
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 May 2022

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/K1128/D/22/3294530

5 Whittingham Road, Yealmpton Plymouth, PL8 2NF

- 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 C Luscombe against the decision of South Hams District Council.
 - The application Ref 2488/21/HHO, dated 18 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of single storey side utility and formation of porch & rear extension with utility replacement.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of single storey side utility and formation of porch & rear extension with utility replacement at 5 Whittingham Road, Yealmpton Plymouth, PL8 2NF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2488/21/HHO, dated 18 June 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan 2019.OS.01 Rev P1, Proposed Elevations, Section A-A 2019.SK-D.04 Rev P2, Proposed Elevations, Section B-B 2019.SK-D.05 Rev P2, Proposed Loft/Roof Plan 2019.SK-D.03 Rev P2, Proposed Floor Plans 2019.SK-D.02 Rev P2, and Proposed Site Plan and Drainage Proposals 2019.SK-D.01 Rev P2.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey home with an added large front dormer on a relatively isolated ex MOD estate set within attractive, AONB, countryside. The dwellings on the estate have moved into private ownership and the rather utilitarian and plain appearance of the original homes has in places markedly altered with external works and various extensions and/or
-

porches to many properties and these have been successfully absorbed within the immediate and wider scene. Whilst somewhat regimented in layout the estate does benefit from substantial shared green space and the aesthetic is one of established residential character and pleasing appearance. The proposal is as described above.

4. The Council is concerned that the scale, massing and design of the scheme would appear incongruous and unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The argument is put that the simple original form of the dwelling would be obscured and that the additions would lack coherence.
5. From my perspective I can agree that extension on three sides of the home would change the appearance of the property but a re-modelling of a home, rather than slavish subordination, can at times be successful and justified. I would see this as one such example.
6. The applicant has clearly adopted a lean-to approach on five of the elements and this does give a degree of coherence. The rear gable would not be excessive in size, would sit well below the main ridge, and the single storey side extension negates the need for a set-in off the main side wall one might often seek for a rear gable of this nature. Windows are logically positioned to my eye, materials carefully considered and I would not class the scheme as over-development. The dwelling with its continued main ridge height, defined curtilage, and relationship to the street and neighbouring homes will comfortably read as an integral part of the estate but, along with others which have changed, would be reflective of residents' reasonable wishes to upgrade, modernise and enlarge their homes on this fairly spacious ex MOD development. In all the circumstances the scheme would be appropriate for this property and its environs.
7. Policies SPT1, SPT2, TTV29, DEV20 and DEV23 of the Plymouth & South West Devon Joint Local Plan, along with sections of Policies N3P-1 and N3P-4 of the Newton and Noss Neighbourhood Plan, have relevance to the case. Taken together, and amongst other matters, they seek to ensure that development is of a sustainable nature, of good design, integrating with its host property and surroundings, suitable in scale, form and visual qualities for its context, and protective of landscape and visual amenity. This is reflected in the advice and objectives of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document 2020 (SPD) albeit this document cannot be expected by way of detailed example or statement to cover every eventuality and is *guidance*.
8. I conclude that the proposal would not conflict with the relevant development plan policies and the pertinent aims of the SPD.

Conditions

9. The Council suggests the standard commencement condition along with the requirement for materials to match the existing building. However, materials to be used are specified within the application and so the latter is not necessary. I agree with the Council that there should be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans; to provide certainty. In terms of the suggested condition relating to a Construction Management Plan; I consider this addition the submitted material would be an unnecessary burden given the scale of the proposal and its context. The

drainage works are specified in the application scheme and in part dealt with by legislation other than the Planning Act, and thus no condition is necessary on that front. Similarly further review of ecological mitigation is not necessary given the application content, modest scale of works, physical context and legislative control. Finally, the air source heat pump would not need a specific planning condition as envisaged by the Council bearing in mind the nature, scale and positioning of the plant and given that in the unlikely event of amenity issues arising for neighbours there is resolution available via appropriate legislation.

Overall conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR