

ITEM

ITEM

**REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE SITE INSPECTION GROUP HELD ON
MONDAY, 2 AUGUST 2010**

**54/0800/10/F – Extension to nursing home – Hyne Town House, Strete,
Dartmouth TQ6 0RU**

Present: Cllr Fielden (Chairman)
Cllr Cane
Cllr Hannaford
Cllr May
Cllr O'Callaghan

Also in attendance and participating:

Cllr Longrigg – Local Ward Member
Dean Kinsella – Senior Planning Officer
Kathryn Trant – Senior Member Support Officer
Cllr Pam Wills – Strete Parish Council

Also in attendance and not participating:

Cllr Mark Hanson – Strete Parish Council

In introducing the application, the Senior Planning Officer (SPO) made particular reference to:-

- a) the application being for a scaled down scheme to that previously seen by the Design Panel. This scheme included a first floor extension which was to be stepped down. The existing wall would not be touched;
- b) the scheme allowing for an increase in the number of rooms, with some existing rooms being adapted. It was later clarified that the extension would enable provision for a maximum of 38 beds instead of the existing 33 beds;
- c) the proposal for a sheltered walkway to allow patients to walk around the building outside;
- d) the proposal is for the extension to be covered in cladding. However if the application were to be approved officer's would seek an alternative material which would be more in keeping with being in a Conservation Area.

The Group proceeded to walk up the road to enable the SPO to demonstrate how the view of the church would be affected by the extension. The Group also considered this from lower down the hill. At this point, the SPO reiterated that the site fell within a Conservation Area and the boundary wall was identified as important during the Conservation Area Appraisal. The wall would not be affected by the proposal, so officers felt there was acceptable impact.

A Member queried the ownership of existing trees on the site as they helped to screen the view of the property, and whether the Council could ensure that they were preserved. In response, the SPO said he would seek clarification regarding the ownership of the trees and Members generally took the view that, if the trees fell within the Conservation Area, then they would be protected as a matter of course. Finally, the SPO indicated the car park which formed part of the site and advised that on his numerous visits, it had never been full.

The Group then proceeded to the neighbouring churchyard to assess the ridge height of the extension in comparison to the existing building. The SPO confirmed that in terms of fenestration and form, the proposed extension would reflect the existing extension on the other side of the building.

The local Ward Member accepted the need for extra beds and accommodation for patients suffering from dementia but was not convinced that this site was appropriate for the proposed level of increase. He quoted the Design Panel who had stated that the site could have reached its potential and was disappointed that the revised application had not been referred to the Panel for comment. He felt that the proposed extension would be too big a mass in a small village. His second consideration was the traffic volume, which was getting much worse. He had been through the village on previous days and seen cars parked right up through the busy road. He concluded by stating that no permission had been given by the church for their car park to be used.

The Parish Council (PC) representative reiterated the traffic concerns and stated that recently the police had to be called to move a vehicle which was blocking the road when a fire engine could not pass through. The village did not have a village car park and residents were complaining about the lack of parking facilities. There were concerns that more patients would lead to more people visiting and therefore an exacerbated parking problem.

In discussion, reference was made to:-

- (i) concern over the resulting mass of the building, and the impact on the village. The SPO confirmed however that whilst the view of the church would be affected, the view of the church tower would not;
- (ii) whilst there were local concerns about traffic and parking, the Highways Authority had concluded that there would be no adverse impact. There was further comment that an additional five patients was not likely to cause a great deal of increased traffic;
- (iii) if there was no need for additional beds then the applicant would not be making the application;
- (iv) the proposal being an improvement to the existing building when viewed from the churchyard.

The following motion was then **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED** and on being put to the vote was declared **CARRIED** by a vote of 3 in favour and 2 against:-

RECOMMENDED

That in respect of application number 54/0800/10/F, the application be conditionally approved.

Conditions

- 1 - TIM3 (Standard Time Limit 3 years)
 - 2 - NH05 (Accord with Plans)
 - 3 - Non Standard
- Samples submitted

Reasons for Approval

- 1 This application has been determined in accordance with Section 38 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 which states that planning applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This application has been determined in accordance with approved Development Plan Policies; relevant Government planning policy guidance; and approved in the absence of any other overriding material considerations and having given due weight to all other matters raised in this application including technical and other representations received. The relevant Policies are DP1, DP2, DP3 & DP6 of the Local Development Framework: Development policies; CS1, CS7 & CS9 of the Local Development Framework: Core Strategy; C01, C03 & C07 of the Devon County Structure Plan & SHDC1, SHDC 15, SHDC18 & SHDC19 of the South Hams Local Plan
- 2 All consultations and representations, and relevant planning history, have been given due consideration and balanced accordingly when formulating this recommendation and conditions.