

OTTERY ST MARY TOWN COUNCIL

Council Offices, The Old Convent, 8 Broad Street,
Ottery St Mary. Devon EX11 1BZ

Tel: 01404 812252

E-mail: admin@otterystmary-tc.gov.uk

Web Site: www.otterystmary-tc.gov.uk



02 July 2026

Dear Councillors

I hereby give you notice that the **Planning meeting of OTTERY ST MARY TOWN COUNCIL** will be held at **6:30 PM on Tuesday, July 7, 2026**, at **Ottery St. Mary Town Council (8 Broad Street, Ottery St. Mary, Devon, EX11 1BZ)**.

All members are hereby summoned to consider the matters detailed on the agenda below.

Yours faithfully

Jane Bushby

Ottery St Mary Town Council Admin

INFORMATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC/PRESS:

The law requires that public access is possible and not restricted, unless in the case of an agreed confidential session.

1. For members of the public/press that wish to speak at the meeting, under public participation, please raise your hand and wait for the Chair to prompt you.
2. For those who have no visual access to the meeting, Members will state their name before speaking and voting.
3. The order of business may be changed by a decision of the Council and by resolution without notice.

Note: Under the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, any members of the public are allowed to take photographs, film and audio record the proceedings and report on all public meetings (including on social media). If you are recording the meeting, you are asked to act in a reasonable manner and not disrupt the conduct of meetings for example by using intrusive lighting, flash photography or asking people to repeat statements for the benefit of the recording. You may not make an oral commentary during the meeting. The Chair has the power to control public recording and/or reporting so it does not disrupt the meeting

Mobile Phones, Pagers and Similar Devices – All persons attending this meeting are required to turn off Mobile Phones, Pagers and Similar Devices. The Chair may approve an exception to this request in special circumstances

Table of contents

07/07/2026 6:30 PM - 9:30 PM

P/26/07/01 - Apologies for Absence 4

P/26/07/01 - Declarations and Disclosable Pecuniary Interests 4

P/26/07/01 - Admission to Meetings 4

P/26/07/01 - Reports, Correspondence and Items referred to the Committee 4

Attachments

25.1349 appeal decision 7

25.1349 costs appeal 12

P/26/07/01 - Minutes 4

Attachments

2026-06-09 - Planning Meeting - Draft Minutes 14

P/26/07/01 - Planning Decisions Received 4

P/26/07/01 - Public Participation 4

P/26/07/01 - To consider and determine observations on the following Planning Applications: 5

P/26/07/01 - To receive Councillors' questions relating to Planning Matters 6

P/26/07/01 - Date of the next meeting: TBC 6

.....

AGENDA

P/26/07/01 Apologies for Absence

To receive apologies for absence

P/26/07/02 Declarations and Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

To receive Declarations of interest for items on the Agenda and receipt of requests for new Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPIs) dispensations for items on the Agenda

P/26/07/03 Admission to Meetings

In consideration of the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960 (publicity would be prejudicial to the public interest by reason of the confidential nature of the business to be transacted): to agree any items to be dealt with after the public and press have been excluded

P/26/07/04 Reports, Correspondence and Items referred to the Committee

- 1) Appeal Ref: **6003914** - Four Elms Farm, Alfington Road, Ottery St Mary, Devon EX11 1NY - Appeal allowed
- 2) Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: **6003914** - Refused

P/26/07/05 Minutes

To receive the Minutes of the Meeting of the Town Council of 9th June 2026 and to approve the signing of the Minutes by the Chair as a correct record

P/26/07/06 Planning Decisions Received

<u>26/0760/DOC</u>	9 Mill Street Ottery St Mary EX11 1AB	Discharge of Condition Approved
<u>26/0518/LBC</u>	Knightstone Manor, Knightstone Ottery St Mary EX11 1PP	Approval with conditions
<u>26/0860/PDQ</u>	Barn, Wiggaton, Ottery St Mary	Prior approval refused
<u>24/0307/DOC</u>	Salston Manor, Hotel Ottery St Mary EX11 1RQ	Discharge of Condition Approved
<u>26/0377/MFUL</u>	Land At Metcombe, Higher Metcombe, Ottery St Mary	Approval with conditions
<u>22/2667/FUL</u>	Land South Of Gerway Farm, Ottery St Mary , EX11 1PN	CPE approved
<u>26/1189/DOC</u>	Sunny Corner, Hind Street ,Ottery St Mary, EX11 1BW	Discharge of Condition Approved
<u>26/0994/FUL</u>	17 Shutes Mead, Ottery St Mary, EX11 1EE	Approval with conditions
<u>26/1007/FUL</u>	5 Hayne Park ,Tipton St John, Sidmouth ,EX10 0TA	Approval with conditions
<u>26/1026/LBC</u>	Ark Pottery Higher Barnes Wiggaton Ottery St Mary EX11 1PY	Approval with conditions

P/26/07/07 Public Participation

To assist with the smooth running of the meeting, the Chair will allow members of the public present to submit questions/comments relating to items on the agenda for consideration prior to the application being heard. Individual contributions will be limited to 3 minutes. Where there is a group of objectors or supporters for an application, a spokesperson should be appointed to speak on behalf of the group. The Chair will invite the member of public to speak, after the application has been introduced.

P/26/07/08 To consider and determine observations on the following Planning Applications:

Reference	Applicant	Details
1)	26/1139/TCA	Mrs Carol Akroyd T1: Oak - crown lift to achieve a clearance of 4m from ground level via removal of the lowest second and third order branches. Making target pruning cuts of up to 70mm diameter. To increase light penetration and airflow beneath the canopy, improving growing conditions for the established shrub and planting below, whilst retaining the trees overall canopy and amenity value. Also, to allow pedestrian access under canopy without obstruction. T2: Oak - crown lift to achieve a clearance of approx 5.5m above ground level via removal of 5x lowest secondary branches. Making target pruning cuts of up to 80mm diameter. To increase light penetration and airflow beneath the canopy, improving growing conditions for the established shrub and planting below, whilst retaining the trees overall canopy and amenity value. Also, to allow pedestrian access under canopy without obstruction. T3: Norway Maple (Crimson King) - dismantle to ground level. This tree is suppressed by the adjacent Beech and Oak (larger established canopy trees) limiting it's future growth potential. Removal would reduce competition for light, moisture and nutrients, allowing the larger Beech and Oak to continue developing while improving the overall structure of the tree group. T4: Beech - crown lift to achieve a clearance of 5.5m from ground level via removal of 5x lowest branches, making target pruning cuts of up to 80mm diameter. To increase light penetration and airflow beneath the canopy, to provide appropriate clearance from the adjacent BT line and nearby summerhouse, reducing the likelihood of branch contact whilst retaining the trees overall canopy, health and amenity value. T5: Aspen - remove the 3 lowest branches on the northern

			aspect, making target pruning cuts of up to 75mm diameter. To provide appropriate clearance to the adjacent BT overhead line, reducing the likelihood of branch contact whilst retaining the trees overall canopy, health and amenity value. 1 Paternoster Row, Ottery St Mary, EX11 1DP
2)	26/0903/VAR	Mr Thomas Swift	Variation of Condition Number 2 (approved plans) on Planning Permission 24/1686/FUL (Conversion of existing office to two dwellings) Replacement of existing timber sash windows with uPVC sash windows 9 Mill Street, Ottery St Mary, EX11 1AB
3)	26/1213/FUL	Mr Ben Smith	Demolition of rear extension, construction of single storey rear extension, side porch and single storey front extension 9 Meadow Close Ottery St Mary Devon EX11 1EW
4)	26/0620/FUL 26/0621/LBC	Mr David Armour	Extension to outbuilding, demolish existing porch and construct new porch. Replacement windows and external doors, and replacement of external render. Proposed roof refurbishment and construction of a French drain around property Deblins Brook Farm, Sandgate Lane, Wiggaton, Ottery St Mary EX11 1PX
5)	26/1205/FUL	Mr Michael and Mrs Naomi Cronk	Proposed first floor extension and ground floor single storey extensions to the East, South & West elevations Cardarroch, Ottery St Mary, EX11 1PN

P/26/07/09 To receive Councillors' questions relating to Planning Matters

P/26/07/10 Date of the next meeting: TBC



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2026

by **R Kent BA (Hons) MTP DipM MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6003914

Four Elms Farm, Alfington Road, Ottery St Mary, Devon EX11 1NY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by P Moore against the decision of East Devon District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/1349/PDQ.
 - The development proposed is conversion of existing cattle barn into 2x single storey residential dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and prior approval is granted under the provisions of Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for conversion of existing cattle barn into 2x single storey residential dwellings at Four Elms Farm, Alfington Road, Ottery St Mary, Devon EX11 1NY in accordance with the application 25/1349/PDQ and the details submitted with it including drawing number MOD-91-09 revision F 'Proposed Elevations' and subject to the following condition:
 - 1) No exterior walls or roof shall be installed on the development hereby permitted until details of the materials to be used in those walls or roof have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by the appellant against East Devon District Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appellant's statement of case included additional information regarding the agricultural status of the site and an addendum to the structural engineer's report in response to the two reasons for refusal. As the additional information supplements the appellant's case, does not constitute a fundamental change to the application and the Council has had the opportunity to comment on it, I have taken the additional information into account in my decision.

Background and Main Issues

4. Class Q.(a) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO) allows the change from a use as

a former agricultural building to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of the Use Classes Order. Paragraph Q.(c) allows building operations which are reasonably necessary to convert the building to such a use. Paragraph Q1 sets out the circumstances when development is not permitted by Class Q.

5. The supporting statement¹ to the application includes as an appendix a solicitor's opinion dated 27 March 2025 stating that paragraph Q.1(a) of the GPDO does not apply to the proposal as the site is no longer part of an established agricultural unit, having ceased to be following a change in the ownership in March 2016.
6. Notwithstanding this, the application form dated 24th June 2025 subsequently submitted to the Council stated, through ticked boxes on the form, that the site is both currently part of an established agricultural unit and was part of an established agricultural unit on 24th July 2023. The appellant's appeal statement confirms that it is the appellant's case that the proposal falls within paragraph Q.1(a).
7. There are two points at issue between the parties. The first point at issue is whether there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the proposal complies with either paragraphs Q1.(a) or Q1.(b) regarding whether it currently is or was part of an established agricultural unit and whether it was part of an established agricultural unit on 24th July 2023. The second point at issue is whether the proposal consists of building operations other than those permitted under GPDO paragraph Q1.(j).
8. Against this background, I consider the main issues in this appeal to be whether the proposal would be permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the GPDO, having regard to
 - whether the site is part of an established agricultural unit and if so whether the site was part of that unit on 24th July 2023; and
 - the building operations reasonably necessary for the building to function as a dwellinghouse.

Reasons

Established agricultural unit

9. Part 3 paragraph X of the GPDO defines an "established agricultural unit" for the purposes of Class Q as meaning "agricultural land occupied as a unit for the purposes of agriculture" on or before 20th March 2013 or for 10 years before the date the development begins.
10. A letter dated 28 February 2022 submitted with the appeal indicates that all the farm buildings at Four Elms Farm were in full agricultural use until the farm was sold in March 2016. I have not been provided with any compelling evidence that the land was not occupied as a unit for the purposes of agriculture on or before the dates referred to in paragraph X.
11. Notwithstanding the supporting statement and solicitor's opinion submitted with the application, the appellant's case is that the holding remained active through to and including 24th July 2023.

¹ "Four Elms Farm, Ottery St Mary, Ottery St Mary Supporting Statement. Prior Approval Application for the Conversion of Agricultural Building to Two Dwellings" by Carney Sweeney June 2025

12. Another letter² appended to the appellant's statement of case states that following the sale of the farm, cattle were overwintered and sheep were lambed in "the large barn." The letter states that there are 13 females and 3 males registered to the farm, and that rams are kept in the barn and cattle and sheep in the field to the rear of the barn. I also saw rams in the building and sheep in the field during my site visit. The letter states that these animals have been part of the farming activities at Four Elms Farm from 2016 until the 'present date'. Whilst the letter is undated, it is evidence that the site and adjoining land was used for agricultural purposes after 2016.
13. The British Cattle Movement Records submitted with the appeal also show 18 cattle on the holding. Whilst these records and the barcode labels provided by the British Cattle Movement Service also appear to be undated, the 'official snapshot' from the Rural Payments Agency³ submitted with the appeal indicates 17 cattle were registered to the agricultural holding on 24th July 2023. This is evidence that the site was being used for agricultural purposes on 24th July 2023. Whilst it is not clear to me whether the information submitted with the appeal was available to the solicitors when they provided their opinion, it has not been challenged by the Council.
14. In my judgement, the evidence submitted with the appeal demonstrates that livestock have been kept in and around the building since 2016 and the snapshot' from the Rural Payments Agency indicates that cattle were registered to the agricultural holding on 24th July 2023. Taking the appellant's evidence in the round, I am satisfied that, on the balance of probabilities, the site has continued to be part of an established agricultural unit since it was sold in 2016 and has remained in that use. The evidence, and in particular the Rural Payments Agency records, also show that, on the balance of probabilities, the site was also part of an agricultural unit on 24th July 2023.
15. I am therefore satisfied that, for the reasons given above, the proposal meets the requirements of paragraph Q1.(a) of the GPDO.

The proposed building operations

16. The existing building comprises a part blockwork, part corrugated clad structure with large openings on its south western elevation. Its north eastern elevation is set at a lower level than the adjoining field which it abuts. The roof comprises corrugated sheeting supported by concrete columns.
17. The proposal is to create two single storey dwellings following the demolition of the north western section of the building. Window and door openings would be created in the elevations of the building. The notes on the proposed plans indicate that 70% of the existing blockwork would remain with 30% removed to accommodate new openings for windows and doors. Whilst the existing cladding and roof covering would be replaced, the existing roof supports and concrete uprights would remain in place. The existing floor slab would be replaced.
18. The structural engineer's report includes a diagram showing the structural elements to be retained. It states that the proposed roof would be the same weight as the existing roof and therefore the structure does not need to be strengthened.

² Appellant's appendix C: 'Peter Ayres' letter'

³ Appellant's appendix D: DEFRA MI0091 Official Snapshot

Any internal finishes and services would be supported by the proposed timber frame partitions meaning there would be no additional loading added to the existing structure. Foundations were inspected as part of the report and found to be in good order. The concrete columns, timber roof trusses, purlins and associated connections would all be retained and reused.

19. GPDO paragraph Q.1(j) allows for the installation of windows, doors, roofs or exterior walls to the extent it is reasonably necessary for the building to function as a dwellinghouse. The replacement of the existing cladding and roof covering and the insertion of doors and windows is permissible under paragraph Q.1(j) (i) (aa). Similarly, Planning Practice Guidance makes clear that internal works are not generally development and that for a building to function as a dwelling it may be appropriate to undertake internal structural works. The internal partitioning of the building and new floor would be an example of such works.
20. The Council has referred to the *Hibbit*⁴ judgement suggesting that the proposed building operations exceed those reasonably necessary for the building to function as a dwellinghouse. Whilst the structural engineer's report contains some caveats and general observations, it states that all the existing structural elements can be retained and reused. I am mindful of the *Hibbit* judgement but have not seen any convincing evidence that the structure of the existing building means it is not capable of functioning as a dwelling or is not suitable for conversion to residential use. Therefore, from the evidence before me, I am satisfied that the proposed building operations would not exceed that reasonably necessary for the building to function as a dwellinghouse.
21. Paragraph Q.2 (1) of the GPDO requires that various other matters are considered in the determination as to whether prior approval is required. The site has an existing access to the unclassified Holcombe Lane and raises no adverse transport and highway impacts. The building is sited close to other buildings but I have not been provided with any sound evidence that the proposal would result in adverse noise impacts. Nor have I seen evidence of flooding or contamination risks on the site.
22. The Council concluded that the location of the building would not make it impractical or undesirable for the change of use to residential use to take place and I have found no reason to reach a different conclusion. Subject to a suitable planning condition to require details of the replacement cladding and roofing materials if the appeal is allowed, the design and external appearance of the proposed dwellings would not be harmful to the character or appearance of their surroundings. The Council accepted that all the habitable rooms for both dwellings would receive adequate natural light. I have seen no evidence to arrive at a different conclusion on this.
23. I therefore conclude that the proposed building operations would not exceed those reasonably necessary for the building to function as a dwellinghouse.

Other Matters

24. In view of my conclusion on the first main issue it is not necessary for me to assess the proposal against paragraph Q1.(b) of the GPDO.

⁴ Hibbit v. SSCLG(1) and Rushcliffe Borough Council (2) [2016] EWHC 2853 (Admin)

25. The Council indicates that the site is located within 10km of the East Devon Pebblebed Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Article 3(1) of the GPDO grants planning permission for classes of development as set out in Schedule 2 subject to Regulations 75 to 78 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. This provides that it is a condition of any planning permission granted by the GPDO that development which is a) likely to have a significant effect on a European site or offshore marine site, alone or in combination with other plans or projects and b) not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the site, must not begin until the developer has received written notification of the approval of the local planning authority under Regulation 77. A Regulation 77 application may be submitted and determined separately to an application for prior approval and I have determined the appeal accordingly.
26. I am aware of an appeal decision⁵ relating to the conversion of an existing farm building to a dwelling at Clyst St Lawrence also in East Devon. Whilst that appeal raised some similar issues to this appeal regarding the extent of the proposed building operations and was allowed, I am not familiar with the full details of that site or the proposals involved. I have determined this appeal on its individual merits.

Conditions

27. Conditions imposed by the GPDO, such as that in paragraph Q2.(4) requiring that development must be completed within 3 years starting with the prior approval date, do not need to be repeated. However, in view of the proposed new cladding and roof materials, it is reasonable and necessary to impose a condition requiring that details of those materials be submitted to the local planning authority for its approval before they are installed.

Conclusion

28. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed and prior approval should be granted.

R Kent

INSPECTOR

⁵ APP/U1105/W/24/3344843

Costs Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2026

by **R Kent BA (Hons) MTP DipM MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 June 2026

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: 6003914

Four Elms Farm, Alfington Road, Ottery St Mary, Devon EX11 1NY

- The application is made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, sections 78, 322 and Schedule 6, and the Local Government Act 1972, section 250(5).
 - The application is made by P Moore for a partial award of costs against East Devon District Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of an application to grant prior approval under the provisions of Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for conversion of existing cattle barn into 2x single storey residential dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The application for an award of costs is refused.

Reasons

2. Parties in planning appeals normally meet their own expenses. However, the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that costs may be awarded against a party who has behaved unreasonably and thereby caused the party applying for costs to incur unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process.
3. Paragraph W of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO) clearly states that the local planning authority may refuse an application where, in the opinion of the authority, the developer has provided insufficient information to enable the authority to establish whether the proposed development complies with any applicable conditions or limitations.
4. The Council made its decision on the basis of the information it had before it when it considered the application. The reasons for refusal and the Council's delegated report set out why the Council considered that it had insufficient information to conclude that the proposal constitutes permitted development under Class Q of the GPDO.
5. Whilst the case officer may have been able to see livestock during their site visit and it may have been possible for the Council to seek further information within the 56 day period for determining the application, it was not obliged to do so. Taking into account GPDO paragraph W, I am satisfied that the Council did not behave unreasonably in its approach to the information before it regarding the existence or otherwise of an established agricultural unit.
6. The Council identified apparent inconsistencies between the application form and the supporting statement submitted with the application as to whether the site formed part of an established agricultural unit. Whilst expense may have been

- incurred in seeking a legal opinion, the application form and the applicant's subsequent appeal submissions adopted a different position to the opinion. As a consequence, in my judgement the Council acted reasonably in addressing the alternative scenarios presented by GPDO paragraphs Q1.(a) and Q1.(b) in its report and first reason for refusal.
7. Although expense may have been incurred during the appeal in obtaining further information from the Rural Payments Agency, the British Cattle Movement Service and the structural engineer's addendum, this expense would have been incurred at the application stage had the Council sought additional information at that time. Whilst it was expense incurred as part of the appeal, it was not unnecessary or wasted expense and did not arise as a result of unreasonable behaviour by the Council.
 8. Applying the *Hibbit*¹ judgment, the assessment of whether the existing building is capable of functioning as a dwelling and its suitability for conversion to residential use, is a matter of planning judgement. The Council's report and subsequent evidence has explained the planning judgement it applied to the extent and nature of the proposed building operations. Although I have reached a different conclusion to the Council on whether the proposed building operations fall beyond that permitted by Class Q, I am not convinced that it behaved unreasonably in how it exercised its professional judgement on the extent of the proposed works based on the information before it.
 9. The PPG indicates that failure to determine similar cases in a consistent manner may amount to unreasonable behaviour and I am aware of other decisions made by the Council, including on the same building. However, each application should be considered on its individual merits according to the specific nature of the building, the site, the proposed works involved and the level of information submitted with each application. Whilst the appeal building may not have materially changed since 2022, I am not convinced that the information before the Council in each case was sufficiently similar that the Council acted unreasonably in making the judgement it did on the extent of the building operations proposed in this appeal.
 10. For the reasons given, I conclude that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense has not occurred and an award of costs is not warranted.

R Kent

INSPECTOR

¹ Hibbit v. SSCLG(1) and Rushcliffe Borough Council (2) [2016] EWHC 2853 (Admin)



Ottery St Mary Town Council

Minutes of the Planning Meeting held on **Tuesday 09 June 2026 at 6:05 pm**. The meeting was held in the **Ottery St. Mary Town Council (8 Broad Street, Ottery St. Mary, Devon, EX11 1BZ)**

Present: Ottery St Mary Town Council Admin, Cllrs Richard Copus (Chair), Vicky Johns (Mayor), Peter Faithfull (joined at 18.07), Emily Peka
Minute Taker: Jane Bushby - Ottery St Mary Town Council Admin

P/26/06/01 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive apologies for absence

Apologies received from Cllrs Martin, Grainger and Aherne

P/26/06/02 DECLARATIONS AND DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

To receive Declarations of interest for items on the Agenda and receipt of requests for new Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPIs) dispensations for items on the Agenda

Cllr Richard Copus	No declaration made
Cllr Vicky Johns	No declaration made
Cllr Peter Faithfull	26/1026/LBC applicant known to Cllr Faithfull
Cllr Emily Pekka	No declaration made

P/26/06/03 ADMISSION TO MEETINGS

In consideration of the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960 (publicity would be prejudicial to the public interest by reason of the confidential nature of the business to be transacted): to agree any items to be dealt with after the public and press have been excluded

There were none

P/26/06/04 REPORTS, CORRESPONDENCE AND ITEMS REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE

- 1) To review the Planning Terms of Reference
The Terms of Reference were reviewed and a recommendation made to accept the change regarding site visits

Chair's initials _____

P/26/06/05 MINUTES

To receive the Minutes of the Meeting of the Town Council of 26th May 2026 and to approve the signing of the Minutes by the Chair as a correct record
The Minutes were signed by the Chair as a correct record

P/26/06/06 PLANNING DECISIONS RECEIVED

<u>26/0782/FUL</u>	7 Homefield Close Ottery St Mary EX11 1HS	Approval with conditions
<u>26/0383/FUL</u>	Tumbledale Birdcage Lane, Ottery St Mary, EX11 1LN	Approval with conditions
<u>26/0442/FUL</u>	Sunny Corner, Hind Street, Ottery St Mary, EX11 1BW	Approval with conditions
<u>26/0735/FUL</u>	Higher Barnes Wiggaton Ottery St Mary EX11 1PY	Approval with conditions

P/26/06/07 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

To assist with the smooth running of the meeting, the Chair will allow members of the public present to submit questions/comments relating to items on the agenda for consideration prior to the application being heard. Individual contributions will be limited to 3 minutes. Where there is a group of objectors or supporters for an application, a spokesperson should be appointed to speak on behalf of the group. The Chair will invite the member of public to speak, after the application has been introduced.

There were none

Chair's initials _____

P/26/06/08 TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE OBSERVATIONS ON THE FOLLOWING PLANNING APPLICATIONS:

Reference	Applicant	Details
1)	26/1007/FUL	Mr & Mrs Schofield Two storey side extension 5 Hayne Park, Tipton St John, Sidmouth, EX10 0TA
Town Council Comments; The Town Council support this application		
2)	26/1026/LBC	Mrs Angela Glanville Installation of an array of 7 solar panels on the south-facing roof of outbuilding known as Ark Pottery/Studio and the installation of a battery inside the studio Ark Pottery, Higher Barnes, Wiggaton, Ottery St Mary, EX11 1PY
Town Council Comments; Application 26/0735/FUL was discussed at the last Planning meeting on the 26 th May and supported by the Town Council. Due to an oversight at the validation stage, the two applications were submitted separately and sometime apart. The Town Council support this application on the basis that there being no impact on the setting of the listed building, which is in the curtilage.		
3)	26/0994/FUL	Chris Durfy The formation of a driveway to the front garden 17 Shutes Mead, Ottery st Mary, EX11 1EE
Town Council Comments; The Town Council support this application		
4)	26/1063/FUL 26/1064/LBC	Mr & Mrs Hazlewood Removal of existing timber coach house doors and installation of new joinery panel comprising timber front entrance door and timber flush casement windows The Coaching Cottage, 4 The Fairmile, Fairmile, Ottery St Mary, EX11 1LP

Town Council Comments;

26/1063/FUL – The Town Council are not in support of this application based on the following concerns;

- 1) The proposed development may create an element of noise which could affect the neighbours
- 2) Concerns around the amount of glass being proposed

26/1064/LBC – The Town Council do not support the application based on the following;

- 1) The archway has been in existence for at least 90 years in its present state (fig 8 photo). The archway and the clock are arguably the most important part of this group listing and the proposed plan would adversely affect the historic appearance and the amenity of this and neighbouring buildings
- 2) This building is a local landmark
- 3) This building has collective architectural merit
- 4) While an individual building in a row might be of ordinary design, together they form an outstanding or highly representative piece of architectural history

Chair's initials _____

- 5) Historic buildings play a crucial role in bolstering community identity by providing a tangible link to the past and fostering a sense of belonging. They serve as reminders of the community's history and shared heritage

P/26/06/09 TO RECEIVE COUNCILLORS' QUESTIONS RELATING TO PLANNING MATTERS

There were none

^C
P/26/06/10 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING: TBC

Meeting concluded at 18.58 pm

Name:	Signature:
-------	------------

Chair's initials _____

Chair's initials _____