

**REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE SITE INSPECTION GROUP HELD ON  
MONDAY, 27 APRIL 2009**

**(30/0214/09/F) Creation of two storey extension – 13 Raddicombe Close,  
Hillhead, TQ5 0HB**

**Present:** Cllr Carter  
Cllr May  
Cllr Fielden (Chairman)  
Cllr Pennington  
Cllr Ward

**Also in attendance and participating:**

Cllr Pudduck – Kingswear Parish Council representative  
Jenny Draper – Planning Officer  
Dean Kinsella – Senior Planning Officer  
Kat Winterbottom – Senior Member Support Officer

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

- (A) the details of the proposals. The SPO advised that the application sought to erect a 4m wide two storey extension on the north eastern side elevation, leaving a metre wide walkway for exterior access to the rear and also create a larger parking area to the front. This would extend the lounge and dining area of the ground floor and create two further bedrooms on the first floor. The proposed extension would not project beyond the front or rear elevation and the roof would emulate the existing pitch and design. Furthermore, it was noted that the materials proposed would match the existing building to give the feeling of continuity and lessen the visual impact of the addition;
- (B) the proposed parking area. The SPO informed those present that the proposed parking area did not require planning permission and therefore, if minded, the applicants could construct this aspect of the application at any given time. However, as this did form part of the application being presented for determination, Members did need to take it into account when forming a view. Although, it was noted the applicants did not consider the proposed parking facilities as an integral part of the application;
- (C) concerns raised by neighbouring properties. The SPO highlighted the objections raised by concerned parties (as outlined in the presented officer report) which included concern that increased parking and traffic movement would cause difficulty for the other households sharing the drive and the consequent health and safety implications;
- (D) potential loss of amenity. The SPO confirmed that, in officers opinion, there would be no detrimental impact on amenity to number 13 Raddicombe Close due to the available outside space in the front and rear gardens;

(E) concerns raised in relation to loss of privacy. Members were informed that, although the existing side elevation had a side window serving the lounge, the proposed extension would have no window and therefore would cause no loss of privacy to the neighbouring property at 15 Raddicombe Drive.

In conclusion, whilst the concerns raised by the neighbouring residents had been taken into consideration, officers felt that the proposed extension was considered on balance to be acceptable and in accordance with the relevant development plan policies and were therefore recommending conditional approval.

The Group then proceeded to view the application site and noted that 15 Raddicombe Drive, one of the concerned parties, sat at an angle to the application site and was situated lower due to the topography of the land.

The Parish Council representative in attendance raised concern that the proposal could be perceived as overdevelopment. Furthermore, although there was no proposed window in the side elevation of the extension, the window which would be installed overlooking the front garden of the property, could overlook neighbouring properties.

The Group then proceeded to view the application site from the garden of 15 Raddicombe Drive looking up at the proposed extension.

In discussion on the application, Members supported the officer recommendation and felt that there would be no detrimental impact on neighbouring properties.

It was then unanimously:-

**RECOMMENDED**

That in respect of application number 30/0214/09/F, the application be conditionally approved.

Conditions

- 1 - TIM3 (Standard time limit 3 years)
- 2 - RES30A (Windows - exclusion from GDO – Oct 2008)
- 3 - Non Standard  
Unsuspected contamination
- 4 - MAT1 (Matching Materials)
- 5 - Non Standard  
Hedgerow retention
- 6 - Non Standard  
Hardsurface details

## 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 Devon County Structure Plan policies C03, C06, South Hams Local Plan policies SHDC1, SHDC15, Local Development Framework policies CS1, CS7 and CS9.
- 2 Special regard has been given to the representations about increase in traffic and parking problems, invasion of privacy and the blocking of sun light. But these were not considered to be overriding because following a site visit from the Highways Dept., they are satisfied that there are no objections to be made. There are no openings in the side elevation of the extension to cause any privacy issues and it is considered the development will cause a tolerable increase to any shadowing that may occur to the rear of the garden of the adjacent neighbour.

## Informatives

- 1 This recommendation refers to drawing nos. Location Plan, drawing 1 and drawing 2 received on 11th February 2009 by South Hams District Council.
- 2 South West Water have no objections to the development but, as advised direct to you and copied to the Local Planning Authority, they wish it to be noted that there are public sewers in the vicinity, which were shown on the plan sent with their correspondence. No development will be permitted within 3 metres of the sewers without the express consent of South West Water. They also request that ground cover is not substantially altered to ensure the security of their apparatus.