



Ilsington Parish Council

Clerk: Mrs C Retallick, Bagtor Barton, Ilsington, Newton Abbot, Devon, TQ13 9RT.

Telephone No: 01364 661532

E Mail: clerk@ilsingtonpc.org

Ilsington Parish Council Planning Committee Meeting at Ilsington Village Hall Tuesday the 9th of September 2025

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

Present: - MJ Wills C Germon M Wills C Reeve
B Turner M Freeman

Also, present Mrs C Retallick Clerk and 0 members of public.

Cllr MJ Wills welcomed everyone to the meeting.

1. **Apologies**
Received from Cllrs, Bainbridge, Codner, Retallick and Steemson
2. **Declaration of interest in items on the agenda.**
Cllr M Wills has signed with regard to item 5a on the agenda
3. **To confirm the minutes of the last meeting on 10th June 2025**
These were signed as a true record of that meeting.
4. **PUBLIC FORUM & MEMBERS COMMENTS– this will be limited to 10 Minutes** (*Applicants with planning applications for consideration may speak for up to 3minutes on behalf of their own application*)
None present.
5. **To consider planning applications received from Teignbridge District Council and Dartmoor National Park Authority.**
 - a) TDC 25/01251/FUL - Location: ILSINGTON - Jacaranda, Exeter Cross Proposal: Erection of replacement self-build dwelling. **Support it is pleasure to see something individual rather than the monotony of much extra urban development. The owners are expressing their personal aesthetic.**
 - b) TDC 25/01367/TPO Location: ILSINGTON - 6 Monro Mead, Liverton Proposal: Oak T1- a crown lift and reduction to create more space between tree canopies allowing more light into the garden and improving the overall tree health. Oak T2- a crown lift, tree thin and reduction to create more space between tree canopies allowing more light into the garden. **Support – for essential tree maintenance.**
 - c) DNPA 0285/25 Installation of electric vehicle charging point to the garage at Apple Tree Cottage, Higher Brimley, Bovey Tracey, Newton Abbot, TQ13 9JT **Support – As an essential facility for future proofing the property, in line with DNPA energy conservation aspiration.**

Grant of Conditional Planning Permission

- **DNPA 0139/25** - Variation of condition 2 of approved planning ref: 0278/23 Erection of general-purpose agricultural barn with roof mounted Photovoltaic panels and related cabling, Higher Knappa, Bickington, Newton Abbot, TQ12 6LB
- **TDC 25/00897/FUL - Location:** ILSINGTON - Hillside, South Knighton **Proposal:** Demolition of two agricultural buildings and construction of two detached dwellings following Class Q Approval (23/00667/NPA)
- **TDC 25/00925/TPO Location:** ILSINGTON - 7 Monro Mead, Liverton. **Proposal:** Single oak tree (labelled T1 on sketch plan), to be crown raised and the lower crown reduced to clear No.40

Kittersley Drive by minimum 3m. Some lower limbs removed to stem where no appropriate pruning points are available further out on each branch
Exemption works to trees covered by a Tree Preservation Order

- **25/01342/TPO Location:** ILSINGTON - 22 Kittersley Drive Liverton
Proposal: Remove dead Oak tree

Refusal of Planning Permission

- **DNPA 0103/25** - Retention of existing structure used as welfare facilities in conjunction with tree works business, Hillcrest Barn, Ilsington, Newton Abbot, TQ13 9RD
- **TDC 25/01142/CLDE Location:** ILSINGTON - Lower Staplehill Farm, Teigngrace **Proposal:** Certificate of lawfulness to establish implementation of planning permission reference 12/03707/FUL (Conversion of four redundant barns into six holiday letting units and ancillary games room with associated parking).

Certificate of Lawfulness of proposed use or development

- **0214/25** - Lawful development certificate for the proposed installation of conservatory to rear of property, Tor Hayes, Ilsington, Newton Abbot, TQ13 9RR

6. Local Plan 2020-2040 Main Modifications Consultation – discussion and consideration of our response.

The councillors will send this as our response:-

BRADMORE

MM2 - enhance, biodiversity and geodiversity. It is not clear how this intention sits against the removal of undeveloped, important farmland and SAC bat transit routes, particularly to the western extremity of the proposed Bradmore scheme.

MM5 - sustainable development and effective use of urban opportunities. The 'outlying' nature of some of the Bradmore proposal still seems to go against the data in terms of the separation from Newton Abbot's facilities. These are not being compensated for in any tangible Master Plan and huge amounts of resident journeys are inevitable.

MM6 - 'special environment' used to guide Neighbourhood Plan allocations. MM5 and MM6 have a bearing on this, and it should be considered in conjunction with MM147 (see later observations).

MM16 - The ongoing lack of liaison with Dartmoor National Park is noted as a particular concern and disappointment. Ilsington Parish Council should remind Teignbridge and the Inspector that the Parish sits part in both Authority areas and that should have a bearing on planning considerations and Neighbourhood Plan factors.

MM36 - Viability. This suggests the removal of control surrounding heritage, ecological assets, woodland and the deployment of steep slopes. This seems to contradict the aspirations of policy criteria as outlined in MM147 and advice put forward in the Design Code (e.g. R15) where inappropriate or excessive ground engineering are to be discouraged. Developer profits must not be allowed to dominate the actual deliverability of appropriate, suitable design led schemes and physical development placement. Of particular concern is what this could mean for Bradmore Wood which, after all, caused the proposed scheme (GC13) to be so named.

MM144 - The current NPPF (84c) does not so restrictively preclude certain rural buildings coming forward for conversion. It seems that Teignbridge wish to restrict such applications to historic or buildings of architectural merit.

MM147 - There is some slight reassurance on this matter, but it is also a question of how such aspirations will be interpreted and enforced. The now potentially defunct Bradmore Master Plan sought to protect western facing slopes, northern areas and the development's western extremities, then to allocate them to parkland and low-lying attenuation infrastructure. However, inferences in **MM36** are concerning and contradictory to MM147. Matters of this nature perhaps need to be tougher and more specifically worded, linked to a final (publicly displayed) Master Plan. Is it not the case that another master plan could supersede an earlier one but that, of course, relies on an original master plan being in place first - otherwise we are going to rely on a simple red line boundary where all previous development format bets are off? MM147 talks about separation from the rural backdrop, the retention of important rural views (outlook), protecting local settings with

value to people (long standing small communities and their residents). Also, a pronounced desire to protect important distinct hills, ridge lines and skylines is noted. The Parish identified several key zones of this nature, particularly looking east towards Seale Hayne and these should be included in the Master Plan which was, in part, informed by Parish feedback in the latter stages of the consultation process. Virtually nothing is lost in terms of overall development objectives even if these ridges, hill tops and skylines remain protected. We have to be sure that MM36 does not dominate the process.

MM149 - There is some reassurance here, providing MM147 and MM149 are balanced against an excess or inappropriate use of MM36.

MM156 - The 'tools' which are proposed to be removed for widespread access to the public is of concern. Put simply, why and why are these reference tools not being updated? This is particularly relevant because MM205 states that justifying flood control by the use of the Holmbeam Dam is not going to be included. This is of great concern when the NPPF specifically asks for offsite flood and drainage consequences to be fully considered in relation to emerging development. A scheme of the magnitude of GC13, discharging its surface water run off to a Zone 3 flood risk area, already relying on a dam to protect Newton Abbot, surely must be better controlled as design work progresses? Additionally, then to suggest removing the checks and balances available in various resources does not make sense.

MM160 / MM161 - These are crucial matters on a matter where Ilsington Parish Council feel that the SAC, bat transit routes and other environmental and ecological factors have been overlooked. It is also questioned how such large-scale development can provide a 10% biodiversity nett gain within the confines of the scheme. These points then have a great bearing on the vital need to protect (and maintain) mixed habitat on the western facing slopes, adjoining valleys, certain ridges and hilltops (earlier comments in relation to M22 refer).

MM185 - This is of great concern, particularly in relation to the now TPO protected Bradmore Wood. The Local Plan map shows this as within the Bradmore concept but not coloured brown, which we can only assume means that it is to be retained.

MM204 - It is with considerable disappointment that Ilsington Parish Council see the proposed omission of the Bradmore and NA1 Master Plan. This begs the question - why? Our only point of reference is what a representative for the developer said at the public hearings when he referred to rising contours, development areas and the need to make money. It is suspected that this may be why MM36 has been included. This does not, however, consider the consequences to the local environment, rural lifestyles, adequate separation, outlook or biodiversity. Additionally, there is a concern that any adopted design code will not have 'the teeth' to enforce appropriate design and we will be faced with more mediocre standard house types at high density, paying little regard for what might be suitable. At least the old master plan identified western areas of low level, low density housing which may have stood a chance of blending (with high quality design) into a rural backdrop. Alternately, if the zones present too many challenges, perhaps they should be considered as undeliverable, rather than eating up countryside (away from Newton Abbot) until they pay their way.

MM206 - Earlier comments referred to the importance of vital landscape buffers between rural dwellers and the need to protect hilltops, ridges, woodland and steep sloped, western facing extremities. Aside from dropping Bradmore's Master Plan, these westernmost zones must remain allocated to parkland and wildlife habitat.

MM208 - It is disappointing to note the omission of any need to consider the input that the Holmbeam Dam will have towards effectively managing surface water run-off from Bradmore. It begs the question - how will effective management be achieved and where will the water go? Is there a quiet plan already which the public do not know about?

MM210 - The new Design Code is noted but it is questioned how much this has become developer led. It is disappointing to see so many omissions of 'what we don't want' when they so ably demonstrated the errors of the past (e.g. R15 and some of the Mile End / Hele development). It is felt that there are great risks of this document being ridden roughshod over in favour of worrying criteria as outlined in paragraphs such as MM36 and its ripple effect into other MM suggestions.

MM434 - Bradmore's Master Plan was a pivotal factor in how the public consultations concluded and where any form of reassurance was gained. Heaven forbid this was nothing more than a sales

brochure when other agendas were released late in the process (e.g. developer public hearing comments) to 'move the goal posts'. Ilsington Parish Council feel that an alternative general plan should be prepared before any allocation is made, specifically to pick up on earlier development strategies and some of the control measures outlined in certain relevant MM paragraphs. This is also likely to have a bearing on Ilsington's Neighbourhood Plan which is in its formative stage.

WELCOME STRANGER TRAVELLER SITE

MM285 - It is extremely disappointing to see the ongoing inclusion of this site when such a compelling argument was put forward in terms of the ratio of certain community groups to established residents in a small area (ignoring, of course, Teignbridge's efforts to 'water that down' by seeking to link Ilsington to Bickington to soften the ratio). Policy H10 was re-written to remove a number of criteria that would have rendered the site unsuitable, and it still has a long way to go in terms of meeting a wide range of policy and decision-making criteria. Devon County Highways admitted that it would only work with entrance modifications and a passing place in a road which is single track. The site concerned has already been assessed as one where hedge improvements (retention and thickening) are necessary and a passing place may rely on an uncooperative adjacent landowner. That alone could render the site undeliverable. Regrettably, the suggested mitigation matters provide little reassurance because it is a matter of development principle. Ilsington Parish Council have previously stated that it appears to be a 'soft touch' for such schemes because its population's voice cannot shout loud enough and previous policy and technical matters have been overlooked to help facilitate such schemes.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Local Small Roads - It would be irresponsible to overlook the need to isolate and protect certain adjacent roads from serious traffic increases. In particular, the roads between the A383, Ingsdon and the road to Knighton Coss and the Welcome Stanger could become rat runs with no places for vehicles to pass. This is already a problem with 'sat nav', inappropriate delivery vehicles and at times when adjacent roads are under repair (e.g. the recent week closure of the A383 for a water main repair). This is exactly where a master plan would help rather than Devon County Highway's comment at the public hearing. They said that the South Knighton road had not been considered because it was outside the development and 'they assumed' that increased volumes of residents would not use it. That overlooks the fact that, for example, a new industrial park is to be built at Liverton and there is going to be increased area traffic as a result, possibly with workers living in Bradmore.

In summary, the current proposals under consideration are not what was debated and commented upon at public consultation or public enquiry stages. The overall consequences (likely changes) are not able to be assessed by the Parish or the local community because there is nothing hugely tangible to review and comment upon. There are however concerns that an excess of freedom may be bestowed on the developers with little need to justify their actions to the local communities or rigorous planning policies. We simply cannot embrace more poor-quality schemes where deleted and worthwhile earlier design code and master plan criteria sought to send out clear warnings. There is a concern that a layer of democracy and Human Rights consideration could be overlooked if the current proposals are 'steam rolled' forward without more clear public consultation.

The next meeting of the planning committee to be on 14th October 2025. In Ilsington village hall, meeting room.

Meeting closed at 20.10pm

Signed Date