



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2025

by C Rose BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K1128/D/24/3351396

Firm Anchor, Grenville Road, Salcombe, Devon TQ8 8BJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Jonathan Gould against the decision of South Hams District Council.
 - The application Ref is 1391/24/HHO.
 - The development proposed is householder application for the erection of a boat store to the front of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for householder application for the erection of a boat store to the front of the property at Firm Anchor, Grenville Road, Salcombe, Devon TQ8 8BJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 1391/24/HHO, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan; Site Block Plan; PL.02 Proposed Site Plan; PL.03 West elevation; PL.04 North elevation—existing & proposed; and PL.05 Boat store plans and elevations.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Jonathan Gould against the decision of South Hams District Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of development in the banner heading above has been taken from the appeal form and decision notice as it more accurately describes the development than that given on the application form.
4. At the time of my site visit the development had been carried out and appeared to accord with the submitted plans. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal based on those plans.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site comprises a rendered detached house set within a row of dwellings fronting Grenville Road. The dwellings are set back from the road behind small open frontages predominately used for the parking of vehicles. The parking areas and dwellings are generally separated by boundary walls. Materials to the dwellings comprise light

render, light coloured cladding and brick. The appeal site respects this character through the provision of off-street frontage parking and provision of a rendered boundary wall adjoining Redwood and part of its road frontage.

7. The evidence before me indicates that the appeal property previously comprised two garages attached to the front of the dwelling alongside the existing rendered boundary wall. This arrangement was not characteristic of the wider area with the garages fairly prominent in the street scene due to their position forward of the dwelling. Furthermore, by reason of their position and scale, they were incongruous in relation to the host dwelling giving the impression that the dwelling had turned its back on the street.
8. While the provision of garages and extensions to the front of dwellings are not generally supported by the Plymouth & South West Devon Joint Local Plan 2014-2034 Supplementary Planning Document 2020 (SPD), the development is for a small detached store positioned against the boundary walling that significantly minimises its prominence. Furthermore, it has a shallow pitched roof, is finished in light-coloured timber cladding and is partly screened by existing planting that has grown adjacent to the boundary wall. The boat store by reason of its small scale therefore has an insignificant visual effect. As a result, there is no harm to the open frontage of the site or wider area. Moreover, the development is considerably smaller than the garages it replaced with their removal and existing arrangement opening up the site frontage. This enables the parking of cars and provision of a frontage that is characteristic of the area and local development pattern.
9. For these reasons, the development appears subordinate to the dwelling, is not prominent and does not harm the open frontage to the site or wider area. It is also less prominent and more in-keeping with the street scene than the previous garages. Taking all that into account, the development respects the character and appearance of the area and does not detract from the street-scene, any openness or the primacy of the host dwelling.
10. It follows from the above that I conclude that the development does not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the surrounding area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with policies DEV20 and DEV23 of the Plymouth & South West Devon Joint Local Plan 2014-2034 (March 2019), policy SALC B1 Salcombe Neighbourhood Development Plan 2018 to 2034 (2019) and the SPD. Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that development proposals have proper regard to the pattern of local development and the wider development context, deliver locally distinctive design, are designed to respect scenic quality and maintain an area's distinctive sense of place and reinforce local distinctiveness and be of, and demonstrate, high quality design.

Other Considerations

11. I have also had regard to the comments from Salcombe Town Council related to the development setting a precedent. However, I have limited evidence before me of the prospect of similar development coming forward in comparable circumstances.

Conditions

12. I have had regard to the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to conditions, and the planning condition suggested by the Council. As the development has already commenced, there is no need for the standard time condition. It is however necessary for a condition to confirm the approved plans in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

C Rose

INSPECTOR