

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT – Householder Developments

Case Officer: Nicola Glanville

Parish: Tavistock

Application No: 4490/22/HHO

Agent (if applicable):

Mr Damon Pearce - Le Page Architects
Limited
Plumer House
Tailyour Road
Plymouth
PL6 5DH

Applicant:

Mr John Taylor
29 King Street
Tavistock
Devon
PL19 0DX

Site Address: 58 Whitchurch Road, Tavistock, PL19 9BD



Development: READVERTISEMENT (revised plans) Householder application for proposed demolition of single storey garden room & erection of two storey extension, over cladding of existing external envelope with insulation, slating & render systems & replacement windows & doors with thermally broken PPC aluminium & new porch to north east elevation

This application has been called to Committee by Cllr Mandy Ewings for the following reasons:

'I would like to call Application 4490/22/HHO to the October DM&L committee, the reasoning being related to Policy Dev 20 of the JLP. With regard to the design of this application, I have a contrary view in terms of the planning judgements reached.'

Recommendation:

Refusal

Reasons for refusal

1. The proposal is considered to be an unacceptable development in terms of its design, siting, size, scale and materials. The proposed two-storey A-symmetric modern extension to the east elevation (side) and south elevation (principal elevation) would be a dominant addition that relates poorly to the existing dwellinghouse and does not have proper regard to the traditional appearance and pattern of local development of the row of detached dwellings that form its setting and the wider development context and surroundings in terms of style, local distinctiveness, siting, visual impact, scale, massing, materials and detailing contrary to Joint Local Plan Policy DEV20 (2, 3 and 4) and the councils Supplementary Planning Document - 13 APPENDIX 1: Residential extensions and alterations (July 2020).

Key issues for consideration:

Design, scale and massing. Visual impact on the host dwelling and its setting.

Consultations:

- County Highways Authority - No Highways Implications
- Environmental Health Section - No comment
- Town/Parish Council - Support

The measures being undertaken to improve the energy efficiency of the property were welcomed.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

Representations:

Representations from Residents

None received

Relevant Planning History

[00881/2015 Mr & Mrs J Taylor](#)

Householder application for an extension to existing garage.
Mulberry House 58 Whitchurch Road Tavistock Devon PL19 9BD

Conditional Approval
11 August 2015

Site & Surroundings

The site is a large 4-bedroomed (ensuite to master bedroom) detached dwellinghouse located along Whitchurch Road, Tavistock.

The site forms one of a row of large detached dwellings, which back on to Whitchurch Road and look out across the lower end of the town towards Callington Road. The Plots are large and the dwellings are well spaced apart. The site steeply slopes away from Whitchurch Road to the south-west with the dwelling being set down lower than the road. Vehicular access is gained from both Whitchurch Road and below the site from Mohun's Close. A garage/store belonging to the site is also accessed from Mohun's Close.

A separate dwellinghouse No.58B was built within the garden of No.58A to the north-east of the site, which is also in the ownership of the applicant.

The site is not Listed, nor is it within a designated area of landscape or Heritage protection.

Proposal

The proposal is for the demolition of an existing single storey extension that projects beyond the front elevation. This is to be replaced with a much larger two storey extension to the south-east (side) and south-west (front) elevations and a new porch to the north east elevation. Opportunities to improve the energy efficiency of the existing building are to be carried out including cladding the building with slate, replacing existing render and incorporating insulation, replacement windows & doors with thermally broken PPC aluminium.

The proposal would create a dwelling with a large 'open-plan' living area on the ground floor with 5-bedrooms, 2 ensuites and a dressing room and stairwell access to a converted roof space (to be used as storage) on the first floor.

The existing single-storey garden room to be demolished is approx. 7.5m x 4m. The two-storey element of the proposal measures 6m x 11m with a further 3m x 3m of ground floor accommodation provided to the front of the host dwelling, covered by an A-symmetric roof.

The distance between the proposal and the new garden boundary fence at its nearest point would be approx. 3m.

Analysis:

1.0 Principle of Development

1.1 The proposal is within the curtilage of an existing 1920's dwellinghouse. The principle of extensions within the domestic curtilage of a property is acceptable. The acceptability of the proposal will however need to be considered in terms of visual impact and siting, particularly with regards to the impact on the host dwelling and its wider setting.

2.0. Design

2.1. The proposal is not within a designated Heritage or Landscape protection area.

2.2. The proposal has been assessed against Policy DEV20 of the Joint Local Plan

2.3. Policy DEV20 'Place shaping and the quality of the built environment' requires that development proposals will be required to meet good standards of design, contributing positively to both townscape and landscape, and protect and improve the quality of the built environment by amongst other things:

i. Using materials and design solutions that are resilient to their context and will endure over time.

ii. Having proper regard to the pattern of local development and the wider development context and surroundings in terms of style, local distinctiveness, siting, layout, orientation, visual impact, views, scale, massing, height, density, materials, detailing, historic value, landscaping and character, and the demands for movement to and from nearby locations.

iii. Achieving a good quality sense of place and character through good utilisation of existing assets such as quality buildings, heritage assets, trees and landscape features and attention to the design details of the scheme.

iv. Delivering locally distinctive design.

v. Delivering landscape design that is appropriate to the location of the development, with full consideration given to its future management and maintenance and the need for landscape measures that are resilient.

vi. Rectifying and repairing damaged environments and townscapes.

2.4. The policy seeks to ensure that all development has regard to key design principles for high quality places, which are echoed by the SPD. Design is not just about the architecture of a building. It is also about the spaces within which the development sits, the quality of the relationships between the development and surrounding areas, and the appropriateness of the design of the building in its context. Together these types of consideration combine to create high quality places that people find attractive, enhance townscape and are easy to live in.

2.5. The councils Supplementary Planning Document (SPD 2020) gives clear guidance on good design principles and appropriate design for Front and Side extensions in Appendix 1: Residential extensions and alterations:

13.36 of the SPD states: 'Extensions that project forward of the existing house will generally be resisted. Where a street has a clear established building line, the only development that might be acceptable at the front is likely to be a small, sympathetically designed porch. In certain circumstances, an exception may be allowed where there is no obvious building line, where the property is set back from other houses, or where front extensions are a feature of houses in the street or dwellings in more rural locations where there is no 'street scene'.'

13.37 of the SPD states: *'In order to ensure that a side extension does not over-dominate the existing house or street-scene, it should generally be subordinate (smaller) in scale to the original dwelling and set back from the front of the property, especially in a street characterised by regularly spaced properties of similar design and scale. The individual characteristics of the site and proposal will determine the exact set back distance required, however a distance less than 1m will rarely be considered acceptable.'*

13.39 of the SPD states: *'Where an extension is set back, the roof of the extension should be lower than that of the main house. This ensures that the extension is subordinate. Side extensions should also be of a width to ensure they appear less important than the original dwelling.'*

13.40 of the SPD states: *'In some situations the erection of a two-storey side extension could create or contribute to an effect known as 'terracing'. This is where side extensions almost link up with neighbouring properties ... Piecemeal joining up of individual properties is also likely to appear visually obtrusive and the loss of space can be harmful to the whole character and amenity of an area.'*

13.41 of the SPD states: *'To avoid a terracing effect, a gap should be left between the extension and the boundary with the neighbouring property. This gap should generally be at least 1.5m wide. Where it is not feasible to leave a gap, an alternative is to set the extension further back from the front of the house. The required set-back distance to avoid the appearance of terracing will vary, however a set-back distance of at least 2m may be necessary.'*

13.42 of the SPD states: *'Where there is an existing ground floor extension that is not set back from the front of the house (as is the case with this site), then a proposed first floor extension should normally be set back by at least 2m to ensure that subordination is maintained and terracing avoided.'*

2.6. The proposed side/front extension is partially visible from the public realm and forms a backdrop to views across the town to the moors of DNP behind the site.

2.7. The proposed two-storey element to the principal elevation is a dominant form that relates poorly to the existing dwellinghouse. The proposal would have a detrimental impact on the visual appearance of the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse and the broader street-scene, without significant public benefit.

2.8. The proposed zinc cladding does not match the materials used in the existing dwellinghouse and is not considered appropriate in the context of the setting. The siting, scale and design of the proposal are also not supported.

2.9. The proposal is considered to be an unacceptable development in terms of its siting, design, size, scale and materials. Although there is an existing single storey flat roofed 'garden room' extension that projects forward of the front building line, this extension was built many years ago (prior to the JLP & SPD) and can be said to detract from the simplicity of the original dwelling. The proposal would replace this old extension and introduces a new modern A-symmetric building style to the front of the dwellinghouse using large areas of glazing and zinc cladding and proposes a dominant side extension with no drop in its

ridgeline or recessed walls to make it sub-ordinate to the host dwelling. The proposed design of the building changes the character of the host dwelling and is uncharacteristic of the style of buildings found adjacent to the site. The host dwelling has been consumed by the extension and its original features removed. As the building is visible from Whitchurch Road and from below the site, the current design-scheme is not considered to provide positive change to the character of the area and would erode the traditional appearance of the row of detached 1920s dwellings and local street scene, without significant public benefit.

3.0. Officers do not consider that the new extension to the SW/SE elevations reflects the architectural style of the host dwelling or that of the character of the row of detached dwellings to the lower side of Whitchurch Road and it is therefore considered contrary to DEV20.

3.1. DEV20 (2) requires proposals to have (amongst other things) proper regard to the wider development context and surroundings in terms of design, scale, siting and materials. Given the discussion above, Officers conclude that the proposal fails to consider the host dwelling or wider setting and therefore is contrary to DEV20.

4.0. Amenity

4.1. The foot print of the proposal encroaches on the boundary of the neighbouring property No58B and fencing has recently been moved to accommodate the proposal. However, the side facing walls of both No.58A and the proposed extension do not contain any windows that would pose any issues of over-looking.

4.2 Although the proposed extension is large and is not considered to be subservient to the host dwelling by way of its proposed size and form, the two adjacent properties are in large enough plots and are sited at a slight angle to each so not to overlook, therefore the proposal is not considered to result in a loss of amenity.

4.3 The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in terms of amenity and accords with JLP Policy DEV1.

5.0 Highways

5.1. The proposal has No Highways Implications

6.0 Drainage

6.1 The site is within Flood Zone 1 so an FRA is not required. Officers consider the application accords with DEV35 and is therefore acceptable. Surface water is to be disposed of via a soakaway.

7.0 Carbon Reduction

7.1 The following Carbon reduction measures have been proposed within the application:

- Integrated solar panels
- Improvements to Building fabric and insulation
- Electric car charging point

This is a Householder application and the proposal is considered to accord with Local Plan policy DEV32.

8.0 Ecology

8.1 An Ecology Report was submitted (30/11/2022) that states no protected species were present on inspection. Therefore the proposal would have no impact on protected species and Officers consider that the proposal accords with DEV26.

9.0 Trees

9.1. No trees will be affected by the proposal. Therefore Officers consider that the proposal accords with DEV28.

10.0 Conclusion

10.1. In totality, the proposal is considered contrary to policies DEV20 within the Joint Local Plan and the guidance within the Supplementary Planning Document and various paragraphs of the NPPF. For the reasons stated above, the proposal is recommended for refusal.

This application has been considered in accordance with Section 38 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Planning Policy

Relevant policy framework

Section 70 of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act requires that regard be had to the development plan, any local finance and any other material considerations. Section 38(6) of the 2004 Planning and Compensation Act requires that applications are to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. For the purposes of decision making, as of March 26th 2019, the Plymouth & South West Devon Joint Local Plan 2014 - 2034 is now part of the development plan for Plymouth City Council, South Hams District Council and West Devon Borough Council (other than parts of South Hams and West Devon within Dartmoor National Park).

On 26 March 2019 of the Plymouth & South West Devon Joint Local Plan was adopted by all three of the component authorities. Following adoption, the three authorities jointly notified the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG)* of their choice to monitor the Housing Requirement at the whole plan level. This is for the purposes of the Housing Delivery Test (HDT) and the 5 Year Housing Land Supply assessment. A letter from MHCLG to the Authorities was received on 13 May 2019 confirming the change.

On 13th January 2021 MHCLG published the HDT 2020 measurement. This confirmed the Plymouth, South Hams and West Devon's joint HDT measurement as 144% and the consequences are "None".

Therefore a 5% buffer is applied for the purposes of calculating a 5 year land supply at a whole plan level. When applying the 5% buffer, the combined authorities can demonstrate a 5-year land supply of 5.8 years at end March 2021 (the 2021 Monitoring Point). This is set out in the Plymouth, South Hams & West Devon Local Planning Authorities' Housing Position Statement 2021 (published 12th November 2021).

[*now known as Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities]

The relevant development plan policies are set out below:

The Plymouth & South West Devon Joint Local Plan was adopted by South Hams District Council on March 21st 2019 and West Devon Borough Council on March 26th 2019.

SPT1 Delivering sustainable development
SPT2 Sustainable linked neighbourhoods and sustainable rural communities
TTV1 Prioritising growth through a hierarchy of sustainable settlements
TTV2 Delivering sustainable development in the Thriving Towns and Villages Policy Area
DEV1 Protecting health and amenity
DEV2 Air, water, soil, noise, land and light
DEV10 Delivering high quality housing
DEV20 Place shaping and the quality of the built environment
DEV26 Protecting and enhancing biodiversity and geological conservation
DEV29 Specific provisions relating to transport
DEV31 Waste management
DEV32 Delivering low carbon development
DEV35 Managing flood risk and water quality impacts

Neighbourhood Plan – A Neighbourhood Plan Area for Tavistock has been designated but has not progressed to the next formal stage.

Other material considerations include the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) including guidance in Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Additionally, the following planning documents are also material considerations in the determination of the application:

Joint Local Plan SPD
Plymouth and South West Devon Climate Emergency Planning Statement

Considerations under Human Rights Act 1998 and Equalities Act 2010

The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 and Equalities Act 2010 have been taken into account in reaching the recommendation contained in this report.