



## AUGUST 2024 Planning Minutes

### 1) PLANNING APPLICATIONS

**NB: Members of the public please note. District Planning only make the following applications available online at [www.southhams.gov.uk](http://www.southhams.gov.uk). If any copies of letters to SHDC, stating objections or support for these applications, could be made available for the Town Council when it is making its recommendations it would be very helpful. Members of the public are very welcome to arrange to speak in the Open Forum section of the meeting by whatever means allow safe participation.**

- a) *For Councillors to consider the following applications and send observations to the District as the Planning Authority:*

**1850/24/LBC** Proposal: Listed Building Consent for new signage on front elevation of pub Site Address: Victoria Inn Fore Street Salcombe TQ8 8BU. **RESPONSE by 29 August 2024.**

*The existing stretch tent canopy in the rear garden is to be removed and replaced with a smaller custom stretch tent supported by steel posts. This is very similar to that which exists but half the size. The signage is discreet and minor on the front elevation.*  
"NO COMMENT"

Against: 0      Abstain: 1      For: 9

**2255/24/VAR** Proposal: Application for variation of condition 4 (windows to second floor bathroom) of planning consent 3415/23/HHO Site Address: 5 Lakeside Salcombe TQ8 8EJ. **RESPONSE by 5 September 2024.**

*Minor addition of window to 2nd floor.*  
"NO COMMENT"

Against: 0      Abstain: 0      For: 10

**2282/24/HHO** Proposal: Householder application for single storey rear extension with replacement balcony over Site Address: 7 Courtenay Street Salcombe TQ8 8DQ. **RESPONSE by 5 September 2024**

*Minor rear extension which has no effect on neighbours and has no visual impact.*  
"NO COMMENT"

Against: 0      Abstain: 0      For: 10

**2378/24/HHO** Proposal: Householder application for proposed two permanent parking spaces Site Address: Highwood Moulton Road Salcombe TQ8 8LG. **RESPONSE 5 September 2024.**

*We were not happy with the previous carport which was subsequently approved, and this application now extends the parking bays and carport by 2m.*  
*"This proposal exacerbates the bulk of the carport by extending it to the rear which will have an impact on the adjacent property Courtenay Villa. There is no reason for this extension to have a full height privacy wall to the side or to extend the roof of the carport. The proposal is too bulky."*  
"OBJECT"

Against: 0      Abstain: 0      For: 10

**2392/24/HHO** Proposal: Householder application for rear dormer to accommodate en-suite & new rooflight Site Address: 8 Croft Road Salcombe TQ8 8DZ. **RESPONSE by 5 September 2024**

*Very minor rear dormer not affecting the street scene.*  
"NO COMMENT"

Against: 0      Abstain: 0      For: 10



**2438/24/HHO** Proposal: Householder application for new outbuilding & pergola Site Address: Longmynd Main Road Salcombe TQ8 8JW. **RESPONSE by 12 September 2024.**

*This is for a sunroom and laundry with a pergola round the pool.  
"The out-building should not be used for a separate letting or accommodation unit."  
"SEE COMMENT"*

Against: 0      Abstain: 0      For: 10

**2448/24/VAR** Proposal: Variation of condition 3 of planning consent 0583/24/FUL to change the opening hours to 0800 - 1700 Site Address: Overbecks, Sharpitor, Salcombe, TQ8 8LW. **RESPONSE by 19 September 2024.**

*This is to align with the opening hours of Overbecks. A change from that previously approved (10.30 till 4.30) to 8.00 till 5.00.  
"NO COMMENT"*

Against: 0      Abstain: 1      For: 9

**2494/24/HHO** Proposal: Householder application for removal of sliding door to first floor balcony & replace with hinged doors Site Address: 1 Rosemount Court Church Street Salcombe TQ8 8QB. **RESPONSE by 26 September 2024.**

*"NO COMMENT"*

Against: 0      Abstain: 0      For: 10

**2495/24/HHO** Proposal: Householder application for alterations to dwelling Site Address: Haven Coronation Road Salcombe TQ8 8EA. **RESPONSE by 19 September 2024**

*"The existing house has level access but the new proposal requires access via 3 steps, yet justification for the scheme is to accommodate a disabled parking space. This is not acceptable. There is a proposal for an electric charging point which will mean the lead will block the new path. The location of a new meter box is in a very prominent and unsightly position. There is the loss of a green front garden area which is to be replaced by a hard surface parking space. This loss of softness and landscaping is a detrimental downgrade of the street scene. There is no provision for any soft landscaping whatsoever."  
"OBJECT"*

Against: 0      Abstain: 0      For: 10

[b\) Although there is no statutory consultation requirement on the applications below, for Councillors to consider the following applications and send observations to the District as the Planning Authority:](#)

**2154/24/NMM** Non Material Minor Amendment Applicant Name: Mr Mark Preece Officer: Tim Whipps Grid Reference: (273299, 38389) Site Address: Land At Sx 733 383 Sandhills Road Salcombe. Description: Non Material Minor amendment to Planning consent 0723/23/FUL to amend the wording of condition 13 so that it refers to the revised Mesh Carbon Report

*Revised mesh carbon report.  
"NO COMMENT"*

Against: 0      Abstain: 0      For: 10

Observations could not be logged as Planning was approved.

**2421/24/NMM** , Non Material Minor Amendment , Applicant Name: , RPA Investments Ltd , Officer: Ian Cousins Grid Reference: , (273923, 38971) , Site Address: , Park House, Devon Road Salcombe, TQ8 8HQ , Description: , Non-material minor amendment to planning consent 0934/24/VAR for minor design change to staircase, minor amendments to kitchen windows on Devon Road, minor increase in height to east elevation eaves line



*“This is the seventh application to vary the scheme and we anticipate there will be more. This is not acceptable to way to manipulate the planning system to achieve things that should have been thought about earlier. All the changes so far, and those in this application compound the poor design of this scheme. This exacerbates the public backlash against the scheme which is appearing on social media. The new, dark coloured down pipe on the east elevation contrasts with the light coloured render. This is poor design and it should be replaced in the position shown on the previously approved scheme. The increase in height is unfortunate as the house is already too high in our opinion. The changes made on the east elevation drawing have not been taken into account on all other elevations. We would not wish you to accept any further changes, especially in height should further retrospective applications be forthcoming.”*  
“OBJECT”

Against: 0      Abstain: 0      For: 10

Observations could not be logged as Planning was Approved.

**2387/24/CTN** , Temporary Campsite Notification , Applicant Name: , Emily Squire , Officer: Alexis Wilson  
Grid Reference: , (272534, 38339) , Site Address: , Land At Sx 725 383 Moul Hill, Salcombe ,  
Description: , Temporary campsite notification to operate from 28th July 2024 to 22nd September  
2024 ,2551/24/ARC, Approval of Details Reserved by Conditions, Applicant Name:, National Trust , Officer:  
Molly Northmore Grid Reference:, (272726, 37379), Site Address:, Overbecks, Sharpitor, Salcombe, TQ8 8LW,  
Description:, Application for approval of details reserved by condition 3 (Drainage Equipment/ Infrastructure) &  
4 (Surface Water Management Scheme) to Planning Consent 0886/24/VAR,

*No more than 2 tent pitches. Temporary toilet/waste connected to a pre existing septic tank. Refuse collected on a regular basis.*

*“The location plan is not acceptable as there are no road names, no scale and no complete land ownership details or red line. There are no details of the existing septic tank. There are no details about refuse collection point or how rubbish is stored. There are no details about the regularity of waste collection. There are no details of car parking or disabled access. It would not be a suitable site for more than 2 tent pitches, glamping or for caravans.”*

“OBJECT”

Against: 0      Abstain: 0      For: 10

Observations could not be logged as Planning is Under Consideration

**2560/24/ARC** , Approval of Details Reserved by Conditions , Applicant Name: , Katrina & Heather Lintott & Larson , Officer: Molly Northmore Grid Reference: , (272991, 37493) , Site Address: , The Bolt, Bolthead, Salcombe, TQ8 8LL , Description: , Application for approval of details reserved by condition 7 (External Lighting) to Planning Consent 2232/23/HHO

*Approval of external lighting.*

*“This is a sensitive site in a dark sky location. It is very difficult to assess the implications of the scheme especially when considered with window light glare. Further and better details should be required.”*

“OBJECT”

Against: 0      Abstain: 0      For: 10

Observations could not be logged as Planning is Under Consideration

c) *The following application was considered since the last meeting and observations duly sent to the District as Planning Authority:*

None

d) *Application For Works to a Tree Preservation Order Tree*

i) *The below are for consideration and response to be submitted to District as the Planning Authority:*



**2275/24/TPO** Proposal: T1: Monterey Pine - break at ground level due to no, or very little , sound wood within the main stem, risk of falling, dismantle Site Address: Woodcot, Cliff Road, Salcombe. **RESPONSE within 28 days from 16/08/2024**

Not considered by Council as no recommendation received

**2602/24/TPO** Proposal: T1: Holm oak – Fell tree as tree had previous stem failure, decay is starting to set in at the pruning wound of the steam failure at the base of the tree making it potentially unstable, tree to be replanted with the same species, 2x standard Quercus Ilex trees Site Address: Murrawingi Moul Road Salcombe TQ8 8LG. **RESPONSE within 28 days from 19/08/2024**

Not considered by Council as no recommendation received

- ii) The below were considered since the last meeting and a response submitted to District as the Planning Authority:

## 2) PLANNING CORRESPONDENCE

### TO RATIFY THE COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO THE REQUEST FOR A RESPONSE TO A PRE-APPLICATION SUBMISSION FOR SHEERWATER:

*This is a very sensitive site with many special designated planning policies. It is the responsibility of the Town Council to consider the impact of any proposal in the context of Salcombe estuary.*

*The building either needs to be discreet and melted into the background or of a design that is exemplary. It is our opinion that the designs submitted so far all fall short of these criteria. Currently the proposal still looks like overdevelopment and fails to provide any articulation or stepping and it still lacks interest and richness. The removal of the render bands would be the first stage of acceptability.*

*The Town Council had made two submissions on the previous application which has now been withdrawn. (3540/23/FUL)*

*We have now been sent by email a pre-application design proposal summary and a landscape design document. The comparison elevations drawing is also useful addition.*

*We recognise the attempt to break up the elevations, but we do not feel the whole problem has been solved without the removal of the render band on the main elevation and on the curved games room at the lower level. (Even though something similar was there before.)*

*With regard to landscaping we note that design changes have been made although the full extent has not been shared. One important point to raise would be that the roof over the games area, shown densely planted, should not be used for sitting, nor for garden paraphernalia nor have glass balustrading as this would increase the perceived bulk and intensity of use.*

*We do not accept the comments made on light pollution although some reduction of glazing is to be welcomed. The argument that light pollution is lessened by being recessed and shielded is not accepted because at night this will have no relevance. During the day sunlight reflection may be diminished by this but the problem still exists with the long length of glass balustrading on each of the terraces.*

*The argument about the existing building having four levels is not accepted. It has two levels on it each of three sections which are slightly staggered down the hillside and it cannot be compared to the obvious four levels of the proposal.*

*We do recognise that there are existing stone retaining walls on the site which have a significant effect on the perceived bulk, although these are, in the main, camouflaged with planting.*

*The comments and calculations on volume and massing are again misleading. There are no volume calculations that we can find but in terms of floor area, our calculations suggest that the existing house has a floor area of approximately 328 m<sup>2</sup> on the first floor and 299m<sup>2</sup> on the ground floor. This totals 627 m<sup>2</sup>. (This excludes the existing garage building). We have only the first and second floor plans for the revised design, but*



*the previously withdrawn application had approximate floor area calculations on the fourth floor at 22.5 m<sup>2</sup>, third floor 260.5 m<sup>2</sup>, second floor 235.5 m<sup>2</sup>, first floor 202 m<sup>2</sup> and ground floor 259.5 m<sup>2</sup>. This total is 980 m<sup>2</sup> which is an increase of 353 m<sup>2</sup> or a 56.5% increase over the existing. In any event the use of figures to justify the design is inappropriate. The Golden Section makes use of mathematics to arrive at an elegant proportion, comparable floor areas do not have a similar benefit.*

*During our zoom meeting there was some explanation that some floor area that was dug into the hillside was not being included in the calculations. This is clearly not an acceptable premise. Once property areas can be demonstrated, we would review this against policy SALC Env7 of the Neighbourhood Plan.*

*We would also wish to see footprint calculations as we do not accept that the new proposal does “not impact in any greater footprint than the existing building.” We would certainly not take this for granted.*

*The use and amount of render is not considered a mathematical issue. It is about impact. Whilst it is to be applauded that the render has been reduced, we believe the omission of any bright render would be a significant enhancement to both design and the impact within the setting. It is not a necessary architectural expression and could easily be replaced. Such an omission would considerably resolve any objection in this regard from the Town Council.*

Against: 0      Abstain: 0      For: 10

DRAFT