

# PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT – Householder Developments

**Case Officer:** Ian Lloyd

**Parish:** Thurlestone

**Application No:** 0857/20/HHO

**Agent (if applicable):**

Mr Stephen Guard - Stephen Guard  
Architects  
2 Efford Corner  
East Allington  
Devon  
TQ9 7RA

**Applicant:**

Mr & Mrs D Gibby  
3 Edwards Close  
Thurlestone  
Kingsbridge  
TQ7 3BP

**Site Address:** 3 Edwards Close, Thurlestone, TQ7 3BP

**Development:** Householder application for first floor extension



## Recommendation – Conditional Approval

### Reason item is being put before Committee

The views of the Parish Council are contrary to the officer recommendation

### Introduction/Background

The application property is one of a small development of 11 dwellings, being within the second (penultimate) of the final three phases of development of the Mead Estate, which originally began

in the 1960's. The most recent relevant history therefore surrounds this penultimate Reserved Matters submission in 2007 (Ref: 55/0804/07/RM) and in particular the Planning Statement which supported it. Thurlestone Parish Council raised no objection to the 2007 Reserved Matters submission, though wished to see a further height reduction if this was achievable. The Parish Council are concerned that this proposal is inconsistent with the original concept and ethos of the planned estate (full details provided in the consultation section and further details are discussed in the report below).

The Planning Statement accompanying the 2007 submission set out the planning history and policies to date and the design principles underpinning the proposals, together with details of the pre-application consultations undertaken. The layout and design of the cul-de-sac had been considered in great detail and subject to a Design and Conservation Panel Review. The houses were all individually designed, following a common theme and with a shared palette of materials. The historical documents also detail how the scheme was carefully planned, with an emphasis on strategic landscaping and ecology, along with a specific masterplan approach towards grouping buildings in clusters, keeping some gaps and siting 2-storey elements sensitively in relation to contours to avoid blocking views and reducing land levels to limit impacts in local and wider views.

The site lies within a very sensitive landscape setting, close to the southern boundary of the Mead development (with only the dwellings on the south side of Edwards Close nearer to the valley bottom), before open wetland and the agricultural fields of the open countryside rise again to the south.

To the north on higher ground are detached bungalows in Mead Drive.

The wider Mead development comprises a mix of single and two-storey properties of different styles and character. The estate has a spacious and green, open plan character of its own, distinct from the more historic village core. Edwards Close has a more modern feel, with less space for landscaping and more emphasis on the buildings, walls and hedges creating the boundaries and a different public realm character. Set at a lower level, the Edwards Close development is perhaps not as prominent in wider views as other parts of the Mead development. It is though indivisible from it and the development reads as a whole in distant views.

The whole area lies within the South Devon Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The application site is discreetly located and well screened in local views, set towards the eastern end of the cul-de-sac, but has some limited visibility in wider views from the south and west.

It is clear from the examination of the planning history, which involved a Planning Brief, public consultation events, a master planning approach and the involvement of the landowners, their consultant specialists, the Parish Council and wider public, that there has been much interest and exploration into how the Mead development was to be completed.

The 2007 Reserved Matters approval (55/0804/07/RM) set the access, siting and design and revised access arrangement for the erection of the 11 detached dwellings we now see constructed in Edwards Close.

## **The Proposal**

55/0804/07/RM: This application seeks permission for a first floor extension to No. 3 Edwards Close to provide a family room above an existing attached single storey garage set to the eastern side of the house.

The application site is a part two, part single storey detached dwelling in a generous plot with shared access/shared courtyard, located on the north side of Edwards Close towards the eastern end of the cul-de-sac. The access is shared with No. 4 (for the avoidance of doubt whose occupiers object). The house opposite to the south is No. 5 (whose occupiers support). No representations have been received from the occupiers of the bungalow in Mead Drive having a boundary with the site.

The site lies within and towards the southern edge of the settlement boundary for Thurlestone.

### **Relevant Planning History**

OA/WX/1193 Outline Consent for the erection of 84 dwellings granted 22.2.1960

55/0624/02/RM Reserved matters application for confirmation of 26 plots together with vehicular access points and drainage Granted 22.2.2005

55/0804/07/RM Reserved Matters application for the erection of 11 detached dwellings and access road (Phase 2) Granted 26.6.2007

### Other Neighbouring History

11 Edwards Close 55/0092/12/F Resubmission of planning application 55/1592/11/F householder application for first floor extension over garden room and single storey extension to rear Refused 6.3.2012 Appeal Allowed 2.7.2012 (unimplemented/time expired);

2 Edwards Close 3595/17/HHO Householder application for a proposed first floor extension and installation of roof lights Granted 12.12.2017;

7 Edwards Close 55/1292/15/F Householder application for alteration and extension to dwelling Granted 3.8.2015;

### **Consultation Responses/Representations**

Thurlestone Parish Council: Object - extension is not subordinate in scale and form to the existing dwelling, being at the same ridge height (drawing no SG20-04/05 - see South Elevation) and therefore contrary to NP Policy TP7.2.i.; that the proposal is likely to have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties which will appear overbearing and have a dominant impact on the adjacent house (4 Edwards Close) and bungalow to the rear (37 Mead Drive) (see photograph attached) (NP Policy TP1.1); and that the style, scale and character of the proposal would not be proportionate and appropriate to the location, as it contravenes the planning rationale behind the approval of the original planning application for the Edwards Close estate (55/0804/07/RM) (NP Policy TP1.2). Edwards Close was designed so that there would be a mix of single and two storey dwellings across the development to avoid a regimented approach design in order to retain the views of the line of bungalows behind (including 37 Mead Drive) and respect the relationship between each of the new properties on the development. See Development Brief, page 2, para 2 (copy attached). Councillors felt that approval of this application would set an unacceptable precedent and unlike the Appeal decision for a first floor extension at 11 Edwards Close (55/0092/12/F), this extension is located within a shared courtyard and not on the periphery of the development.

*A photograph from the rear of 37 Mead Drive was provided, together with a copy of the original Development Brief, planning appeal at No 11 and other photographs.*

In response to the re-consultation the Parish Council reiterated the objection - Councillors find it necessary to provide further representations to clarify why this application fails to comply with key

policies in the Thurlestone Parish Neighbourhood Plan (NP). The NP was made in July 2018, it is part of the statutory development plan of the area and must be taken into account when determining this application.

1. Contrary to NP Policy TP1.2, the proposal is not appropriate and proportionate in terms of its design because it fails to respect the original planning rationale upon which planning permission was originally permitted for the development of Edwards Close (55/0804/07/RM). Copies of the original Committee Report and Planning Statement are attached which explain that this development generated a lot of local concern and much consideration was given to the site's setting and the relationship with neighbouring properties. Approximately 100 people attended a pre-application community exhibition and the layout and design was the subject of a 'design and conservation panels' examination. The approved scheme was therefore specifically designed so that the two-storey element of each house was 'dug down' and would be orientated perpendicular to the contours (roughly North-South) so as to limit the bulk and massing of the new buildings and reduce their impact on the coastal views of the existing one-storey properties to the rear. To this end, permitted development rights were also removed and a Development Brief (submitted with our earlier representations) was annexed to the land transfer of the development site, setting out the design objectives to be adhered to. The Committee Report included an extract from Planning Policy Statement 1 (para 35) advising that good design should endure not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development, which remains the case today (NPPF 2019 para 127).

2. Contrary to NP Policy TP7.2.i, the proposal is not subordinate in scale and form to the existing dwelling. The design, scale and massing mirrors that of the existing dwelling so that when viewed from the shared courtyard, the South elevation, the house and extension read as a single structure. The ridge and eaves levels are the same and the extension is not distinguishable from the main two-storey dwelling. See drawing no SG20-04/07 Rev B and annotated photograph from the rear (37 Mead Drive) submitted earlier.

3. Contrary to NP Policy TP1.1, the proposal does not protect neighbouring residential amenity as it will appear dominant and overbearing to the house adjacent to it and to the single-storey dwellings to the rear. By our calculations, the North East elevation of the extension is only 8 metres away from the upstairs bedroom window of the adjacent no 4 Edwards Close. This is substantially closer than the 12 metres prescribed in the Council's recently adopted Supplementary Planning Document, which provides that LPAs have a responsibility to protect the existing amenities of all residents [para 13.17]. This is particularly relevant in Edwards Close, which is not densely developed and where a high level of privacy can therefore be expected [para 13.18]. The impact on the bungalows to the rear has already been dealt with in our earlier representations.

Further, Councillors are unaware of any material planning considerations that would dictate that this extension is not determined in accordance with the development plan. There was a similar proposal for a first floor extension over the garage at 11 Edwards Close but this was withdrawn in 2011. Reference has been made to an application for a first floor extension at no 11 which predated the NP and was granted on appeal in 2012 (LPA ref 55/0092/12/F). However, that extension was located at the rear of the property, adjacent to open space, and designed with ridge and eaves lines that were lower than those of the existing dwelling which the Inspector found "appropriately subordinate to it" [para 4 of DL]. The extension has not been built and permission ran out 5 years ago. We fail to see that decision can therefore be regarded a relevant material planning consideration for the purposes of determining the present application. As stated previously, for the above reasons, Councillors consider that this proposal would set an unacceptable precedent for the area and strongly object to the application.

Devon County Highways: No comment

Third Party Representations:

8 objections have been received from the occupiers of 4 different properties on grounds summarised as:

- Design, appearance & Density, Edwards Close is a dense development with houses close together, particularly No's 3 and 4 and raising the roof line of the garage to that of the main house will increase the density/crowding factor unacceptably;
- Shared courtyard, only circa 4 feet between garages, overly dominant;
- overshadowing & loss of light;
- Planned development of 11 properties of individual detail but having a uniform style with variation of roof heights to limit the blocking effect of 2 storey properties on Mead Drive;
- out of character, massing appearance;
- original Edwards Close development was very carefully designed to avoid blocking;
- create a precedent;
- while it is claimed that the new roof line is subservient to the main north-south ridge, nevertheless it would add height to the existing building, impacting both neighbouring houses and dwellings to the north on Mead Drive;
- Parish rejected plans for 11 Edwards Close and consideration of that application referenced massing effect, precedent, overbearing character and the officer's report referred to the potential misfit, location within AONB and Coastal Preservation Area, the need for good design that respects local character and avoids overbearing and dominant impact and the importance of good design qualities such as bulk, height, and visual emphasis taking into account local context;
- suggest withdrawal;
- Development Brief advises new development should be a "good neighbour with the existing Mead development, consideration given to the views currently enjoyed by existing properties on the Mead Estate and to the relationship between each of the new properties on the development to ensure where possible views are preserved;
- immediate neighbour agrees with the comments of the Thurlestone PC;
- revised drawings don't address concerns;
- original proposal unacceptably took away light from No. and minor change to the angle of the hipped roof does not "overcome the issue";
- mischaracterisation to say that No.4 would not be significantly affected because the main rooms open out to a different aspect. All the downstairs rooms except the kitchen have windows looking out on to the courtyard. Upstairs, the large landing and one bedroom would be particularly affected;
- increase in bulk would detract from amenity where two properties are so close;
- does not sit easily with AONB considerations or with the Neighbourhood Plan;
- references to what was approved for No.11 are made interchangeably between the first refused proposal and the second allowed proposal;
- reference to the original design principles being 16 years old are not relevant;
- reference is made to the Neighbourhood Plan being in support of home working, proposal use as a hobby room has been emphasised;
- unneighbourly;
- out of keeping;

3 submissions in support have been received from the occupiers of 2 different properties on grounds summarised as:

- having immediate visibility of the proposed extension consider it quite modest and being constructed with the same or similar materials have no or negligible effect on Edwards close and won't detract from the design of the surrounding properties;

- small alteration does not alter the original way the development was designed to fit in with the surrounding properties;
- nice to see at least half of phase 2 is now occupied by full time residents;
- other properties have received approval to make alterations, no reason why this should be deemed unacceptable;
- will improve the appearance of the house-providing matching materials and the same height windows are used-as the current easterly part of the building almost appears truncated;

## **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.

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.

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  
 DEV23 Landscape character  
 DEV24 Undeveloped coast and Heritage Coast  
 DEV25 Nationally Protected landscapes

### **SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT ADOPTED JULY 2020:**

Particularly 13 APPENDIX 1: Residential extensions and alterations, paragraphs

13.6 13.7 - Visual impact

13.11 13.14 - Roofs

13.15 – 13.16 Windows

13.17 – 13.21 Privacy

13.27 – 13.29 Outlook (distances specified, including Fig 23)

13.30 & 13.34 - Daylight/Sunlight

Following a successful referendum the Thurlestone Parish Neighbourhood Plan was made as part of the statutory development plan for the area by South Hams District Council on 19 July 2018.

TP1: General Development Principles - particularly paragraphs 1 (Residential Amenity), 2 (Design), 4 (Dark Skies) and 5 (Natural Environment)

TP7: Replacement Dwellings and Residential Extensions- particularly paragraph TP7.2.i is subordinate in scale and form to the existing dwelling);

TP22: The Natural Environment – particularly paragraphs 1 character of skylines and quality of the area;

Other material considerations include the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and guidance in Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Additionally, the South Devon AONB Management Plan may also be a material considerations in the determination of the application.

## **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.

## **Analysis**

Decisions are to be taken in accordance with the provisions of the development plan unless material considerations dictate otherwise. The JLP and Thurlestone Neighbourhood Plan together contain the relevant development policies.

The entirety of Thurlestone Parish is located within the South Devon Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Heritage Coast and Undeveloped Coast policy protections are also relevant. As such, development is assessed having regard to the highest status of protection afforded to such nationally protected landscapes and the duty of the Council in relation to conserving and enhancing their landscape and scenic beauty.

Part of the vision of Thurlestone Neighbourhood Plan for how the community would like to see the Parish look in 15-20 years' time (para 2.9 page 14) is for:

*“A vibrant coastal and rural community where the quality of life of its residents and the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment are paramount and where any development should be proportionate, balanced and sustainable in keeping with its designation within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.”*

It is appropriate to keep this in mind during considerations.

As with the appeal into an extension at No. 11 Edwards Close, the main issues are considered to be the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, together with any impacts on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, notably the living conditions at No. 4 and 5 Edwards Close and also 37 and 39 Mead Drive.

### Character and Appearance

Policies and Guidance seek to ensure developments are harmonious and accord with their surroundings. The JLP policies and SPD Guidance seek to achieve this, as do the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan. Policy DEV20 seeks to ensure the quality of the built environment is respected and landscape and AONB protection policies (DEV 23, 24 & 25) are all of relevance in the circumstances.

The Neighbourhood Plan requires (TP7 ii) requires extensions be subordinate in scale and form to the existing dwelling. Parish concerns centre on Neighbourhood Plan compliance and whether the extension is subordinate.

The recent Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which seeks to explain and expand upon the JLP includes an appendix on residential extensions which advises they should relate well to the main dwelling and character of the area. They should generally follow the same architectural style and use the same materials as the original dwelling. Proposals should also respect the character of the area, including building form and layout, architectural style and materials.

Chapter 12 of the NPPF focuses on achieving well-designed places, consistent with the JLP and Neighbourhood Plan approaches. Chapter 15 conserving and enhancing the natural environment advises (paragraph 172) of the great weight to be afforded to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in the AONB. Similarly paragraph 173 affords protection to Heritage

where decisions should be consistent with the special character of the area and the importance of its conservation.

The application site lies towards the eastern end of a cul-de-sac of modern detached dwellings in Edwards Close. As described under Background/Introduction above, this part of the estate was one of the final phases of the larger Mead development at the southern edge of the settlement.

Edwards Close is located on the lowest slopes of the estate. Beyond, to the south, the agricultural land rises towards the C classified single two-lane carriageway Ilbert Road to Whitlocksworthy Cross which links Thurlestone to South Milton and Upton. There are glimpsed views of the upper parts of the Mead Estate from the road, notably through field gates. Due to topography, views of the application site are only readily available from within the fields and from the direction of South Milton Footpath 7 which lies to the west/south-west.

When viewed at the distances from where public vantage points exist, the application development is seen against the backdrop of the bungalows and other houses on the higher ground of the estate. The estate has a mixed character, but is largely characterised by detached dwellings set in spacious grounds with an emphasis on landscaping and greenery as a result of the open plan front gardens.

Edwards Close is a departure from this, though as recognised by the Inspector in the appeal at No. 11, there is a coherent design approach, with a consistent palette of materials and broad architectural style. The Inspector also noted the individuality of the design of each dwellings and it is this variety which contributes positively to local character. As such, the acceptability or otherwise of any proposed addition will depend on its individual relationship with the host building and its immediate neighbours, together with any wider impacts locally if occurring. The Inspector noted (paragraph 3 of appeal decision notice 2 July 2012) that it is this evaluation which is important "...rather than playing any significant role in offering relief to the bulk and mass of the development as a whole, which includes a significant presence of 2-storey elements".

However it is noted that the Planning Statement which formed part of the 2007 Reserved Matters approval, places significant emphasis on the how the scheme had been carefully planned, grouping buildings in clusters, keeping some gaps and siting 2-storey elements sensitively in relation to contours and reducing land levels to limit impacts in local and wider views. In relation to the 2-storey elements, these are primarily oriented north-south, which reduces the 'blocking' effect in local views and the individual properties clearly designed along these principles. The 2-storey element proposed would be a departure from this, introducing a significant 2-storey element running along the contour. A number of the representations in objection, including from the Parish, reference this point.

The proposed first floor extension is above an existing pitched roof attached garage to the eastern side of the main 2-storey element of the dwelling, though part of the original house also already projects at 2-storeys beyond the main eastern flank of the main accommodation, linking into this garage.

The proposed roof is hipped, has been reduced from 35 degrees to 30 degrees, and would tie in with the existing ridge height of the 2-storey roof, in roofing materials to match. Coloured cladding at first floor would also match existing. Window fenestration would be a slight departure from the current first floor window design, but there are a variety of window sizes and proportions and the proposed windows are not considered to be out of keeping.

The existing single storey garage is a wide span, and with a steeply pitched roof. Though single storey, its ridge is high. It does though currently read entirely as single storey and provides variety and interest/contrast typical of the other buildings in the immediate locality. No. 3 has a

shared driveway with No. 4. No. 4 also has a comparable attached single storey garage adjacent to but separated from the application garage by circa 4 feet or so. The dwelling at No. 4 has a dominant presence in the courtyard as a result of its proportions and projecting gables, notably the southern-most gable which is wide, and has less variety of visible single storey elements in public views than some of the other dwellings locally. This is not a criticism, merely an observation, as what is of importance is the individual relationship between these two buildings.

Parish concerns focus on consistency with the past Planning Brief and masterplan approach along with Neighbourhood Plan compliance and in particular whether the extension is subordinate and therefore if not, inappropriate. While the addition is relatively small in terms of additional volume created and could therefore be seen to be subordinate, it does result in a 2-storey element of greater bulk than existing and therefore an assessment is required as to how appropriate this form of development may be.

Having the roof hipped in contrast to the current gable and keeping the roof to 30 degrees reduces the potential bulk of the roof. Notwithstanding this, there is an increase in bulk, magnified when read in conjunction with the existing 2-storey element. The existing covered veranda retains visual interest and viewed in isolation, the extension relates reasonably well to the existing form of the host building. It is arguable whether 2 additional roof lights are necessary and contribute unnecessarily to light pollution in the AONB (the rear has no windows so would be dark without one, but the benefits of the one on the front are marginal).

What the proposed extension doesn't achieve is subservience to the original building, nor reflect the variety of roof forms/component parts so typical of elsewhere on this part of the estate and which contribute so much to its appeal. The Parish concerns and those of others are understood in this regard. However, as required by the recent SPD, it can be argued that the form of addition proposed does generally follow the same architectural style and use the same materials as the original dwelling and seeks to respect the character of the area, including building form, roof form, architectural style (windows are different but not inappropriate) and materials. The form of development is not untypical of many proposed first floor extensions across the District. Notwithstanding this, the sensitivities of the AONB landscape are a factor.

Policies and guidance, including DEV 23, 24 and 25 and the AONB Management Plan seek to safeguard and protect important landscapes from visual harm, including from inappropriate built form.

Having regard to sustainability principles, adaptable accommodation, to meet the needs of evolving families is considered appropriate. Particular recently, with the increase in homeworking, adaptations to properties may become more sought after and providing flexible accommodation can be sustainable and reduce car travel. This though should not be at the expense of character.

It is considered that there are alternative ways of developing the property to provide a similar or comparable (if slightly reduced) extent of accommodation in a more subordinate form. The applicants provide an example with the roof ridge lower within their submission to demonstrate alternatives have been considered. In writing this report the author favours this alternative over the application scheme (subject to fenestration detailing). There are also other forms of development more appropriate but not considered such as a variation on the theme used at No. 7, whereby a dormer-like addition is set within and projecting above existing single storey pitched roof and provides greater visual interest, reduced bulk and still decent useable accommodation (though likely a more complicated build and slightly reduced internal footprint). Such an alternative approach here would be supported. However, we are only able to consider the application submitted (as currently revised) and must treat it on its individual merits.

The reality is that the existing single storey/proposed 2-storey element of the application property is very well screened in local views. Where it is sited, set back and screened by the main 2-storey dwelling in approaches, it has no real public visibility/prominence. This has a bearing on considerations. It will have some limited public visibility in wider views, but at the distances involved, would be seen and read as part of the estate and not erode or alter the appearance and relationship of the built form/green space to any degree which would be unduly noticeable or harmful in the wider landscape (sensitive though that landscape undoubtedly is). This conclusion is reached notwithstanding that the extension does not provide any break or is in any way subservient in terms of the overall bulk when viewed as a finished entity. A gap is still maintained in views to no. 4, including by the single storey garage separating them.

The impacts of the development are considered to be extremely localised.

Materials would match and, like the conclusions of the appeal Inspector at No. 11, it is not considered that the loss of the single storey element and the alterations to the appearance of the dwelling would be harmful, appear incongruous or out of keeping with the surrounding development to an extent that would warrant a recommendation of refusal.

In coming to this conclusion, it is appreciated that this is based on an evaluation of the design, design is subjective, and others may and have placed different emphasis and drawn different conclusions and those views are respected.

#### Neighbouring Amenity

In coming to the above conclusion, impacts have also been assessed on the amenities of the near neighbours. Objections have been received from the occupiers of No. 4, support from those in No. 5 and no response from the immediate neighbours in Mead Drive. Notwithstanding this all impacts are assessed, including outlook, on Nos. 4 and 5 Edwards Close and 37 and 39 Mead Drive.

No. 4 shares an access/courtyard with the application property and sits directly facing it. The single storey garage projects in a perpendicular manner towards it. The first floor flank would therefore come nearer to No. 4, but habitable room windows are still separated by the width of its own garage and more. It can be seen that the existing garage has a gable end, with ridge equivalent to the height of the eaves of the 2-storey element. Consequently, while guidance suggests gables are set 12m back, and the existing flank wall is circa 10m away from No. 4, there is already an impact and with the hipped roof it won't be significantly worse. Nevertheless there is an impact.

Daylighting impacts have been assessed through the submission and no significant of daylighting impacts arise.

There will be a greater bulk and associated increased sense of enclosure within the shared courtyard area as a result of the loss of one of the two single storey elements, but separation remains and no significant concerns arise in this regard. The principal outlook/orientation/amenity for nos. 3 and 4 is towards their respective private gardens, not the shared forecourt, though appreciably the windows facing west serve the rooms within.

While there will be an increase in visual enclosure as described above, given the extent of the change proposed, the development is not considered to amount to an unneighbourly form of development.

No. 5 to the south is set at a lower level, has a walled garden, and again its principal outlook is not toward the application site. The occupiers support the application proposals. At the distances involved no concerns arise.

The principle views of properties to the north nos. 37 and 39 Mead Drive are southwards towards the application site and the rear of the dwelling and garage are clearly visible from the elevated gardens. A photograph has been supplied from the rear garden looking towards the application site. It has also been used on behalf of the applicants to outline the planned extension to demonstrate how much/little outlook would be affected. Set at this higher level, with rear windows and gardens facing south towards the application site, views are largely across to the upper slopes of the valley beyond to the south, not directly at/onto the application premises. Views are presently blocked to a degree by the current form of the dwelling. No. 5 is visible in this view above the current garage and acts as a partial blocker, but is further away. Although there would be some limited reduction in what can open countryside can be seen in those views as a result of the increase in ridge height, this is not considered to amount to harm to outlook and any impacts could not be classed as unneighbourly. Windows are avoided towards the north to avoid loss of privacy, other than a roof light to afford light to the rear of the proposed room, and overall the proposal is not contrary to Policy DEV1.

Conditions are recommended to ensure the development takes place in accordance with the approved plans, material to match and for the removal of permitted development rights for new openings in the north or east elevations (the 2007 approval removed rights for the insertion of windows in the north of the original building) in relation to harm to neighbouring amenity; and to the south elevation/all roof elevations in relation to harm to local character (particularly the AONB and avoiding inappropriately designed windows/ more roof lights to minimise impacts on dark skies).

### **Other Matters**

The issue of precedent has been raised by a number of parties. The estate is so individual, the properties are uniquely designed and have different relationships with neighbours and combined with the requirement for decisions to be judged on their own individual merits, this decision (whether ultimately approved or refused) will not act as a precedent.

### **Conclusions**

The applicants have given consideration to the design and appearance and submitted alternatives for considerations as part of the Design & Access Statement. There are potentially other more preferable alternative solutions including some yet to be considered. However, the application falls to be determined on its own individual merits. Based on the above evaluation, the proposed 2-storey development, while not necessarily subordinate to the original building, has very limited public visibility and does not give rise to any undue harm within the local setting. Notwithstanding that there is no break and the side addition will appear as one mass, it will not be discernible as distinct or different from other properties locally or erode/alter the built/open form of the estate when viewed at distance and would not be harmful to the special character or natural beauty of the AONB. That is not to say that any form of development would be acceptable, it would not. It is though not considered to be an example of poor design. It adds to the bulk but not in a way which is unduly incongruous.

Having regard to the Thurlestone Neighbourhood Plan vision for a vibrant coastal and rural community where the quality of life of its residents and the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment are paramount and where any development should be proportionate, balanced and sustainable in keeping with its designation within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, it is not considered that the proposed development would be prejudicial or harmful to

these aims. While the concerns of the Parish and local people are fully appreciated and understood (and this recommendation is based on an aesthetic judgement of design, weighed against the policies, and others may take a different view) on balance approval is recommended as proportionate and sustainable.

## **Recommendation**

Conditional Approval

## **Conditions**

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which this permission is granted.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby approved shall in all respects accord strictly with Drawing Nos. Site Location Plan SG20-04/01, Block Plan SG20-04/02, Proposed First Floor and Roof Plans SG20-04/06A, Proposed Elevations SG20-04/07B and Proposed ground Floor Plan SG20-04/08.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development is carried out in accordance with the drawings forming part of the application to which this approval relates.

3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order, 2015 (and any Order revoking and re-enacting this Order), no windows other than those authorised by this permission shall at any time be inserted in the northern, eastern or southern elevations (including the roof) without the express consent in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to exercise control over development which could materially harm the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and/or the character and visual amenities of the development and locality, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

## **INFORMATIVES**

1. This authority has a pro-active approach to the delivery of development. Early pre-application engagement is always encouraged. In accordance with Article 35(2) of the Town and Country Planning Development Management Procedure (England) Order 2015 (as amended) in determining this application, the Local Planning Authority has endeavoured to work proactively and positively with the applicant, in line with National Planning Policy Framework, to ensure that all relevant planning considerations have been appropriately addressed.

2. The responsibility for ensuring compliance with the terms of the approval rests with the person(s) responsible for carrying out the development. The Local Planning Authority uses various means to monitor implementation to ensure that the scheme is built or carried out in strict accordance with the terms of the permission. Failure to adhere to the approved details can render the development unauthorised and vulnerable to enforcement action.