

MINUTES of the Meeting of the **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT & LICENSING COMMITTEE** held at the **Council Chamber, Drake Road, Tavistock** on **MONDAY 14TH SEPTEMBER, 2026** at **6.30pm**.

PRESENT

Councillor B Smith
Councillor A Hutton

Chairman
Vice Chairman

Councillor J Moody

Deputy Mayor ex officio

Councillors G Parker, A Venning.

IN ATTENDANCE

Town Clerk (part meeting), Administrative & Democratic Support Officer

134. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Mrs A Johnson and A Lewis.

135. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

RESOLVED THAT the Minutes of the Meeting of the Development Management & Licensing Committee held on Tuesday 4th August, 2026 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman (Appendix 1).

136. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made at this point in the Meeting.

137. CONSULTATION ON A REVIEW OF THE SOUTH HAMS AND WEST DEVON JOINT LOCAL PLAN

The Committee considered the Notice of Scoping Consultation and the associated questions (Appendix 2) in connection with the proposed review by the Local Planning Authority of the Joint Local Plan with South Hams District Council. The observations of a Member, as amended, had previously been distributed.

Reference was made, in particular, to the impact of the recently announced 'pause' on local government reorganisation in Devon, timelines for the Joint Local Plan and accompanying process/matters arising from which it was:

RECOMMENDED THAT Tavistock Town Council respond to the consultation as follows:

Scoping: Vision and Objectives

VO1: Do you agree that the draft Vision creates an ambitious and positive outlook for the plan area to 2044?

Neutral

VO2: Are there any objectives that you feel are missing, or themes that have not been included?

- Tavistock is the only World Heritage Town in Devon. Section 3 of the Engagement Strategy contains a section "Place-based engagement", which reflects the different characteristics of the places in West Devon. Missing from this list is **"World Heritage site"**, which should be included.
- Providing, over the next 10 years, the level and nature of Affordable Housing set out in up-to-date local Housing Needs Assessments
- Setting out clear criteria for the location of housing to ensure that it will not harm the vitality and viability of the host settlement, for example, by overstressing the capacity of Tavistock's fragile highway network and other infrastructure.
- Ensuring that major developments secure the level of infrastructure identified by up-to-date analysis in respect of the needs of the host settlement.
- Ensuring that the main towns are promoted as centres for employment to support their long-term resilience and self-containment.

Note: the Council was surprised at the omission of the prior Joint Local Plan Outcome – 'places are created for enterprise to thrive and business grow', most particularly in view of the various references elsewhere to 'self-containment' and reduction of commuting.

Engagement Strategy

ES1: Do you agree with the proposed approach to engagement and consultation?

Strongly disagree

ES2: Are the proposed communication channels (website, printed press, social media, newsletters, local media and emails) appropriate?

Agree - whilst noting hard to reach communities often do not have digital access.

ES3: Which methods would you prefer to receive information about the Joint Local Plan?

Email

ES4: Are there any additional communication methods we should use?

no comment

ES5: Do you agree that the strategy will be effective in enabling everyone to participate, regardless of age, disability, location or background?

Strongly disagree

ES6: Are there any groups or communities that you feel may not be adequately reached?

Elderly, young, people isolated through health or other

ES7: Which engagement methods would you be most likely to use?

Workshops

ES8: What additional measures could help involve groups that do not traditionally participate in planning consultations?

no comment

ES9: Is there anything else you would like to tell us about how we should engage with residents, businesses and stakeholders during the preparation of the Joint Local Plan?

no comment

The Council further requests a 7th category be included in place based engagement – ‘World Heritage Site’

Settlement Hierarchy

SH1: Should the local plan continue to direct the majority of development towards our most sustainable settlements?

Yes

SH2: Should the local plan identify potential capacity constraints at our most sustainable settlements?

Yes

SH3: Should the local plan consider identifying areas for new towns or villages?

Yes

SH4: Should the next local plan allocate sites at a range of scales to enable large scale investment in infrastructure to be secured where necessary?

Yes

SH5: Should the local plan identify and allocate sites at named sustainable villages, in collaboration with neighbourhood plan groups and parish councils?

Yes

SH6: Are there any alternative policies that could be considered that could make remote rural development more sustainable and resilient?

No comment

SH7: What policies should we consider to keep our main towns vibrant and prosperous?

- Consider the cumulative impact of development on the infrastructure of our towns – transport, social, health, community, services.
- Pay special attention to the constraints of World Heritage, National Landscapes and National Park on the ability of Tavistock to extend.
- Direct development away from locations around the main towns that would harm their vitality and viability. In the case of Tavistock that indicates restricting major development away from the west, north and east of the town.

Housing and Population

HP1: What new policies should we consider to try and improve the affordability of new homes for local people?

The issue here is not so much the policies that govern the provision of Affordable Housing. The problem is that West Devon Borough Council has not implemented the existing policies fully – sometimes not at all. For example:

- At the Little Orchard site, a development of 44 very expensive homes was permitted with no affordable housing at all
- Applications appear to be being encouraged, outside but on the edge of Tavistock, to provide 30% Affordable Housing rather than applying JLP policy TTV27 which requires a maximum of 40% open market housing with a minimum of 60% affordable/custom built/self-build housing.
- Permissions are being granted on TTV27 sites with only 30% Affordable Housing. (The most recent being behind the Farriers in Lamerton)
- Within a year of adopting the JLP, WDBC actually attempted to disapply policy TTV27 to Tavistock – paragraphs 11.44-11.49 of the Supplementary Planning Document.

The Council suggests that the Affordable Housing crisis might not be so severe if existing policies were implemented rigorously.

Having said that, there does appear to be a trend (unquantified) toward second/holiday homes in the area. This is an issue that might be picked up in a new planning policy

HP2: How should the Local Plan ensure that new homes meet the needs of local communities?

For Tavistock, this would involve taking note of, and using, the most up to date assessment of Housing Need, prepared for the Neighbourhood Plan in 2023.

HP3: Should the local plan explore the use of eligibility restrictions on new houses to prioritise people with a local connection to ensure we are meeting local housing needs?

The question is considered ambiguous.

If it applies to Affordable Housing, then the answer is clearly “Strongly agree” (although this is already the case).

If it applies to housing in general, then the answer is “Strongly disagree” – policies discriminating against incoming populations would be unworkable and would serve no good purpose.

HP4: Should eligibility restrictions (for example having a local connection to the area) apply everywhere, or apply differently in different parts of the settlement hierarchy?

Everywhere

HP5: Should policies support the delivery of more innovative forms of housing delivery, including Co-housing and Community Land Trusts (CLT)?

Yes (Note the Tavistock Neighbourhood Plan and National Planning Policy Framework already do this)

HP6: How should the Local Plan support an ageing population in the provision of new homes?

By promoting and facilitating the provision of retirement/extra care/nursing home accommodation. The Tavistock Neighbourhood Plan already specifically supports the provision of Extra Care accommodation.

HP7: Should we explore policies that could retain younger working age people in the area?

Yes

HP8: What housing policies do you think would be most effective in the new local plan?

Policies that:

- Meet the local planning authority’s overall housing requirement (yet to be set by the Spatial Development Strategy)
- Support development in sustainable locations
- Protect the countryside from isolated development and from urban sprawl.
- Direct development to locations that support, rather than harm, their host settlements
- Meet local housing needs as defined by the most up to date local assessments.

Economy

EC1: How should the local plan look to diversify the types of jobs available in South Hams and West Devon?

In the case of Tavistock, take advice from the Town Council and local organisations, especially the Chamber of Commerce, BID and sixth form

colleges. Take advice from Plymouth-based employers to establish the scope for business satellites.

EC2: Do you agree that the local plan should consider policies that offer innovative responses to the economic challenges experienced by many farmers? What would be the most effective policies to achieve this?

No comment

EC3: Do you agree that the local plan should promote a sustainable transition towards a low carbon economy? What would be the most effective policies to achieve this?

Yes The most effective policies would be to promote sites and opportunities for local businesses and training/innovation centres in order to minimise commuting and increase self-containment

EC4: How should the local plan help reduce the need for people to travel long distances for work?

The starting point is to implement existing policies. In the debate on the Linden Homes and Baker Estates applications on Plymouth Road, the Town Council objected because the applications did not provide the 18,600 sq.m. of Employment space required by policy TTV17 of the JLP.

In those cases, the response from WDBC was not to require that amount of and to be provided. Rather, it was to argue that the reduced amount was not significant because **"there is a very healthy supply of employment land identified (elsewhere) within the TTVPA"**

Despite the evidence that 93% of the employment land referred to by WDBC would involve more than a 40 km round trip from Tavistock, permissions were granted to lose at least half of that employment allocation.

Policies to allocate additional employment land in Tavistock, in the interests of, reducing commuting and increasing self- containment and sustainability, are certainly needed. However, no policy is worth anything if the local planning authority is not inclined to implement it.

EC5: How should the local plan protect and enhance the vitality and resilience of our town centres and high streets?

In the case of Tavistock, first, support the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Second, in view of the fragile nature of the highway network and the many junctions surrounding the town centre, ensure that future development in the town does not create traffic conditions that make it impossible for the centre to function.

Third, develop policies and proposals that make it easier and safer for visitors to access the town centre and to move around it.

EC6: What economic policies do you think would be most effective in the new local plan?

Encourage choice of job-creating locations within and close to the town

Promote the development of a skills ,learning and innovation centre.

Pay proper attention to the need to facilitate access to and through the town by all means of transport.

Climate Change

CC1: Should the local plan consider ambitious policies that can reduce the emission impacts of development?

No comment

CC2: Should the local plan consider identifying sites for renewable energy generation and storage?

No comment

CC3: Should the next local plan include proactive policies that respond to the direct and indirect effects of climate change, both in terms of mitigation and adaptation?

No comment

CC4: Should the plan include policies that actively create biodiversity and habitat, rather than simply protecting what we already have? How could this best be achieved?

No comment

CC5: What climate change and emissions reduction policies would be most effective in the new local plan?

No comment

Natural Environment and Landscape

NE1: How should the local plan balance the need to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of designated landscapes (including the South Devon National Landscape and the Tamar Valley National Landscape) with the need to ensure the ongoing sustainability of local communities in these areas?

No comment

NE2: Do you agree that the local plan should seek to promote access to, and enjoyment of, South Hams and West Devon's natural environment and scenic landscapes, while protecting ecological sites, habitats and species?

No comment

NE3: How should the local plan should seek to positively influence land management practices to improve environmental quality?

No comment

Historic Environment

HE1: As historic buildings continue to change and evolve, they need to contribute to a greener future and be fit for purpose for the people who live in, experience and care for them. With this in mind should the local plan consider policies that reflect this ambition and better align with wider carbon reduction targets and policies?

Strongly agree

HE2: Would you support utilising heritage buildings and environments for high-quality brownfield development, protecting heritage buildings through their redevelopment and preserving them through finding ongoing uses and retrofitting to reduce carbon footprint?

Select one option

Strongly disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly agree

This is considered an issue that can only be dealt with on a case-by-case basis

HE3: How best can local communities be involved in these brownfield redevelopment schemes to ensure that projects are culturally sensitive, socially inclusive and economically beneficial?

By establishing local Conservation Advisory Panels and, where Heritage Assets need specific protection, Heritage Trusts.

HE4: What historic environment policies do you think would be most effective in the new local plan?

Again, this is a question of implementing consistently the policies of the NPPF, the Tavistock CAMP, the WHS MP and the Neighbourhood Plan. The Local Plan should not repeat those policies so that its most useful purpose could be to identify to which Heritage Assets the policies apply.

Health and Wellbeing

HW1: How should the new plan secure better health and wellbeing outcomes from new development?

No comment

HW2: Should the local plan explore policy options that can prevent health and wellbeing issues occurring in the future? What would be the most effective policies to achieve this aim?

No comment

HW3: Are there any planning policies that could improve the health and wellbeing of our existing communities and new residents in the new local plan?

No comment

Infrastructure, Transport and Facilities

TI1: How should the local plan explain the bigger picture of funding for infrastructure and services, and be clearer about what can and cannot be expected of developer contributions?

The policy part of the plan should make clear the principles:

- What matters can/should concern a Local Plan and what matters do not
- What are matters for government/local government control or funding
- What are matters for private sector funding/management
- What matters developers can legitimately be asked to contribute to (including the principle that developers cannot be held responsible for previous underfunding)

TI2: Should the local plan do more to explain the difficulties of balancing infrastructure investment and broader viability considerations?

Strongly agree

TI3: Should the local plan consider allocating larger development sites that will attract more investment into onsite and offsite infrastructure and services?

Select one option

Neutral

Note: the reason for this is that there is merit on both sides of this discussion. Although the questioner has a good point that larger developments can afford larger amounts of infrastructure investment, the fact is that larger developments usually take much longer to initiate and deliver. Obvious cases in Tavistock are the speed of delivery at the Tors (13 years and counting) compared with Embden Grange and Broadleigh Park. The latter two have already delivered all of their S106 obligations, whereas the former has not

TI4: What do you see as the opportunities and risks of allocating larger sites?

Speed of delivery is the main one. The Parliamentary investigation into the housing industry some years ago identified that small/medium sites were considerably better at helping local planning authorities to meet their targets. In addition, there is a limit to the numbers of homes that can be/are sold through individual sales points. Thus, very large sites tend to 'drip feed' over longer periods than small/medium sites, causing people to believe that the larger developers are land banking

TI5: How should the local plan seek to protect existing community facilities which help meet the needs of local communities?

In the case of Tavistock, implement policy CF1 of the Neighbourhood Plan. the Council is not aware of any planning application where this policy has been referenced.

TI6: How should the local plan look to improve active travel infrastructure to make it easier for people to reach destinations by walking, cycling and wheeling? (Wheeling refers to using things like wheelchairs, mobility scooters and prams.)

This is a matter for action programmes rather than the Local Plan.

TI7: How should the local plan ensure that new developments provide residents with good access to outdoor spaces and nature?

Implement the policies of the existing JLP

TI8: It is important that new development helps deliver necessary improvements to infrastructure. Which types of infrastructure should be given the highest priority?

In the case of Tavistock, the fragile highway network. However, Primary Health Care, education and public transport are also important

TI9: Do you agree that the railway network has a key role to play in enabling sustainable forms of development over the plan period, and that the local plan should seek to unlock the unrealised potential of railway infrastructure?

Strongly agree. However, the Council believes that this issue is out of the hands of the Local Planning Authority and beyond the scope of this Local Plan, other than offering moral support for the Tavistock Rail Link.

TI10: What infrastructure policies do you think would be most effective in the new local plan?

Policies that require cumulative assessment of the impacts of developments on all types of infrastructure, particularly the highway network but also on the full range of infrastructure types.

Also, policies that prevent land value from being an *input* into viability assessments. Too often, the price of land is held to be a reason why policy-compliant S106 Obligations cannot be achieved. This is a point highlighted on many occasions by government, not least in the latest version of the NPPF, **“Neither the price paid for land, nor the price intended to be paid through an option agreement, should be a justification for failing to accord with relevant policies in the plan.”**

Noted That after this discussion the Town Clerk left the meeting.

138. DARTMOOR NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY (DNPA)

No items received.

139. TOWN PLANNING ISSUES

No items received.

140. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

a) **Planning Decisions**

Planning Decisions reached by West Devon Borough Council were attached at Appendix A (Appendix 3).

b) **NEW Planning Applications**

New Planning Applications to West Devon Borough Council.

RECOMMENDED THAT the views of the Town Council, as listed in Appendix B, be passed to the Local Planning Authority for consideration (Appendix 4).

141. NEXT MEETING

The next Meeting of the Development Management & Licensing Committee would be held on Tuesday 6th October at 6.30pm in the Council Chamber, Drake Road.

The Meeting closed at 7pm.

Signed:

Dated:
CHAIRMAN

TAVISTOCK TOWN COUNCIL**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT & LICENSING COMMITTEE – LIST OF PLANNING DECISIONS (Appendix A) FOR MEETING 14.09.2026**

Applicant's Name, Site Location, P/App No.	Development Type	Town Council's Comments	Decision by Local Planning Authority	Date of Decision
Mr H Williams 8 Westmoor Park Tavistock PL19 9AA P/A No. 1866/26/TPO	TPO S265: G2 - Cherry – Fell as too large for garden & is in danger of snapping branches. The canopy extensively overhangs neighbouring properties (no's. 60 & 62) & has the potential to cause damage from snapping branches, excessive shading destroying amenity value. Replacement tree will be planted	Support	Grant	18 th August 2026
Mr G Thomas 5 Frobisher Way Tavistock PL19 8RE P/A No. 1906/26/TPO	Reducing the height of these trees will allow more light in to all the surrounding gardens and should propagate growth at the base of the trees to form a thicker hedge between the properties.	Support	Grant	18 th August 2026
Mr B Heartfield Uplands Down Park Drive Tavistock PL19 9AH 1986/26/TPO	TPO S251 T14: Silver Birch – remove, dead.	Support	Grant	27 th August 2026

TAVISTOCK TOWN COUNCIL**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT & LICENSING COMMITTEE - NEW PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Appendix B) FOR MEETING 14.09.2026**

Applicant's Name & Location	P/App Link	Proposal	Deadline to respond
Mr S Bradford 25 Alder Road Tavistock PL19 9LW P/A No. 2321/26/TPO	Planning Application: https://westdevon.planning-register.co.uk/Planning/Display/2321/26/TPO	T1: Elm - Reduce crown height of tree by 3 metres so as to reduce amount of wind it catches and reduce risk of branches failing and falling on warehouse behind and client property Reduce lateral spread throughout on all 4 cardinal points N, S E & W by 2.5 metres so as to reduce risk of branch failure and amount of shading and overhang over client property and warehouse behind.	Neutral refer to tree officer
Mr&Mrs Shore Hillcrest 2 Abbotsfield Crescent Tavistock PL19 8EY P/A No. 2266/26/HHO	Planning Application: https://westdevon.planning-register.co.uk/Planning/Display/2266/26/HHO	Proposed single storey rear extension to bungalow. Replace garage and insert new pedestrian gate & path. Associated solar panels.	Support – Note the front extension in the drawings is not included in the application
Ms I Chambers Annexe Round House Old Launceston Road Tavistock PL19 8NA P/A No. 2121/26/VAR	Planning Application: https://westdevon.planning-register.co.uk/Planning/Display/2121/26/VAR	Removal of condition 2 (parking spaces) of 3529/25/VAR (retrospective)	Support – However committee are concerned about the condition of the listed building and suggest including it on the emerging Historic Buildings At Risk register.

Applicant's Name & Location	P/App Link	Proposal	Deadline to respond
35 Bannawell Street Tavistock PL19 0DL P/A No. 1872/26/LBC	Planning Application: https://westdevon.planning-register.co.uk/Planning/Display/1872/26/LBC	Re-roofing of existing dwelling	Support
Better Diamonds Ltd 1 Spring Hill Tavistock PL19 8LB P/A No. 1997/26/FUL	Planning Application: https://westdevon.planning-register.co.uk/Planning/Display/1997/26/FUL	Change of use from C2 (Residential Institutions) to C3 (Dwellinghouse)	Support but inaccuracies in form regarding parking, recycling and biodiversity and wrong site address.
Mr D Bennett DB Garden Services Beech Tree House 2B Roland Bailey Gardens Tavistock PL19 0RB P/A No. 2449/26/TPO	Planning Application: https://westdevon.planning-register.co.uk/Planning/Display/2449/26/TPO	T5: Fagus Sylvatica, Beech tree – Crown height reduction by 9m and lateral crown reduction by 6m, leaving the tree to be 9m in height and 5m in width left standing to maintain balance. Safety to all residences close by and to maintain the ongoing of a healthy tree and prevent any damage in the near future. T3: Quercus Robur, Oak tree – Crown height reduction by 9m and 5m lateral crown reduction, leaving the tree to be 9m in height and 5m width, maintaining its shape and balance to this healthy tree whilst making the surrounding area safer. Tree is which is	Neutral – refer to tree specialist

Applicant's Name & Location	P/App Link	Proposal	Deadline to respond
		growing at an angle into the garden and towards the house which could cause some considerable to damage to the house should it continue to grow and collapse.	