways

Plans and sections have been submitted for consideration in consultation with DCC as Local Highway Authority.

(See comments above in respect of condition 3 - Access)

Condition 18 (Details of car parking provision)

Details of parking provision are provided and discussed above.

Condition 27 (Cycle parking)

Cycle parking facilities across the site are shown on the submitted plans.

Condition 28 (Details of hard and soft landscaping)

(See comments relating to Landscaping above).

Condition 31 (Details of POS including play equipment)

A number of issues were originally raised by the Parks, Leisure & Culture Officer whose most recent comments were:

- The Play Area (LEAP) meets the minimum requirements, but it should be noted the play value of the climbing net, bridge and the stand alone slide are very low and

could be improved upon, especially for a development of this size. For instance a multi-functional module combining climbing, balance and slide could be provided instead of three independent pieces. A roundabout and/or twin swing incorporating infant seat and flat seat could then be provided within the space vacated. However as stated the design does meet minimum standards – *an amended drawing 9344-L26 B has been submitted.*

- Do the footpaths for the wider informal open space come with lighting? Given the size and succession of paths, we are not convinced street lighting would be sufficient to light these areas, which is a safety consideration. Are footpaths hogging paths, which is required as a minimum for people with mobility issues? – *an amended drawing 9344-L26 B has been submitted.*
- We cannot see an updated plan showing the breakdown of quantum's for each element of POS to confirm the elements are the sizes previously agreed upon (MUGA 685sqm; LEAP 400sqm; Allotment 0.25 Hectares; Orchard Quantum; Informal Open Space Quantum) - *this information is annotated on drawing 9344-L-05 C.*

In response to amendments, the PL&CO has the following comments:

- We believe the developer has addressed our concerns regarding the equipped play area and we believe this to be acceptable.

Condition 32 (Biodiversity Mitigation Plan)

A Biodiversity Management Plan has been submitted. In response the Arboriculturalist comments 'I'm broadly content with the overall submission but I believe that there are a number of areas where clarification should be sought and where additional information could be provided that would demonstrate policy compliance with the current local plan as opposed to merely addressing the condition requirements of the earlier consent. In particular I would wish to see further detail in relation to;

- a. the % species mix of the proposed new woodland and hedgerows
- b. the proposed planting densities / spacing and varieties of malus species for the proposed new orchard
- c. details in respect of the proposed ecological monitoring and means of reporting to the local authority and means of seeking written agreement to the BMP in order to ensure that it delivers the stated aims and objectives
- d. details in regard to how the proposed works will deliver biodiversity net gain as required through current local plan policies – i.e. use of the DEFRA metric to assess the existing habitat value and proposed habitat value in order to demonstrate / quantify the increase in biodiversity value of the existing and post development habitat.

As referred to above at Condition 3, the applicant has submitted a Response to Arboricultural Officer, along with Assessment & Method Statement and amended landscaping plans.

A further response from the Arboriculturalist is awaited.

Natural England originally advised it had no comment to make on the approval of reserved matters.

Since that initial response they commented 'Further to Natural England's no comment response in August this year (317726) for reserved matters for the development around Winsham Farm in Ilfracombe, we have just been made aware of a GHS maternity roost within the farm buildings that may also be linked to the Caen Valley Bats SSSI. I note the reserved matters decision is still pending and hope you can take this in to account to ensure the roost, the bats and their flight lines are protected. Please note that an HRA is not required, as the SSSI is not part of a wider European site network. However, your Authority has a duty to take reasonable steps to conserve and enhance the special features of sites of special scientific interest when carrying out your statutory duties as well as considering the impacts on protected species'.

As the applicant points out 'Firstly, the applications which are before the Council are reserved matters submissions for the first phase of a wider development that was granted outline planning permission (under applications ref. 56675 and 62544) in May 2017. The RM submissions relate to land at Channel Farm, situated to the east of Old Barnstaple Road. Only matters of access, layout, appearance, scale and landscaping are for determination, consideration of other matters would be ultra vires.

The comments provided refer to the Caen Valley Bats SSSI and a potential maternity roost at Winsham Farm. The Caen Valley Bats SSSI is situated approximately 9.5km to the south west of the site ('as the crow flies'). The normal foraging range of a GHB is circa 4km (paragraph 29 of the Secretary of State decision to appeal ref. 3205558, Wolborough Barton, Newton Abbot). Greater Horseshoe Bats (GHBs) prefer linear features such as wood edges and hedges, therefore the actual flight distance between Caen Valley SSSI and the submission site would be substantially greater. Therefore, the SSSI is significantly further away from the site (more than double the distance) of the normal foraging range of any GHB that may roost at the Caen Valley SSSI.

As NE point out, the SSSI is not a component site of a wider European designated site. The application site is not located within, adjacent or close to part of a European designated site or any defined sustenance zone. It is apparent therefore that the application proposals cannot impact on the SSSI due to distance and the absence of any pathway which the proposals could produce an impact upon habitats at the site (such as via a connecting watercourse).

The ES (Environmental Statement accompanying the outline application) confirmed that roosts supporting greater horseshoe bats were present in the Winsham Farm buildings (see section 9.4.39. It was deduced from the surveys that GHBs that roosted at Winsham Farm commuted mainly along Winsham Valley westward (i.e. in the opposite direction of the current RM site) and then dispersed to foraging grounds to the south of west. However, outside of the Winsham Valley, GHBs were rarely recorded over most of the site'.

Condition 43 (Details of siting and design of changing facilities)

Community Building Land up to 2000sqm was identified in the outline planning application to accommodate a community building. See also the comments above relating to funding/phasing of infrastructure.

Details of the siting and design of the Community Building are required for approval by the LPA.

The applicant states 'The Community Building is to be accessed from along the same tree lined street as the Primary School and Sport Pitches. This will allow for future flexibility to share facilities and car parking. Together with the sports pitches and multi-use games area (MUGA) as a focal point at the end of the street, a 'Community Hub' will be created. Mixing residential units along the other side of the street will also enable activity and subsequently natural surveillance throughout the day and night for a safe environment for all. Homes that front onto this street are to have courtyard parking to avoid conflict between reversing vehicles and children / school buses'.

Whilst it is the intention as set out in the S106 Agreement that the land be transferred to a 'not for profit' organisation, which is being set up by the applicant with details to be provided in due course, with the facility forming part of the HIF funding, it has been necessary to consider likely end users and their requirements.

In terms of proposed building design, the PL&CO commented:

- In regards the community building, there is a lack of storage to serve the pitch uses. This should be accessible from outside.
- If we are to assume this will be a hub site for youth football and rugby then there could be upward of 66 young people using this site for rugby at any one time. The current changing provision is not adequate as it would accommodate less than half that number. Ideally there should be 2 sets of changing rooms and referees facilities in case there are two sports/teams/genders using the facilities at the same time. At the very minimum the changing rooms need to meet the requirements for rugby which has a higher space requirement than football, accommodating a minimum of 18 people; and large independent (lockable) kit storage space needs to be provided so that the changing rooms can be shared on a staggered use and kit left in another space once changing rooms have been vacated. Football spec would not be sufficient.
- It appears the requirement for indoor tennis in the building has been ignored. Why has this been omitted?

Amended plans have been submitted to take on board the first and second points. The third point was raised late in the day in terms of the outline application and was not pursued because it would have meant a larger dimension/higher cost building.

In response to amendments, the PL&CO has the following comments:

- We recognise that the changing rooms have been increased in size to cater for rugby and we believe this to now be acceptable. However with only one set of changing rooms provided and two pitches to serve we recommend the community building/changing rooms have the addition of bag storage space that can be accessed from outside so that changing rooms can be used on a staggered arrangement and left clear for the next users. In effect the bag storage will need to be big enough to be divided into 4 lockable areas, each area big enough for approximately 20 bags.
- In regards to the official changing room in the community building. This should be accessible from outside. Could the location of the official's room be swapped with the first aid office and an external door added?

In response, the applicant states *'We are pleased that the Parks, Culture and Leisure Officer has confirmed that their previous comments regarding the equipped play area, pitch orientation and the size of the proposed changing rooms have been addressed and the details provided are acceptable. In response to the other comments provided by the officer:*

- *Please find enclosed a surface water drainage scheme for the pitches.*
- *We have increased the storage containers to three as requested and is shown on the updated Site Layout Plan enclosed (ref. 9344-L-100 Rev E). A drawing of the storage containers is also provided.*
- *We have considered the further request for bag storage, in the event that staggered changing is required. To provide this additional storage, would involve increasing the footprint of the building further and/or redesigning the internal layout, raising concerns over financial viability of the building, based upon the fact that the secured Government HiF funding is fixed. Furthermore the majority of junior rugby and football clubs, operate staggered kick off times, to ensure adequate changing facility space is available, along with grassroots football usually taking place on a Saturday morning and rugby, on a Sunday morning. Once the adjacent school is built in the future, this will also provide for additional changing and storage provision for pupils, within a short walk of the sports pitches.*
- *The junior match day official's changing room, can be accessed via the external changing room corridor or main entrance external lobby doors. The first aid room has been sited in the entrance lobby, to enable the changing room corridor doors to be locked, improving security and safety, whilst also providing highly visible access to first aid, for all users of the building, at all times. To 'swap' the two rooms, would involve a fundamental redesign of the building, impacting on other room layouts / sizes and therefore on balance, is not considered appropriate'.*

With regard to the main hall, the applicant has been working collaboratively with DCC who have been providing advice in relation to community building layout, alongside NDC. Whilst it would appear that a nursery school is much needed (with under provision in the town) and is DCC's preferred option for part of the building and an important aspect for the new community, it is noted that it was envisaged by DCC that such provision would form part of the school site. Following further discussions between NDC and DCC officers, it transpires that if a nursery permanently occupied the community space part of the building, it would not be available to any other community use. As an

alternative it appears that DCC Early Years colleagues are willing to consider a Plan B option, i.e. that an Early Years provider rent out the space. It would be necessary to provide the bare minimum requirements to enable this to happen – e.g. sufficient storage space to pack everything away after each session, baby change facilities, suitable outdoor space etc'. This would be seen as a temporary arrangement until provision is made on the school site as originally intended.

More recently, the applicant has commented 'On another matter, I have now written to the Football Club and Rugby Club to discuss future use of the community building. Obviously we have focused on complying with consultee feedback so far, but I am happy to take a lead on involving both clubs in the future running of the facility. You'll be aware the S106 obligation on the developer is to provide a serviced site for the community facility, but with the addition of HiF funding being secured by NDDC, the building is now to be provided also. The S106 requires the developer to transfer the site to NDDC/DCC and talks between the parties continue and will do post RM. I am also in talks with a nursery school provider and I will invite them to the future meeting with the sports clubs, to see if there is any synergy with the three parties working together. Obviously the final building usage decision will be between NDDC/DCC'.

The issues raised by the Crime and Disorder officer have also been noted and incorporated where appropriate.

Condition 51 (Details of refuse and recycling storage)

A Refuse Strategy Plan has been submitted, that shows the location of rear garden waste storage points and communal waste/waste collection points, located across the site.

Conclusion

The site benefits from outline planning permission, which establishes the principle of development of the site.

This Reserved Matters application is submitted in compliance with condition 3 of that outline permission, along with information to discharge/partially discharge various conditions. Other conditions remain to be discharged, some pre-commencement.

The submission shows a development that is of an appropriate layout, scale and appearance for the site's context and the character of Ilfracombe and provides suitable access and landscaping.

The application is considered to accord with the adopted development plan. Approval of the application is therefore recommended subject to the imposition of planning conditions.

Subject to:

- The further comments of DCC as Local Highway Authority.
- The further comments of DCC as Lead Local Flood Authority.
- A further response from the Arboriculturalist.

- No adverse comment from Housing Enabling in response to the amended plans/clarifications.

It is recommended that the application be approved.

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT 1998

The provisions of the Human Rights Act and principles contained in the Convention on Human Rights have been taken into account in reaching the recommendation contained in this report. The articles/protocols identified below were considered of particular relevance:

Article 8 – Right to Respect for Private and Family Life
THE FIRST PROTOCOL – Article 1: Protection of Property

Recommendation

Delegate to the Chief Executive to approve, subject to no adverse outstanding consultation responses from the Local Highway Authority, Lead Local Flood Authority, Arboriculturalist and Housing Enabling in respect of the amended plans/clarifications, and the following conditions:

Conditions

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than whichever is the later of the following dates:
 - (i) the expiration of three years from the date on which the outline permission was granted : or
 - (ii) the expiration of two years from the final approval of the reserved matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.

Reason :

The time limit condition is imposed in order to comply with the requirements of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/details:
 - 9344-L-01C Location Plan received on the 13/05/20
 - 9344-L-04B Development Framework Plan received on the 09/02/21
 - 9344-L-05C Site Layout Plan received on the 09/02/21
 - 9344-L-06C Materials Plan received on the 09/02/21
 - 9344-L-07C External Works Plan received on the 09/02/21
 - 9344-L-08C Building Heights received on the 09/02/21
 - 9344-L-09C Block Plan 1 received on the 09/02/21
 - 9344-L-10B Block Plan 2 received on the 09/02/21
 - 9344-L-11B Block Plan 3 received on the 09/02/21
 - 9344-L-12B Block-Plan 4 received on the 09/02/21
 - 9344-L-13C Landscape Framework Plan received on the 09/02/21
 - 9344-L-14B Planting Plan 1 received on the 09/02/21

9344-L-15C Planting Plan 2 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-16B Planting Plan 3 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-17B Planting Plan 4 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-18B Planting Plan 5 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-19B Planting Plan 6 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-20B Planting Plan 7 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-21B Planting Plan 8 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-22B Planting Plan 9 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-23B Planting Plan 10 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-24B Planting Plan 11 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-25B Planting Plan 12 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-26B Equipped Play Area Plan received on the 04/02/21
9344-L-27C Community Building Layout Plan received on the 04/02/21
9344-L-28 Landscape Details received on the 13/05/20
9344-L-31C Refuse Strategy Plan received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-32C Phasing Plan received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-33 Long Site Section & Retaining Structure Evolution received on the 02/11/20
9344-P-20A House Type 2A Villas received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-21A House Type 2A Hamlets received on the 09/02/21
9344-A-22A House Type 2B Villas received on the 09/02/21
9344-A-23A House Type 2B Hamlets received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-24A House Type 3A Hamlets received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-25A House Type 3C Villas received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-26A House Type 3C Hamlets received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-27A House Type 3D Hamlets received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-28A House Type 3E_ Villas received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-29A House Type 3E Hamlets received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-30A House Type 4C Villas received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-31A House Type 4C Hamlets received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-32A Apartments F2 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-33A Apartments F4 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-34A Apartments F5 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-35 9344-P-35 Apartments F4-M received on the 13/05/20
9344-P-36A HT M432b-2 and M432b-3 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-37A HT M432b-2 and M432b-3 received on the 09/02/21
9344-SK-01E Community Building Ground Floor Plan received on the 04/02/21
0488.101B Drainage Strategy received on the 02/11/20
0488.400A Scheme Key Plan received on the 02/11/20
0488.410 Long Section Road 1 1 received on the 22/05/20
0488.411 Long Section Road 1 2 received on the 22/05/20
0488.412 Long Section Road 2 received on the 22/05/20
0488.413 Long Section Road 3 received on the 22/05/20
0488.414 Long Section Road 4 received on the 22/05/20
0488.415 Long Section Road 5 - 5a received on the 22/05/20
0488.416 Long Section Road 6 - 7 received on the 22/05/20
0488.417 Long Section Road 8 received on the 22/05/20
0488.418 Long Section Road 9 1 received on the 22/05/20
0488.419 Long Section Road 9 2 received on the 22/05/20
0488.421C s38 Contours and Levels 1 received on the 02/11/20

0488.422C s38 Contours and Levels 2 received on the 02/11/20
0488.423B s38 Contours and Levels 3 received on the 02/11/20
0488.424B s38 Contours and Levels 4 received on the 02/11/20
0488.425B s38 Contours and Levels 5 received on the 02/11/20
0488.426B s38 Contours and Levels 6 received on the 02/11/20
0488.427B s38 Contours and Levels 7 received on the 02/11/20
0488.428A s38 Contours and Levels 8 received on the 02/11/20
0488.440B s278 Access Plan 1 received on the 09/02/21
0488.441A s278 Access Plan 2 received on the 09/02/21
0488.442 s278 Access Plan 3 received on the 09/02/21
0488.460A s38 Swept Path Analysis received on the 02/11/20
0488.461A s38 Swept Path Analysis received on the 02/11/20
9344-P-38 Apartments F6 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-39 House Type 2A - High Villas Type 2 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-40 House Type 2B - High Villas Type 2 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-41 House Type 4C - High Villas Type 2 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-42 House Type 2A - Hilltop Hamlets Type 2 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-43 House Type 2A - Hilltop Hamlets Type 3 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-44 House Type 2B - Hilltop Hamlets Type 2 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-45 House Type 2B - Hilltop Hamlets Type 3 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-46 House Type 2B - Hilltop Hamlets Type 4 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-47 House Type 3A - Hilltop Hamlets Type 2 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-48 House Type 3A - Hilltop Hamlets Type 3 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-49 House Type 3C - Hilltop Hamlets Type 2 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-50 House Type 3C - Hilltop Hamlets Type 3 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-51 House Type 3C - Hilltop Hamlets Type 4 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-52 House Type 3C - Hilltop Hamlets Type 5 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-53 House Type 3D - Hilltop Hamlets Type 2 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-54 House Type 3D - Hilltop Hamlets Type 3 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-55 House Type 3D - Hilltop Hamlets Type 4 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-56 House Type 3D - Hilltop Hamlets Type 5 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-57 House Type 4C - Hilltop Hamlets Type 2 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-58 House Type 4C - Hilltop Hamlets Type 3 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-59 House Type 4C - Hilltop Hamlets Type 4 received on the 09/02/21
SWE 211 Version 1 Biodiversity Management Plan SWE211 v1 received on the 13/05/20
WSI ACD2264/1/1 v2 WSI ACD2264/1/1 v2 for Condition 16 of 56675 received on the 16/06/20
NDC001 Arun Bus Shelter details received on the 15/01/21
NDC002 Retaining Wall Specifications received on the 22/01/21
HCE0488 0488 Technical Memo - Surface Water Drainage received on the 04/02/21
FCPR-VM-04 Arboricultural Assessment & Method Statement February 2021 received on the 09/02/21 ('the approved plans').

Reason:

To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of proper planning.

3. No work shall commence on any part of the development hereby approved until details of the external finishing materials to be used for the development hereby approved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:

To enable the Local Planning Authority to consider the materials in the interests of the character and appearance of the development in accordance with Policy DM04 of the North Devon and Torridge Local Plan.

4. Having now considered the submitted details 9344-L-01C Location Plan received on the 13/05/20
9344-L-04B Development Framework Plan received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-05C Site Layout Plan received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-06C Materials Plan received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-07C External Works Plan received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-08C Building Heights received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-09C Block Plan 1 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-10B Block Plan 2 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-11B Block Plan 3 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-12B Block-Plan 4 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-13C Landscape Framework Plan received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-14B Planting Plan 1 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-15C Planting Plan 2 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-16B Planting Plan 3 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-17B Planting Plan 4 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-18B Planting Plan 5 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-19B Planting Plan 6 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-20B Planting Plan 7 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-21B Planting Plan 8 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-22B Planting Plan 9 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-23B Planting Plan 10 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-24B Planting Plan 11 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-25B Planting Plan 12 received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-26B Equipped Play Area Plan received on the 04/02/21
9344-L-27C Community Building Layout Plan received on the 04/02/21
9344-L-28 Landscape Details received on the 13/05/20
9344-L-31C Refuse Strategy Plan received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-32C Phasing Plan received on the 09/02/21
9344-L-33 Long Site Section & Retaining Structure Evolution received on the 02/11/20
9344-P-20A House Type 2A Villas received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-21A House Type 2A Hamlets received on the 09/02/21
9344-A-22A House Type 2B Villas received on the 09/02/21
9344-A-23A House Type 2B Hamlets received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-24A House Type 3A Hamlets received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-25A House Type 3C Villas received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-26A House Type 3C Hamlets received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-27A House Type 3D Hamlets received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-28A House Type 3E_ Villas received on the 09/02/21

9344-P-29A House Type 3E Hamlets received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-30A House Type 4C Villas received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-31A House Type 4C Hamlets received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-32A Apartments F2 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-33A Apartments F4 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-34A Apartments F5 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-35 9344-P-35 Apartments F4-M received on the 13/05/20
9344-P-36A HT M432b-2 and M432b-3 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-37A HT M432b-2 and M432b-3 received on the 09/02/21
9344-SK-01E Community Building Ground Floor Plan received on the 04/02/21
0488.101B Drainage Strategy received on the 02/11/20
0488.400A Scheme Key Plan received on the 02/11/20
0488.410 Long Section Road 1 1 received on the 22/05/20
0488.411 Long Section Road 1 2 received on the 22/05/20
0488.412 Long Section Road 2 received on the 22/05/20
0488.413 Long Section Road 3 received on the 22/05/20
0488.414 Long Section Road 4 received on the 22/05/20
0488.415 Long Section Road 5 - 5a received on the 22/05/20
0488.416 Long Section Road 6 - 7 received on the 22/05/20
0488.417 Long Section Road 8 received on the 22/05/20
0488.418 Long Section Road 9 1 received on the 22/05/20
0488.419 Long Section Road 9 2 received on the 22/05/20
0488.421C s38 Contours and Levels 1 received on the 02/11/20
0488.422C s38 Contours and Levels 2 received on the 02/11/20
0488.423B s38 Contours and Levels 3 received on the 02/11/20
0488.424B s38 Contours and Levels 4 received on the 02/11/20
0488.425B s38 Contours and Levels 5 received on the 02/11/20
0488.426B s38 Contours and Levels 6 received on the 02/11/20
0488.427B s38 Contours and Levels 7 received on the 02/11/20
0488.428A s38 Contours and Levels 8 received on the 02/11/20
0488.440B s278 Access Plan 1 received on the 09/02/21
0488.441A s278 Access Plan 2 received on the 09/02/21
0488.442 s278 Access Plan 3 received on the 09/02/21
0488.460A s38 Swept Path Analysis received on the 02/11/20
0488.461A s38 Swept Path Analysis received on the 02/11/20
9344-P-38 Apartments F6 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-39 House Type 2A - High Villas Type 2 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-40 House Type 2B - High Villas Type 2 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-41 House Type 4C - High Villas Type 2 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-42 House Type 2A - Hilltop Hamlets Type 2 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-43 House Type 2A - Hilltop Hamlets Type 3 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-44 House Type 2B - Hilltop Hamlets Type 2 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-45 House Type 2B - Hilltop Hamlets Type 3 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-46 House Type 2B - Hilltop Hamlets Type 4 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-47 House Type 3A - Hilltop Hamlets Type 2 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-48 House Type 3A - Hilltop Hamlets Type 3 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-49 House Type 3C - Hilltop Hamlets Type 2 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-50 House Type 3C - Hilltop Hamlets Type 3 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-51 House Type 3C - Hilltop Hamlets Type 4 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-52 House Type 3C - Hilltop Hamlets Type 5 received on the 09/02/21

9344-P-53 House Type 3D - Hilltop Hamlets Type 2 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-54 House Type 3D - Hilltop Hamlets Type 3 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-55 House Type 3D - Hilltop Hamlets Type 4 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-56 House Type 3D - Hilltop Hamlets Type 5 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-57 House Type 4C - Hilltop Hamlets Type 2 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-58 House Type 4C - Hilltop Hamlets Type 3 received on the 09/02/21
9344-P-59 House Type 4C - Hilltop Hamlets Type 4 received on the 09/02/21
SWE 211 Version 1 Biodiversity Management Plan SWE211 v1 received on the 13/05/20
WSI ACD2264/1/1 v2 WSI ACD2264/1/1 v2 for Condition 16 of 56675 received on the 16/06/20
NDC001 Arun Bus Shelter details received on the 15/01/21
NDC002 Retaining Wall Specifications received on the 22/01/21
HCE0488 0488 Technical Memo - Surface Water Drainage received on the 04/02/21
FCPR-VM-04 Arboricultural Assessment & Method Statement February 2021 received on the 09/02/21 for the conditions 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 27, 28, 31, 32, 43 and 51 the Local Planning Authority have determined that these are acceptable.

The requirement to provide acceptable details of these conditions is therefore discharged.

The works are now required to be carried out in accordance with these details.

Informatives

1. The applicant is reminded of the planning conditions and Section 106 Legal Agreement that were imposed on the Outline Permission and still relevant to this application.
2. Statement of Engagement
In accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework the Council has worked in a positive and pro-active way with the Applicant and has negotiated amendments to the application to enable the grant of planning permission. This has included consideration of reserved matters and outline planning permission conditions.

Appendices:

Appendix A – Location Plan

Appendix B – Decision Notice re 56675

Appendix C – Design Review Panel and applicant comments

Appendix D – Building for Healthy Life Assessment