

## PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT – Householder Developments

**Case Officer:** Nicola Glanville

**Parish:** Tavistock

**Application No:** 4087/22/HHO

**Agent (if applicable):**

Miss Katie Mes - 4D Architects Studio  
Plymouth Science Park  
1 Davy Road  
N24  
Plymouth  
PL6 8BX

**Applicant:**

Miss Felicity McCarter  
61 Parkwood Road  
Tavistock  
PL19 0HH

**Site Address:** 61 Parkwood Road, Tavistock, PL19 0HH



**Development:** Householder application for alterations to existing building including rear/side extension & roof conversion

**Cllr Jeffrey Moody has called this application to committee and feels that a site visit would be beneficial for the following reasons:**

- 1) The Tavistock Town Council DM&L Committee support the application.
- 2) The Officer states: *The site forms the end of a row of well-preserved traditional buildings within the Conservation Area and World Heritage Site.* However, there are multiplicity of historic examples of modifications to the buildings which detract from the architectural merit of the row which does not support the claim that they are

'well preserved'. These include removal of some porches, installation of flat roofed carports on several buildings, the building of first floor extensions on porches on 2 buildings, one porch roof converted to a flat roof.

3) The Officer states: *The proposal would have a detrimental impact on the visual appearance of the rear of the dwellinghouse.*

Each building has a tenement at the rear of the building with a small (in most cases) lean-to extensions, but this symmetry is broken with one extension roof having been converted to a flat roof. Furthermore. The building on the opposite end of the row has a similar extension in mass and scale to that in this application.

4) The extension of the tenement is on the same footprint of the existing tenement and lean-to.

5) Officer states: '*.. two-storey rear element is an over-bearing addition that would overlook the neighbour's amenity space to the rear and encroach on their privacy.*' I am advised that there are no overlooking elements included in the proposal save for skylights in the roof from which there will be no view of the neighbouring property. There is however an existing window in the tenement which has historically overlooked the neighbouring property's amenity space.

6) It could be argued that view of the rear tenement extension element from the front public realm at the front of the building is minimal. There are no views of the proposed application site from the public realm behind the site.

### **Recommendation:**

Refusal

### **Reasons for refusal**

1. The proposal is considered to be an unacceptable development in terms of its design, size and scale. The site forms the end of a row of well-preserved traditional buildings within the Conservation Area and World Heritage Site. The proposed extension would wrap around the side of the dwellinghouse and would be visible within the Public realm when viewed from the front of the site causing harm to the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage Site and character and appearance of the Conservation Area, without significant public benefit.
2. The two-storey rear element is a dominant form that relates poorly to the existing dwellinghouse. The proposal would have a detrimental impact on the visual appearance of the rear of the dwellinghouse and is considered to cause harm to the setting of Listed Buildings and NDHAs in the broader street-scene, within the Conservation Area and World Heritage Site, without significant public benefit.
3. The two-storey rear element is an over-bearing addition that would overlook the neighbour's amenity space to the rear and encroach on their privacy contrary to DEV35.
4. The site is within Flood Zone, requiring a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) to be submitted. Insufficient drainage detail has been submitted to fully assess the application.

The proposal is therefore contrary to the following policies:

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) including but not limited to paragraphs 197 and 203 and guidance in Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Policies SPT1, TTV2, DEV1, DEV2, DEV10, DEV20, DEV21, DEV22 and DEV35 of The Plymouth & South West Devon Joint Local Plan (adopted by West Devon Borough Council on March 26th 2019)

Supplementary Planning Document (July 2020).

**Key issues for consideration:**

Design, scale and massing, the impact on non-designated heritage asset and setting, impact on the Cornwall and West Devon World Heritage Site and Tavistock Conservation Area, Tamar Valley Area. Impact on neighbour amenity.

---

**Consultations:**

- County Highways Authority - No Highways Implications
- Environmental Health Section - No comments
- Town/Parish Council - Support
- Drainage Specialist - Object

**Recommendation**

Due to insufficient information we would recommend that the application is not decided at this time.

**Comments**

The site is within Flood Zone 2 so an FRA is required. This information has not been submitted so we are unable to fully assess the application.

If the LPA is minded to approve the application then please ensure a suitable condition is added to cover the flood risk and drainage elements.

- Heritage Specialist - Object

The application site is within the Tavistock Conservation Area (CA) and the Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape World Heritage Site (WHS) and can also be considered as part of the setting of the listed miners cottages and the foundry buildings / site.

Further to our discussions regarding this application I can summarize the heritage concerns as follows.

The property is part of a wider group of semi-detached Victorian dwellings which are identified as 'positive' in the adopted Conservation Area Appraisal and are judged to be 'non-designated heritage assets' within the designated assets of the CA and WHS. Section 72 of the Planning, (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 requires that '*special*

*attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance...'*

Paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) affirms that World Heritage Site status is a heritage asset of 'the highest significance'. As well as NPPF 20 and 203 para 206 says, '*Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance*'.

As well as having group value each of the Parkwood Road properties must be considered to contribute individually. Numbers 51-65 are of a consistent 'pattern book' type design. As well as their general elevation appearance having been the same they also had attractive brick porches to the side and identical 2 storey wings to the rear. The legibility of these original features is important as the standardised design contributes to their significance. Numbers 61 and 63 make a legible pair having unspoiled brick porches adjacent to each other. The proposed addition of a ground floor fake lean-to will be visible and is a change that would cause harm.

When viewed from Yelverton Terrace the 2 storey rear wings of the group are notably unaltered and have a clear rhythm that is a positive character feature. Number 55 was extended to a similar extent as the current proposal prior to CA designation and it is evident how it stands out as an irregularity. The proposed enlarged wing is also a change that equates to harm to the NDHA as a positive component of the CA and WHS. Rather than offering justification for further change and loss of character it is important to emphasise how the rarity of surviving characteristics adds to their heritage value and makes retention as designed much more significant.

With regard to setting of the listed buildings it is important to recognise that 'setting' can be more than simply visual. It is likely that these properties were associated with the adjacent foundry sites. Whilst they may post date the high point of the mining boom the foundries continued to function long after and exist entirely to service the mines. If these properties were occupied by staff of the works then that would add to their significance.

In terms of the WHS the property has the Attributes of being part of the mining settlement of Tavistock and a probable association with the ancillary industry of the foundry sites. The relevant policy in the WHS Management Plan is C2 which says, '*New development will add to the quality and distinctiveness of the Site by being of high-quality design and respectful of setting.*'

The Heritage Statement supporting the application does not adequately assess the heritage values, concentrating largely on cosmetic appearance from the front of the property and not the overall character. It does not meet the aims of NPPF 194.

I conclude that the proposed development would cause some 'less than substantial harm' to the character and appearance of the CA and to the outstanding universal value of the WHS. As there is no public benefit to outweigh the harm then I can only make a recommendation of refusal.

## **PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS**

### **Representations:**

#### **Representations from Residents**

Comments have been received and cover the following points:

- Question regarding whether the development would invoke the Party Wall Act.

This is a matter covered by separate legislation and is therefore not material to this application.

## **Relevant Planning History**

4040/21/PR1 – Scoping Only - Pre-App Enquiry for – Alterations to existing building including rear/side extension and roof conversion – No Officer support

F/3/50/634/1985/81 Formation of a vehicular access. Conditional Approval

## **Site & Surroundings**

The site is a 3-bedroomed dwellinghouse located at the eastern end of Parkwood Road close to the junction with Stannary Bridge Road, Tavistock.

The site forms one of a row of six semi-detached villas of a similar uniform appearance. Numbers 51-65 are of a consistent 'pattern book' type design. Numbers 61 and 63 make a legible pair having unspoiled brick porches adjacent to each other. Each property has a small front and rear garden with a side vehicular access onto the highway.

61 Parkwood Road is not listed, but sits within the Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape World Heritage Site and the Tamar Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The host dwelling is considered a non-designated heritage asset and sits within the setting of multiple non-designated heritage assets and Listed Buildings surrounding the Foundry.

## **Proposal**

The proposal is for alterations to the existing building which include:

- a second storey to the rear above an existing single storey outshot.
- a single storey corner infill between the existing 2-storey outshot to the rear of the host dwelling and the boundary. This would sit on the boundary with the neighbour.
- A single-storey side extension with lean-to roof that extends from behind the existing porch to the rear of the building.

The proposal would provide a large kitchen/family room and breakfast bar, utility and wc on the ground floor. Three bedrooms (one being en-suite), walk in wardrobe and bathroom on the First Floor with landing and stairs to a fourth bedroom within the roofspace.

## **ANALYSIS**

### 1.0 Principle of Development

1.1 The site is located within the curtilage of an existing dwellinghouse (NDHA). 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 World Heritage Site, Conservation Area and the setting of the host dwelling (NDHA) and surrounding NDHA's and Listed Buildings.

## 2.0. Design & Heritage

2.1. The proposal sits within the Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape World Heritage Site which is considered to be of Outstanding Universal Value. It also sits within Tavistock Conservation Area. The site makes a positive contribution to the historic character and how the townscape is experienced.

2.2. The Conservation Area Character Appraisal (6.9) for Parkwood Road, Tavistock states:

*Parkwood Road continues the historic line of Brook Street and includes some mid-19<sup>th</sup> century Italianate villas, a group of Bedford Estate cottages, and further groups of well-detailed late 19<sup>th</sup> century terraced houses. A few buildings remain of Tavistock's industrial past, namely the former Town Mill, the Tavistock Foundry, and further buildings associated with the Tavy Iron Works close to Stannary Bridge.*

*Historical development - The larger, more prestigious houses on the south side of Parkwood Road date to the 1860s and 1870s.*

*Historic family houses in Tavistock date to the 16<sup>th</sup> century onwards, and vary according to status. Higher status buildings include ... 19<sup>th</sup> century detached villas along ... Parkwood Road. Of the higher status buildings, the following are a sample: Watts Road and Parkwood Road: Paired or detached mid-19<sup>th</sup> century stuccoed Italianate villas with sash windows and slate roofs (not listed).*

2.3 Having assessed the historical importance of the site against the Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA) Assessment Methodology (SPD 2020) although not Listed the site can be considered a building of significant historical merit worthy of NDHA status. This has been confirmed by the councils Heritage Specialist: *'The property is part of a wider group of semi-detached Victorian dwellings which are identified as 'positive' in the adopted Conservation Area Appraisal and are judged to be 'non-designated heritage assets' within the designated assets of the CA and WHS.'*

2.4 Looking at the proposed development on the basis of NPPF 203 Cllrs must take a balanced judgement having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of heritage assets. The World Heritage Site is the highest Heritage area designation and proposals should be seen to preserve and enhance its outstanding universal value and attributes.

2.5. Policy DEV21 of the Joint Local Plan requires development to sustain the local character and distinctiveness of the area by conserving and where appropriate enhancing its historical environment, both designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings. Criteria 3 of DEV21 states *'Development that harms the significance of locally important non-designated heritage assets, or their contribution to the character of a place will be permitted where it can be justified on the basis on a balanced judgement, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.'* 61 Parkwood Road is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset, as can the row of semi-detached villas it is associated with by way of age and architectural merit. Considering the visible prominence of the proposed single storey side extension from Stannary Bridge Road and the visible presence of

the two storey rear extension from Yelverton Terrace and its impact on setting, Officers consider the development fails to conserve the local character of both the host dwelling, the setting of the additional non designated heritage assets and surrounding Listed buildings in the CA and WHS.

2.6 As commented on by the Council's Heritage Specialist, the proposed side extension will be visible from the public realm and its siting, design and appearance particularly impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site.

2.7 The councils Heritage Specialist comments: *'Numbers 61 and 63 make a legible pair having unspoiled brick porches adjacent to each other. The proposed addition of a ground floor fake lean-to will be visible and is a change that would cause harm.'*

2.8 With regards to the proposed rear extension the Heritage Specialist comments: *'When viewed from Yelverton Terrace the 2 storey rear wings of the group are notably unaltered and have a clear rhythm that is a positive character feature. Number 55 was extended to a similar extent as the current proposal prior to CA designation and it is evident how it stands out as an irregularity. The proposed enlarged wing is also a change that equates to harm to the NDHA as a positive component of the CA and WHS. Rather than offering justification for further change and loss of character it is important to emphasise how the rarity of surviving characteristics adds to their heritage value and makes retention as designed much more significant.'*

2.9 The two-storey rear element is a dominant form that relates poorly to the existing dwellinghouse. The proposal would have a detrimental impact on the visual appearance of the rear of the dwellinghouse and is considered to cause less than substantial harm to the setting of Listed Buildings and NDHAs in the broader street-scene, within the Conservation Area and World Heritage Site, without significant public benefit.

3.0 With regard to setting of the listed buildings: *'it is important to recognise that 'setting' can be more than simply visual. It is likely that these properties were associated with the adjacent foundry sites. Whilst they may post date the high point of the mining boom the foundries continued to function long after and exist entirely to service the mines. If these properties were occupied by staff of the works then that would add to their significance.'*

3.1 In terms of the WHS the property has the attributes of being part of the mining settlement of Tavistock and a probable association with the ancillary industry of the foundry sites. The relevant policy in the WHS Management Plan is C2 which says, *'New development will add to the quality and distinctiveness of the Site by being of high-quality design and respectful of setting.'*

3.2 The Heritage Statement supporting the application does not adequately assess the heritage values, concentrating largely on cosmetic appearance from the front of the property and not the overall character. It therefore does not meet the aims of NPPF 194.

3.3 As stated in the Heritage Specialists comments above, the proposal is considered to be an unacceptable development in terms of its siting, design, size and scale. The site forms the end of a row of well-preserved traditional buildings within the Conservation Area and World Heritage Site. The proposal introduces new built forms to both the rear and side of the dwellinghouse that would be visible within the Public realm, erode the distinctive, traditional appearance of the row of dwellings causing less than substantial harm to the outstanding

universal value of the World Heritage Site and character and appearance of the Conservation Area, without significant public benefit.

3.4 The mass of the structure would detract from the quality of the built form and the authenticity of the World Heritage Site, the Conservation Area and the wider setting. DEV22 requires proposals with the Mining Landscape World Heritage Site to conserve or where appropriate enhance the Outstanding Universal Value of the Site. The proposal causes less than substantial harm to the authenticity of the Outstanding Universal Value of the Site. However less than substantial harm must still be justified and should be wholly exceptional. Criteria 6 of DEV22 requires harm to be weighed against the public, not private benefit of the proposal and whether all reasonable efforts have been made to mitigate the extent of the harm. Officers consider that the benefit of the proposal is solely private, with no mitigation measures put in place. This private benefit does not justify to the long-term harm to the character and appearance of the World Heritage Site and is therefore contrary to DEV22, policies C2 of the World Heritage Site Management Plan and paragraphs 203 and 206 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3.5 The proposed materials match those of the existing dwellinghouse and are considered appropriate within the setting. However, the siting, scale and design of the proposal are not supported.

3.6 DEV20 (2) requires proposals to have (amongst other things) proper regard to the wider development context and surroundings in terms of siting. Given the discussion above, Officers conclude that the proposal fails to consider the wider development and therefore is contrary to DEV20 and DEV21.

3.7 Furthermore, the heritage statement submitted with this application has not wholly provided a sufficient assessment of the impact of the development on the NDHA and its Heritage setting. Paragraph 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework states:

*'Proposals affecting heritage assets should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate of the asset's importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.'*

3.8. The application therefore has failed to meet the minimum requirements set out within the NPPF and the World Heritage Site Management Plan and World Heritage Site Supplementary Planning Document.

#### 4.0. Amenity

4.1. Although there have been no neighbour objections to the proposal, the addition of a second storey above the existing single storey lean-to would result in an over-bearing built form that would encroach on the neighbour's existing amenity space to the rear of the property and the privacy both existing and future occupants would currently enjoy in their garden.

4.2. This new First Floor extension includes a large bedroom window in the end gable (north elevation) where there was previously no window.

4.3. Furthermore, the proposed single storey corner infill sits on the existing boundary with the neighbour, further compromising and crowding the limited available amenity space between the two attached properties.



4.4. The proposal is therefore considered unacceptable in terms of amenity and contrary to 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 2 so an FRA is required. This information has not been submitted so Officers are unable to fully assess the application or determine whether an acceptable drainage scheme is achievable.

6.2. Given the small size of the garden area surrounding the site available to achieve a workable drainage solution Officers do not consider the application accords with DEV35 and is therefore unacceptable.

## 7.0 Carbon Reduction

7.1 There has been no carbon reduction measures proposed within the application. The application date was 30<sup>th</sup> November, before the implementation of additional measures in relation to the Plymouth and South West Devon Climate Emergency Planning Statement as such there is not an expectation within a householder application to demonstrate carbon reduction measures.

## 8.0 Ecology

8.1 An Ecology Report was submitted (dated 07 November 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 DEV1, DEV20, DEV21, DEV22 and DEV35 within the Joint Local Plan and the guidance within the Supplementary Planning Document, the World Heritage Site Management Plan and 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 and with Sections 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.***

## **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 13<sup>th</sup> 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  
TTV3 Strategic infrastructure measures for the Main Towns  
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  
DEV21 Development affecting the historic environment  
DEV22 Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape World Heritage Site  
DEV26 Protecting and enhancing biodiversity and geological conservation  
DEV31 Waste management  
DEV32 Delivering low carbon development  
DEV33 Renewable and low carbon energy (including heat)  
DEV35 Managing flood risk and Water Quality Impacts

Neighbourhood Plan – Not adopted

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: SPD 2020.

**Tavistock Conservation Area Appraisal 2009**

**Tavistock Conservation Area Management Plan 2009**

**Tavistock Conservation Area Designations Map 2008**

**World Heritage Site Management Plan 2020-2025**

**World Heritage Site Supplementary Planning Document 2020-2025**

**Neighbourhood Plan – Not adopted.**

**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.