

Planning Committee: 19 January 2022

Question: J salter (Zoom)	
Redrow Homes are only intending to install working charging points to market homes, and only ducting, with no cables, to affordable homes. Can the Planning Officers please explain what has changed, and why do Redrow Homes appear to be discriminating against Affordable Home owners?	Redrow Homes will be installing all the electrical cabling into the affordable homes. All that will simply be missing is the final 'plug-in' box. This being in response to Registered Providers being undecided about the level of provision and longer term liability. Condition 12, as set out in the Officers report confirms that all residential units shall include EV charging and more specifically for the affordable units, that evidence shall be gathered from the Registered Provider to confirm their specific requirements. Once gathered appropriate provision can be made ahead of occupation. I would therefore advise that EV charging provision is being made irrespective of tenure and without discrimination.
Will the Planning Committee now give material consideration to the fact that Redrow Homes are not providing active charging points to all, irrespective of tenure?	Please see response above

Pub
lic
Que
stio
n
Tim
e:
res
pon
ses

<p>The Government issued an approved revised Building Regulation L. Conservation of Fuel and Power to become effective on June 15th, 2022. Do the Redrow Homes already meet this standard, and do Redrow Homes currently meet all the other revised standards in the new Regulation Part L?</p>	<p>Not relevant to this planning consideration as not a planning matter; this is a Building Regulation matter, subject to separate consideration.</p> <p>Part L of the Building Regulations, that is concerned with conservation of fuel and power, is a matter for Building Control and one that Redrow Homes themselves might be better placed to answer.</p>
<p></p>	<p></p>
<p>Question: H Bingham & G Conabear</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Why are Redrow Homes being allowed to place 20 properties against the boundary of the existing 10 Blundell's Road properties, which is a ratio of 2-to-1 and yet David Wilson placed only 11 properties against the 14 existing properties at The Fairway - a ratio of 0.8?</p>	<p>Each application is assessed on a site-by-site basis giving full consideration to site context; including neighbours.</p> <p>The centre-to-edge principles set out in the Adopted Masterplan SPD & Tiverton EUE Design Guide are detailed in previous committee reports including July 2021.</p> <p>The area to the rear of existing properties south of Blundell's Road is identified in the Adopted Masterplan SPD for densities of up to 42 dwellings per hectare. This would be the equivalent (when applied to this application) to 97 dwellings. This application represents a shortfall of 38 dwellings compared to agreed Masterplan SPD densities.</p> <p>Changes have been introduced during the Planning Committee cycle including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in house types – reduced footprint of the main dwellings; • The introduction of detached garages to the side or rear of 16 units for enhanced visual breaks; • The introduction of two bungalows; • Greater variety of house types; & • Enhanced buffer strip. <p>The layout is wholly acceptable in planning terms and is considered to be a good form of development.</p>
<p>Why are Redrow Homes being allowed to present that there are no amenity impacts by having this higher density housing against the existing 10 Blundell's Road properties?</p>	<p>Total distance between the rear elevation of existing & proposed dwellings varies between 48 - 64m including:</p> <p>Garden lengths to existing properties of between 31-50m; a landscaped buffer of 3m-5m; rear gardens (Plots 1-20) of 8.5 (min).</p> <p>Minimum planning requirements as established by Case Law to ensure privacy: 23m.</p> <p>The total distance is double that established as a standard in Case Law.</p>

	<p>Existing mature planting on rear boundary to be supplemented with additional in buffer strip.</p> <p>Loss of amenity to existing residents is considered limited.</p>
<p>Why are Redrow Homes only providing 2 bungalows when there is a pressing requirement for more bungalows in Tiverton?</p>	<p>There is no requirement in the outline planning application or the Adopted Masterplan SPD for provision of such units. As such, there is no policy requirement for them. However, 2 bungalows have been provided at the request of Planning Committee.</p> <p>Provision reflects market demand whilst being delivered within a viable scheme combining other requirements including affordable housing, social and transport infrastructure.</p>
Question: H Kearns	
<p>How can it be justified for the Planning Officer to state <i>“that Members also noted ongoing concern in relation to road safety. However, road crossings on Blundell’s Road/Linking Road / Spine Road lie outside the parameters of this Reserved Matters application.”</i></p>	<p>Outside the parameters of this Reserved Matters application; has been subject to Outline Application 14/00881/MOUT, approved June 2017. Not a matter for discussion.</p> <p>Road safety concerns are a material consideration.</p> <p>DCC ensure all schemes are safety audited; including safe crossings east to west and north to south at Blundell’s Road / the linking road / the spine road.</p> <p>Statutory procedures require Planning Committee to consider the application before them. Whilst Committee Members will give full consideration to the context of the application they are required to make a decision on the application details before them. On this basis, the Blundell’s Road / Linking Road / Spine Road crossings fall outside this application area & consequently fall outside the parameters of this Reserved Matters application.</p>
<p>If road safety matters cannot be discussed by Planning Committee Members in relation to this application, then when have they been discussed in the past, or when will they be in the future?</p>	<p>Outside the parameters of this Reserved Matters application; has been subject to Outline Application 14/00881/MOUT, approved June 2017. Not a matter for discussion.</p> <p>Road safety concerns are a material consideration.</p> <p>DCC ensure all schemes are safety audited; including safe crossings east to west and north to south at Blundell’s Road / the linking road / the spine road.</p> <p>Outline application (14/00881/MOUT) provided opportunity to discuss road crossings. The detailed design of the Phase II Traffic Calming of Blundell’s Road will be carried out by the County Highway Authority giving full consideration to crossings.</p>
<p>Why are Redrow Homes being allowed to TOTALLY IGNORE the road safety concerns</p>	<p>Outside the parameters of this Reserved Matters application; has been subject to Outline Application 14/00881/MOUT, approved June 2017. Not a matter for discussion.</p>

<p>highlighted by the belatedly formed Specialist Design Review Panel? The Panel effectively raised concerns about the lack of separation between pedestrians and vehicles, particularly in proximity to the 420-place primary school, but these have not been addressed.</p>	<p>Road safety concerns are a material consideration. DCC ensure all schemes are safety audited; including safe crossings east to west and north to south at Blundell's Road / the linking road / the spine road. The primary school will form part of the proposed neighbourhood centre. Outline planning permission has been given (Application No. DCC/4070/2018). Blundell's Road will be the subject of Phase II Traffic Calming to be carried out by the County Highway Authority giving full consideration to crossings.</p>
<p>Why have Redrow Homes been allowed to TOTALLY REMOVE the fully segregated OFF ROAD cycle lanes either side of the Linking Road and Spur Road? The existence of which is a Tiverton EUE Design Guide expectation.</p>	<p>The linking road and spine road are not details of this application under consideration. The linking road was approved through outline planning application: 14/00881/MOUT The Spine road was approved through Reserved Matters application: 21/00374/MARM This application seeks to provide safe and accessible alternatives to the private car; establishing the principle of a network of streets, pedestrian and cycle routes, linking to the public highway & future phases of development.</p>
<p>Why are Redrow Homes being allowed to TOTALLY REMOVE the Green Boulevard to the north of Blundells Road i.e. the Linking Road? In doing so it means that the Affordable Homes front doors will open within 4 meters of a major arterial road without any form of barriers. A Green Boulevard should in fact be a minimum 25 meters wide if the Design Guide expectations are to be considered.</p>	<p>Discussed at length with the applicant at the early stages of the application including the emerging Urban Design and Architectural Principles document. The linking road adopts a more 'urban form' whilst retaining green frontage along the length of the linking road; this to provide visual clues to motorists from the A361 that they are entering an urban area. Green frontage is retained along the length of the linking road including tree planting. Further applications awaited to deliver further areas of green frontage on to the linking road (Care Home and self-build plots). These issues were raised with the former Head of Planning and were endorsed as an appropriate design approach.</p>