



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2023

C Cresswell BSc (Hons), MA, MBA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1153/D/22/3307703

Moor View Lodge, Lane to Moor View Lodge, Grenofen, Devon PL19 9ES

- 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 & Mrs Valentine against the decision of West Devon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 1086/22/HHO, dated 23 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 3 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension at Moor View Lodge, Lane to Moor View Lodge, Grenofen, Devon PL19 9ES in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 1086/22/HHO, dated 23 March 2022, subject to the conditions set out in the Schedule at the end of this Decision.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.
 - whether adequate provision has been made for drainage.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Moor View Lodge is a detached dwelling which is situated in the countryside and is mainly surrounded by fields. It occupies elevated land in close proximity to both the Tamar Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (the AONB) and Dartmoor National Park.
4. The proposed extension would have an unconventional appearance as it would extend at an angle from the front elevation of Moor View Lodge. However, it is a relatively large dwelling which has been subject to a good deal of alteration and extension in the past. As such, it does not conform to any particular architectural style. In my view, the design and positioning of the extension would be compatible with the bespoke architectural style of the property. Although the proposal would represent another sizeable extension, it would nonetheless remain subordinate in scale to the main dwelling.
5. I am nonetheless mindful that the proposal would add further development to an open and elevated part of the countryside. While close up views of the extension would mainly be limited to the confines of the site, the extension

- would be visible from more distant vantage points within the wider countryside. However, from these perspectives, it would be perceived as a relatively small and inconspicuous feature against the backdrop of an expansive landscape. When viewed from the south and east, the extension would not substantially enlarge the profile of the dwelling due to its positioning in front of the existing development. From the north and west, it would be mainly screened by trees.
6. Though the new glazing would increase light emissions from the site, this is an established dwelling and light would be confined to a small area of the same curtilage. There is little before me to suggest that light emissions from the proposal would harm amenity or nature conservation interests. Overall, the proposal would have a very limited impact on the surrounding landscape, including Dartmoor National Park and the AONB.
 7. Although I have not been provided with all the relevant figures, the evidence suggests that the extension, in combination with all previous extensions to the property, would increase the floorspace of the original house by well in excess of 50%. With this in mind, I have been referred to Policy TTV29.5 the SPD¹ which says that *permission may be granted for extensions that seek to increase the size of the internal floorspace by more than 50% if there is a demonstrable uplift in the quality of the built form, that the primacy of the host dwelling is not unduly diminished and that the proposal does not have a negative impact on the external amenity space within the proposal site.*
 8. I have already established that that the primacy of the host dwelling would be maintained. Furthermore, due to the amount of land that surrounds the property, there would be adequate amenity space. Whether the extension would result in the uplift in the quality of the built form is a moot point, but I have found that it would be in keeping with the existing property. Hence, in my view, the proposal would be compatible with the overarching objectives of the SPD in this regard. While Appendix 1 of the SPD says that extensions that project forward of houses will generally be resisted, it allows exceptions where there is no obvious building line, as is the case here.
 9. I conclude on this issue that the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. Of the Local Plan policies listed by the Council, Policy TTV29 is of particular relevance. This says that proposals to extend dwellings in the countryside will be permitted provided the extension is appropriate in scale and design in the context of the setting of the host dwelling. For the reasons given above, the proposal would be in compliance with this policy. Furthermore, there would be no conflict with Policies SPT1, TTV26, DEV1, DEV10, DEV20, DEV23, DEV25 and DEV31 which are also referenced by the Council. In various ways, these policies seek to achieve sustainable development and appropriate standards of design.

Drainage

10. The site lies within a Critical Drainage Area but little information has been provided to show how surface water runoff would be managed. I am not aware of any specific reasons that would prevent a suitable drainage scheme from being implemented in this location. It therefore seems to me that the required drainage could be secured through an appropriately worded planning condition.

¹ Plymouth & South West Devon Joint Local Plan, Supplementary Planning Document, Adopted July 2020

Hence, subject to such a condition, I conclude on this issue that the proposal would make adequate provision for drainage.

Conditions

11. In the interests of clarity, standard conditions requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the plans and within a time limit have been imposed. As indicated, there is also a condition requiring a drainage scheme to be agreed prior to development taking place. Considering the size of the extension, I have also imposed a condition to ensure that it remains ancillary to the host property and is not used as an independent dwelling. I have not imposed the condition suggested by the Council requiring samples of external materials as this is not necessary to make the development acceptable.

Conclusion

12. The appeal is allowed.

C Cresswell

INSPECTOR

(Schedule of conditions attached)

Schedule of 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: 3042-4DAS-DR-A-001-P02, 2042-4DAS-DR-A-013-P02, 2042-4DAS-A-003-P04, 2042-4DAS-A-009-P02, 2042-4DAS-A-008-P02, 2042-4DAS-A-005-P02.
- 3) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as Moor View Lodge, Grenofen, PL19 9ES.
- 4) Notwithstanding condition 2 above, no development shall commence until the full details of a surface water management scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be installed in strict accordance with the approved details and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Design steps should be as follows:

1. Soakaway testing to DG 365 to confirm the use of soakaways or to support an alternative option. Three full tests must be carried out and the depth must be representative of the proposed soakaway. Test results and the infiltration rate to be included in the report.
2. If infiltration is suitable then the soakaway should be designed for a 1:100 year return period plus an allowance for climate change (currently 50%).
3. If infiltration is not suitable then an offsite discharge can be considered. Attenuation should be designed for a 1:100 year return period plus an allowance for climate change (currently 50%). A pumping system for surface water drainage cannot be accepted, therefore the scheme should rely solely on gravity. Permissions from South West Water must be obtained prior if intended to discharge to a sewer.
4. The offsite discharge will need to be limited to the greenfield runoff rate. This must be calculated in accordance with CIRIA C753. The discharge must meet each of the critical return periods. Full details of the flow control device will be required.
5. A scaled plan showing full drainage scheme, including design dimensions and invert/cover levels of the soakaways/attenuation features, within the private ownership. The soakaways should be sited 5m away from all buildings and highways to accord with building regulations and 2.5m from all other site boundaries for best practice.