
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2021

by Adrian Hunter BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K1128/D/20/3262562

Town Mills, Mill Lane To Town Mill, Staverton TQ9 6PD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Colville against the decision of South Hams District Council.
 - The application Ref 2757/20/HHO, dated 5 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is insertion of additional windows, balcony at first floor level, external walkway and steps at ground level, solar PV on roof and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the insertion of additional windows, balcony at first floor level, external walkway and steps at ground level, solar PV on roof and internal alterations at Town Mills, Mill Lane To Town Mill, Staverton TQ9 6PD in accordance with the terms of the application, 2757/20/HHO, dated 5 June 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 19/07/1-PL100.B, 19/07/1-PL101.A, 19/07/1-PL102, 19/07/1-PL103.B, 19/07/1- PL104, 19/07/1-105.A, 19/07/1-PL107, and 19/07/1-PL108.
 - 3) A schedule of materials and finishes, and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces, including roofs, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to installation. The development shall thereafter be carried out only in accordance with the details as approved.

Preliminary Matters

2. Whilst the description of development refers to proposed alterations and additions to the building, the Council's Decision Notice and their submissions identify that their main concern relates to the proposed balcony. I have therefore dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the building, which is a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

4. Town Mills is identified as a non-designated heritage asset, with the significance of the building derived from a combination of its age and the role the building played as a former mill serving the local community, in conjunction with other mill buildings located along the River Dart.
5. Policy DEV20 of the Plymouth & South West Devon Joint Local Plan 2014- 2034 (JLP) requires development to have proper regard to the pattern of local development in terms of style, materials, historic impact and character, amongst other things. Policy DEV21 of the JLP, identifies that where development harms the significance of a locally important non-designated heritage asset, it will only be permitted where it can be justified on the basis of a balanced judgement, having regard to the scale of any harm and the significance of the heritage asset.
6. The existing building, whilst it retains its original footprint and general appearance, has been altered over the years. My attention has also been drawn by the appellant to the recent grant of planning permission for a number of internal and external changes to the building. As a result, these changes have reduced the overall significance of the building.
7. The proposed balcony would be inserted at the rear, which, whilst retaining some of its original character, has been altered over the years. This elevation would change further as a consequence of recent permissions. The balcony would project beyond the rear of the structure, however, it would be of a size, scale and design that would retain the legibility of the building. Overall, as a consequence of the changes to the original building, I do not consider that the insertion of the proposed balcony would materially harm the character and appearance of the building. As such, the proposed development would not harm the significance of the building as a non-designated heritage asset.
8. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not harm the significance of the building as a non-designated heritage asset, and, in this respect, accords with Policies DEV20 and DEV21 of the JLP and Paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the identified conditions.

Adrian Hunter

INSPECTOR