

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

Case Officer: Charlotte Howrihane

Parish: Ivybridge **Ward:** Ivybridge West

Application No: 3021/19/HHO

Agent:

Mr Graeme Barclay
14 Moorland View
Princetown
Yelverton
PL20 6QZ

Applicant:

Mr Wayne Child
11 The Coppice
Ivybridge
PL21 9TR

Site Address: 11 The Coppice, Ivybridge, PL21 9TR

Development: Householder application for single storey extension to dwelling



Recommendation: Refusal

Reasons for refusal:

The proposed extension, by virtue of its scale, use of materials, and architectural composition would be an incongruous addition to the dwelling. The proposal is of poor design which fails to take into account the characteristics of the local street scene, and as such, conflicts with policies DEV20 and DEV23 of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan, and paragraphs 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason item is being referred to Committee: Cllr Austen has requested that the application is heard at the Development Management Committee as he considers the design of the proposal to be acceptable, contrary to Officer recommendation

Key issues for consideration:

Principle of development, design, landscape impact, neighbour amenity.

Site Description:

The site is an end of terrace property within The Coppice, a cul-de-sac within the large residential area to the west of Ivybridge town centre. The entrance to the dwelling is currently located on the side elevation, with a proportionally large area of amenity space to the rear. The property, like the others within The Coppice, is a modern late 20th century house, in a mix of brick and render. A public footpath runs along the front of the site providing pedestrian access to a play area and other residential streets to the north and west of the site.

The site is not within any special areas of designation.

The Proposal:

The application proposes the erection of a single-storey extension to the side of the dwelling. The extension would be of an asymmetrical design, increasing in width as it extends back along the side of the existing property, so that the front elevation would be 3.4m wide, whilst the rear elevation would measure 4.75m in width. The proposal is for a flat-roof extension, with a height of approximately 2.9m. The materials proposed for the extension are black corrugated metal cladding, with a sedum green roof. Doors and windows would be powder-coated aluminium, also in black.

The second part of the proposal is to increase the size of an existing single-storey flat-roof extension to the rear of the dwelling. The extension would extend out just over 1m further for the rear elevation than the current extension, and would extend across the entire rear elevation of the original house. This part of the proposal would be rendered.

Consultations:

- County Highways Authority - no comments
- Drainage- no objection, subject to conditions
- Town Council - support

Representations:

None

Relevant Planning History

None

ANALYSISPrinciple of Development/Sustainability:

The principle of development to the side of the property is acceptable. Given the space available, and absence of neighbouring dwellings to this side of the site, Officers have no concerns with the principle of an extension to the side elevation. However, other material considerations such as design, and landscape impact, must also be considered and are critical to the acceptability of the specific scheme proposed.

Design/Landscape:

The site is within the The Coppice, a cul-de-sac of dwellings of uniform appearance, namely two storey dwellings of brick and render. Whilst the properties are of traditional late-20th century construction with little architectural or historic merit, there is an identifiable character and sense of homogeneity to the street scene. The proposed extension does not respect this vernacular, and the flat-roof construction and black metal profile cladding would introduce a harsh, industrial character to this distinctly residential environment.

Located on the side of the property, extending out in line with the existing front elevation, the proposal would be highly visible from public vantage points, particularly the footpath which runs along the front boundary of the site. The existing property is fairly narrow, with the front elevation measuring 3.8m wide, whilst the proposed extension would measure 3.4m across the front elevation. Given the asymmetrical design, widening towards the rear to a width of over 4.7, the extension would be of a scale which would compete with the original dwelling, rather than appearing as a subservient addition, even with the proposed boundary fence, which would not obscure enough of the development as to make the visual impact acceptable. When viewed from the public footpath, the extension would be nearly as wide as the front elevation of the house, a scale which is not considered to be appropriate given the incongruous materials proposed.

The proposed side extension has a larger footprint than the original house. This not only goes against general design principles, which require extensions to be subservient to their host dwelling, but the size would accentuate the stark contrast in materials and exacerbate the visual intrusion into the street scene. The National Design Guide, published in October, emphasises that the right materials can greatly help new development to fit harmoniously with its surroundings, and this is reinforced in both local and national policy- The Plymouth & South West Devon Joint Local Plan requires development to have *'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'* (policy DEV20) and to *'maintain an area's distinctive sense of place and reinforce local distinctiveness'* (DEV23). The current proposal appears to have shown no consideration of the local vernacular, which is contrary to both these local policies, and the National Planning Policy Framework, which require development to be *'visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout...sympathetic to local character (and) surrounding built environment and landscape setting'* (paragraph 127). Paragraph 130 states that permission should be refused for development of poor design which *'fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area'*.

Overall, the proposal is therefore considered to be of poor design using inappropriate materials, which would negatively impact upon the local landscape character.

Neighbour Amenity:

The site is an end of terrace property, with a footpath and wooded area to the north-west. In front of the property is the continued footpath. Officers are therefore satisfied that the proposal would not harm the amenity of any neighbouring properties in terms of dominance or overlooking and therefore accords with JLP policy DEV1. No third-party representations have been received.

Carbon emissions:

The applicant states that the green roof has been proposed to reduce the carbon emissions from the development, although no evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that this would be the most energy efficient design, or that alternative options have been considered. Whilst low carbon development, and a reduction in emissions is an objective of the Joint Local Plan (policy DEV32), this forms part of the planning balance and does not necessarily override other material planning considerations. In this instance, Officers consider that alternative designs could also include measures to improve energy efficiency, and that this positive aspect of the proposal is outweighed by the harm arising from the poor design.

Highways/Access:

The existing highways arrangement would be unaffected.

Drainage:

The site is within a Critical Drainage Area, as identified by the Environment Agency. No objection is raised by the Council's Drainage Specialists, subject to conditions relating to surface water and foul drainage, should the application be approved.

Other matters:

The applicant references the Draft Supplementary Planning Document, in particular paragraph 13.7, which states that '*Occasionally, extensions which differ or even contrast with the original property can be acceptable. However, even where materials or designs contrast there should still be a harmonious relationship with the main body of the property being extended*'. Officers must stress that this is not an adopted document, it is currently out for consultation and therefore carries little weight in decision making. Nevertheless, Officers have never stated that an extension would have to match the existing property, contrasting designs can often be acceptable. However, in this instance, for the reasons given above, the design and scale are inappropriate and contrary to policy.

Summary:

Officers have tried to work positively and proactively with the applicant, repeatedly advising that while the principle of an extension in this location would be acceptable, an alternative design is necessary to secure a consent. Officers have suggested withdrawal of the application, and working with the applicant through the pre-application process to work towards a design which could be satisfactory to all parties. This was not accepted by the applicant, and so the application has been determined in its original form. Whilst Officers therefore have no objection to some form of extension on the site, the current proposal is of a design which would jar with the current property, and a scale which would dominate the original dwelling. As such, it represents an incongruous addition to the street scene, and is in conflict with both local and national policy and so is recommended for refusal.

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

Planning Policy

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 development plan for Plymouth City Council, South Hams District Council and West Devon Borough Council (other than parts South Hams and West Devon within Dartmoor National Park) comprises the Plymouth & South West Devon Joint Local Plan 2014 - 2034.

Adopted policy names and numbers may have changed since the publication of the Main Modifications version of the JLP.

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
DEV1 Protecting health and amenity
DEV2 Air, water, soil, noise, land and light
DEV20 Place shaping and the quality of the built environment
DEV23 Landscape character
DEV33 Renewable and low carbon energy (including heat)
DEV34 Community energy
DEV35 Managing flood risk & water quality impacts

Other material considerations include the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), guidance in Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and National Design Guidance

Neighbourhood Plan

The site is within the area designated as part of the Ivybridge Neighbourhood Plan. This plan has been made and so forms part of the development plan. However, the site is not within any of the specific policy areas highlighted within the plan, and there are no policies regarding design or alterations to residential properties which would be relevant to the current proposal.

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.