

Appeal Decisions Received between 01/07/09 to 31/07/09

Reference Number	Parish	Proposal Description and Location	Appeal Decision & DATE	Comments
05/1572/08/F & 02/0229/09/F	BIGBURY	Demolition of existing house & garages & erection of replacement single dwelling with integral garage – Bentota, Cleveland Drive, Bigbury on Sea, Kingsbridge TQ7 4AY	DISMISSED 13.7.09 both applications	<p>This joint appeal against two similar schemes for demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of replacement dwelling were dismissed.</p> <p>In dismissing the Scheme A, although the inspector considered there to be no predominant architectural style or design features within the area, she considered that the use of full height glazing throughout the three storeys of development to appear excessive from public views and appear discordant amid the visual solidity of neighbouring development. She also considered that the upper floor windows facing the adjacent property's balcony would have a significant adverse impact on the neighbour's living conditions and whilst the owners of the neighbouring property had not objected to the development, regard must be had to the needs of future occupiers.</p> <p>In dismissing Scheme B the Inspector considered the use of an asymmetrical pitched roof to result in a poorly balanced and overly dominant roof form in relation to other existing residential development and that this asymmetrical gable end would also appear unduly bulky in the context of neighbouring dwellings, which would be heightened by the irregular pattern of fenestration. She concluded that the overall width and massing of the dwelling, incorporating flat-roofed elements to provide balconies at two levels, would be overly dominant in relation to its surroundings.</p>
53/1350/08/F	THURLESTONE	Resubmission of 55/0135/08/F. Demolition of existing dwelling and replacement with two detached dwellings – The Thatches, Thurlestone, Kingsbridge, TQ7 3NG	DISMISSED 14.7.09	The appeal was against refusal of the demolition of the existing dwelling and its replacement with two detached dwellings of a contemporary style, which would comprise rendered walls with cedar boarding set under a mix of shallow pitched, butterfly and flat roofs and incorporate large areas of glazing and balconies, within the AONB, adjacent to the CPA and 40 metres

				<p>from the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The Inspector considered that the erection of two dwellings on the 0.24ha site would maintain the low density character of this part of the settlement and, although the site lay close to the Conservation Area, as there was no visual continuity between the site and Conservation Area, the redevelopment would not harm conservation interests. He noted that there was no overall character to the immediate environs of the site in terms of architectural style, layout or density and considered the contemporary designed dwelling to add to the mixed and varied “architectural vocabulary” and would not result in the harmful loss of any important open space.</p> <p>However, the Inspector considered there to be harm to the character and appearance of the AONB from the inevitable loss of mature trees contained within a banked boundary of the site, due to the close proximity of one of the dwellings, removing a pleasing backdrop to the new dwellings and a necessary foil to the proposed increase in mass of new buildings on the site, which would be contrary to policies that safeguard the landscape qualities of AONBs.</p> <p>The Inspector found there to be an unacceptable loss of privacy to adjacent properties from the combination of the proximity of the new development and inclusion of upper floor windows and balconies.</p> <p>The appeal was therefore dismissed on the basis of harm to the character and appearance of the AONB and a serious loss of privacy to neighbours.</p> <p>It is also interesting to note that the appellant had submitted revised plans as part of the appeal submission, but the Inspector refused to accept these as, in line with the Planning Inspectorate’s Good Practice Advice Note, he considered that some interested parties would be prejudiced by the lack of public consultation, which would be at odds with the spirit of</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.