

**REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE SITE INSPECTION GROUP HELD ON  
MONDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 2009**

**(41/0999/09/F) Householder application for resubmission of 41/0434/09/F for conversion of existing garage to accommodation and erection of a new double garage – 16 Beadon Road, Salcombe TQ8 8LX**

**Present:** Cllr Bastone  
Cllr Cane  
Cllr Longrigg  
Cllr May (Chairman)  
Cllr Steer

**Also in attendance and participating:**

Cllr Moore – Salcombe Town Council representative  
Cllr Carter – Local Ward Member  
Malcolm Elliott – Area Planning Officer (Western Area)  
Darryl White – Member Support Services Manager  
Kathryn Trant – Senior Member Support Officer

**Also in attendance and not participating:**

Cllr Coulson – Local Ward Member (personal interest declared)

In his introduction, the Area Planning Officer (APO) made particular reference to the following:

- a) The application was for a detached double garage in the garden cartilage to the west of the main dwelling. It was noted that one letter of objection had been received raising concerns over loss of privacy, failure to conform with the street scene and visual impact. The general street scene within Beadon Drive consisted of garages set back and open gardens, but officers had concluded that this application could result in the garage being so visually obtrusive to warrant a recommendation of refusal;
- b) A previous application with the garage set further back had been withdrawn (41/0434/09/F refers) as it could have caused damage to the structural roots of a tree on neighbouring land.

The Group then proceeded to walk along Beadon Drive and observed other properties in the street scene, during which the comment was expressed that the prominence of this application would be out of character with the surrounding properties.

In hindsight, (and to make these proposals more desirable), Members made various suggestions such as lowering the roof of the garage and shallowing the pitch, but this would result in design implications and the Chairman stressed that the judgement for the Group was to make a recommendation based upon the current application submitted.

The Town Council representative reiterated that the Council had viewed the proposals and had raised no objection. The participating local ward Member echoed the comments of the Town Council representative and stated that this application was finely balanced.

The following motion was then **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED** and on being put to the vote was, by 2 votes to 3, then declared **LOST:-**

'That the application be refused.'

In discussion, it was apparent that Members had conflicting views on the merits of this application. Some Members stated their agreement with the recommendation of the case officer, whilst other Members did not consider the application to be unduly prominent in the street scheme and also felt that it would not adversely impact upon the neighbouring property.

It was then by 3 votes to 2:-

**RECOMMENDED**

That in respect of application number 41/0999/09/F, the application be conditionally approved.

Conditions:

1. Land Contamination Survey;
2. Materials in Keeping.

In his concluding comments the Chairman stated that this application had warranted a site inspection and requested that the APO check whether the tree located in the garden was the subject of a Tree Preservation Order and report back to the Committee at it's 7 October 2009 meeting.

**(01/0991/09/F) Resubmission of 0327/09 for erection of dwelling –  
1 Dunstone Cottages, Ashprington TQ9 7UW**

**Present:** Cllr Bastone  
Cllr Cane  
Cllr Longrigg  
Cllr May (Chairman)  
Cllr Steer

**Also in attendance and participating:**

Cllr Jim Caton – Ashprington Parish Council representative  
Cllr Tucker – local Ward Member  
Ed Brown – Senior Planning Officer (Eastern Area)  
Darryl White – Member Support Services Manager  
Kathryn Trant – Senior Member Support Officer

In his introduction, the Senior Planning Officer (SPO) made reference to the late letters received, two supporting letters and one letter from Devon County Council which stated no accidents had taken place on the adjacent highway (letters attached at Appendix A). The application was for a single storey dwelling located within the development boundary. Letters of objection had been received on the grounds of overdevelopment, highway safety, adverse impact upon the adjoining Conservation Area, setting a precedent and loss of boundary vegetation.

The Group then walked the site which, to assist Members, had been marked out to identify two parking places for the existing property (1 Dunstone Cottages), two parking places for the new dwelling, driveways, garden areas, a turning bay and the footprint of the proposed dwelling. It was acknowledged that the site was sloping and would be dug in, and markers also showed the height of the eaves and the floor level of the proposed new dwelling.

The Parish Council representative circulated copies of the Ashprington Conservation Area Appraisal. He then stated that the Parish Council had objected to the application on the following grounds:

- a) From a highway point of view this was the main route into the village and was used by both tourists and heavy agricultural vehicles. The proposal was for four parking spaces but it was strongly felt that parking and turning would be difficult and would inevitably lead to parking on the highway;
- b) The site had always been a cottage garden and this should remain. Any form of development would constitute overdevelopment and would do nothing to enhance the village; and
- c) The proposed dwelling would result in a loss of privacy for surrounding cottages.

He concluded by indicating that the photograph contained within the circulated Appraisal document emphasised how important this site was to the village and reiterated that the parish council did not support this application.

The local ward Member raised the following issues:

- a) The design of the dwelling was inappropriate for Ashprington and it should at least be constructed with local stone materials;
- b) The detrimental impact on neighbours (he pointed out the neighbouring properties who would be adversely affected);
- c) Parking issues and the fact that it was likely that cars would end up parking on the highway;
- d) Overdevelopment;
- e) Undermining of boundary walls which were sacrosanct in Ashprington; and
- f) The impact on the streetscene. It was stated that this site was the first area seen when entering the village and whilst no in the Conservation Area, this site was immediately adjoining.

During discussion, the Group made the following observations:

- The vista had already been affected by the placing of the parking spaces and the changes to the splay. A Member agreed that the line of cars and parking spaces would be the first site seen when entering Ashprington. The SPO advised that the Highways Authority had requested the changes already made to the width of the splay (which did not require planning permission) and now had raised no objection to the proposed application.
- The distance from the hedges was a concern for one Member, who felt that the new dwelling would be too close to the boundary wall. In response the SPO advised that the wall would stay and a condition could be added that the vegetation be replaced.
- The parking bays were confirmed to be of standard size.
- Some Members stated that they did not object to the principle of any development on the site but felt that the design of this application would not be in keeping with other properties in the village and it would be more appropriate to resemble a country cottage.

In conclusion, all Members stated their concerns with regard to the design of the proposals and it was then unanimously:-

**RECOMMENDED**

That in respect of application number 01/0991/09/F, the application be refused.