

**REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE SITE INSPECTION GROUP HELD ON  
MONDAY, 3 AUGUST 2009**

**(02/0988/09/F) Retrospective application for amendment to approval  
02/1895/08/F for reinstatement of dwelling. Amendments relate to the  
extension to south/west elevations – Idestone Farm, Loddiswell,  
Kingsbridge TQ7 4EJ**

**Present:** Cllr Cane  
Cllr Carter  
Cllr Fielden (Chairman)  
Cllr May  
Cllr Steer

**Also in attendance and participating:**

Cllr Coates – Aveton Gifford Parish Council representative  
Cllr Carson – local Ward Member  
Kati Owen – Senior Planning Officer (Eastern Area)  
Kat Winterbottom – Senior Member Support Officer

In her introduction, the Senior Planning Officer (SPO) made particular reference to:-

- (A) the details of the proposals. The SPO advised that the application sought permission to amend the previous planning permission granted to reinstate the former dwelling. In outlining the approved application, which included the extension of the building by way of a single storey lean-to extension on the side of the building and a two storey extension to the rear, a comparison was made with the proposed amendments. It was noted that these related to the erection of a two storey side extension, to link in with the rear two storey extension permitted (in place of the small single storey lean-to shown on the approved plans). Furthermore, the ground level of the extension would be set approximately 700mm higher than that of the main house and the eaves and ridge would be set down by approximately 300mm. The front elevation would contain two casement windows and a full height glazed door; the gable set into the bank to the south would contain a large glazed opening as would the west elevation, which was also set into the banked land;
- (B) concern with the amended application. The SPO advised that Officers were raising concern to the proposals by virtue of its size and the two storey wrap around aspect, as it was considered to be out of keeping with the character, appearance and simple form of the existing building.

The Group then proceeded to walk the footprint of the amended proposal. For comparison, the proposal and the approved application had been marked out, both in terms of footprint and height. In looking at the application site, a Member commented on the close proximity of the bank to the proposal and questioned whether Officers felt that this was an acceptable relationship, especially in relation to the limiting amount of natural light it created. In response, the SPO advised that, although quality of life within a dwelling would be considered, if the applicant felt that the amount of natural light into any approved dwelling was acceptable, then Officers were satisfied in this context. Furthermore, Officers felt that the arrangement of the windows was such that, it mitigated concerns of restricted natural light due to the close proximity of the steeped bank.

The local Ward Member then proceeded to address the Group, highlighting the following points:-

- the perceived retrospective nature of the application. The Ward Member advised that, although the application description stated that it was retrospective, the works which had commenced on site were all in accordance with the originally approved application. It was confirmed that no works had commenced on the proposed amended application which was currently being considering;
- the Member reiterated that the building was not necessarily subject to the barn regulations as it had two chimneys and, as noted by the SPO, it was thought that it had previously been used as a residential dwelling as well as for agricultural use;
- it was felt that the lean-to, which had already been approved, would be restrictive in size and subsequently would not be advantageous to a dwelling;
- no objections had been received from neighbouring properties; and,
- there was no overlooking or loss of view to neighbouring properties.

In conclusion, the local Ward Member felt that the design of the proposal was of a good standard and did not warrant refusal. Subsequently, the Member hoped the Group would be able to support conditional approval of the application.

The Parish Council (PC) representative aired his support for the views of the local Ward Member. The representative then stated that, when the PC had considered the application, it debated the impact it would have on the surrounding area and whether it would add value to the immediate vicinity. The PC had concluded that the proposals seemed like a sensible way forward and therefore supported the application.

In discussion on the application, Members supported the comments of the local Ward Member and the PC representative. The SPO advised that, if Members were minded to conditionally approve the application, the conditions should be in line with those of the previously approved application (02/1895/08/F refers).

It was then unanimously:-

**RECOMMENDED**

That in respect of application number 02/0988/09/F, the application be conditionally approved.