| Teignbridge<br>.gov.uk                 |   | Coombe Park Road  |
|--|---|---|
| Planning Committee Report              |   |   |
| Chairman: Cllr. Linda Goodman-Bradbury |   | Poista<br>Participation of the second |
| Date                                   | 22 March 2022   |   |
| Case<br>Officer                        | Jennifer Joule  |   |
| Location                               | Ranworth Thornley Drive Teignmouth Devon<br>TQ14 9JH          |   |
| Proposal                               | Alterations to annexe roof including first floor storage area |   |
| Applicant                              | Mr & Mrs Frodsham   |   |
| Ward                                   | Teignmouth Central  |   |
| Member(s)                              | Cllr Alison Eden, Cllr Jacqui Orme                            |   |
| Reference                              | 21/02720/HOU  |   |
| Online Details and Documents           |   |   |

# **RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION GRANTED**



### 1. REASON FOR REPORT

This application has been called to Planning Committee by Cllr Eden for the following reasons:

- 1. Overdevelopment of a residential property.
- 2. Overlooking.
- 3. Even more loss of privacy for neighbours.
- 4. Design is too high and marks a significant alteration.

# 2. **RECOMMENDATION**

This application is recommended for approval subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Standard time limit
- 2. Accordance with approved plans
- 3. Development to proceed only in accordance with the recommendations of the ecology report
- 4. Nesting bird boxes to be installed prior to first occupation of the annex extension
- 5. Carbon reduction measures to be submitted to and approved by the LPA prior to the commencement of development

# 3. DESCRIPTION

- 3.1. The application site comprises a dwelling known as Ranworth located on Thornley Drive, Teignmouth. Ranworth is a detached bungalow in a residential area.
- 3.2. The site is located on a hill side, sloping down from its northern corner with Thornley Drive to the south west corner of the plot.
- 3.3. A dwelling known as Leastone is located to the north and Bethesda is located to the south. Properties on Yannon Drive lie to the east and north east of the site.
- 3.4. A recent application to extend the main body of the dwelling (and not the annex) was approved at Committee in December 2020 (reference 20/01597/HOU).
- 3.5. This application relates to the annex only. The annex is located to the east of the main part of the dwelling and lies immediately adjacent to Thornley Drive.
- 3.6. It is proposed to extend the annex upwards. What is currently a multi-pitched roof design in an 'L' shape is proposed to become a dual-pitched roof with a straight, single ridgeline. It is also proposed to install three rooflights to the elevation facing away from the public highway.
- 3.7. The proposal will result in an increase in the footprint of the annex by 17sq.m. and an increase in its height by 1.5m. The additional footprint will be taken from the existing outdoor space between the annex and the main dwelling.

# 4. KEY PLANNING POLICIES and ASSESSMENT AGAINST POLICY

- 4.1 The key planning policies considered to be of relevance to this application are:
  - S1 Sustainable Development Criteria

- S2 Quality Development
- S7 Carbon Emissions Targets
- S18 Teignmouth
- WE8 Domestic Extensions, Ancillary Domestic Curtilage Buildings and Boundary Treatments
- EN3 Carbon Reduction Plans
- EN8 to EN11 Biodiversity Protection and Enhancement
- 5.2 The key planning factors are considered to be the impact upon the character and visual amenity of the area, the impact upon the residential amenity of surrounding properties, the ecological impact of the scheme, and the provision for carbon reduction measures.
- 5.3 During the course of the determination period for this application, the applicant was advised that the originally-proposed gable end to the annex extension should be replaced with a hipped roof, to reduce the scale of the proposal. This amendment was submitted in early February 2022. On the basis of the revised plans the application has been recommended for approval. A second round of consultation has not taken place following this amendment as the proposal's scope has been reduced slightly.

#### Impact upon the character and visual amenity of the area

- 5.4 It is proposed to increase the height of the annex by 1.5m and increase its footprint in to an existing area of outdoor 'courtyard' space between the main part of the dwelling and the annex.
- 5.5 The proposed changes are considered to be minor alterations to the building and are not considered to materially impact the character and visual amenity of the area.
- 5.6 Both to the north and south of the site along Thornley Drive, there are a number of properties containing development of a larger scale than is hereby proposed immediately abutting or in very close proximity to the highway, including two storey dwellings, large boundary fences and walls, and 1.5 storey extensions and garages. Together these developments give a relatively enclosed feel to Thornley Drive.
- 5.7 The proposed extension to the annex is an upwards extension which will increase the impression of built development at the site. Importantly, however, the extension will be seen within this existing context, and it is considered that the building will continue to integrate effectively with the relatively enclosed character of the built environment along Thornley Drive. It is also considered that the proposal will work with the design of existing building.
- 5.8 The proposal is therefore considered to meet the requirements of Policies S2 and WE8 where they relate to the character and visual amenity of the area.

#### Impact upon the residential amenities of surrounding properties

- 5.9 Representations have identified concern with loss of privacy at the neighbouring dwelling known as Bethesda and for the neighbouring dwellings on Yannon Drive.
- 5.10 It is not considered that there will be any impact on the level of privacy enjoyed by dwellings along Yannon Drive as there will be no new windows on the roof slope facing Yannon Drive.

5.11 Three new rooflights are proposed on the south-facing roofslope. These windows will be positioned at a height at which occupants of the new room within the annex roof could see out. No adverse impact on the level of amenity experienced by the occupants of Bethesda is considered to arise from these rooflights owing to the intervening mature vegetation between the dwellings and the orientation of the rooflights – which are directed towards the front of Bethesda, where a degree of overlooking from members of the public travelling along the highway could reasonably be anticipated.

#### Ecological impact of the scheme

- 5.12 The site has no ecology designations but an ecological survey was undertaken as the proposal involves work to the roof and therefore has greater potential to impact bats or nesting birds.
- 5.13 Policies EN8, EN9 and EN11 of the Local Plan seek to protect and enhance biodiversity, taking into account the importance of any affected habitats or features.
- 5.14 The ecology survey found no evidence of bats or nesting birds. It identified several best practice recommendations. These recommendations will be secured through condition to ensure that, should bats or nesting birds be identified, protection measures are in place.
- 5.15 Policy EN8 requires ecological enhancement as a result of development. Officers therefore recommend that two nesting bird boxes are installed on the north east facing elevation of the proposal to secure net gain.
- 5.16 The application is therefore considered to satisfy the Local Plan, subject to the conditions being applied.

#### Carbon/climate impact of the scheme

4.14 The application has set out no particular proposals by which the carbon/climate impact of the proposal could be reduced. This is of some concern given the provision of Policies S7 and EN3. A condition is therefore recommended should the application be approved to secure carbon reduction measures prior to the commencement of development.

#### 5. CONSULTEES

5.1. No responses were sought for this application.

#### 6. **REPRESENTATIONS**

- 6.1. Five representations have been submitted: four objections and one comment. The following points have been raised:
  - The site is already overdeveloped this is a further development
  - The increase in the height of the annex by one and a half metres will have a dominant and overbearing impact on Bethesda and other properties in the vicinity of the site
  - A bedroom in the proposed storage space would be unacceptable
  - The rooflights will be set at 1.6m above floor level allowing for views out
  - Questioning requirement for additional storage space

- Concerns with overlooking to Bethesda
- Questioning need to replace the existing roof of the annex
- Alterations to the annex will be particularly visually-prominent from the public highway. The last application was recommended for approval on the basis that the annex was not proposed for alteration.
- The proposal is out-of-scale with neighbouring properties and does not complement the character of the existing residential area

# 7. TOWN / PARISH COUNCIL'S COMMENTS

- 7.1. Recommend Refusal on the grounds of :-
  - 1. Overdevelopment of a residential property.
  - 2. Overlooking.
  - 3. Loss of Privacy for neighbours.
  - 4. Design is too high and marks a significant alteration.

Note that District Cllr Eden has recommended category B

### 8. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY

This development is not liable for CIL because it is less than 100m<sup>2</sup> of new build that does not result in the creation of a dwelling.

#### 9. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Due to its scale, nature and location this development will not have significant effects on the environment and therefore is not considered to be EIA Development.

### 10. CARBON/ CLIMATE IMPACT

If the application is approved it is recommended that a condition be applied to the consent to seek specific carbon reduction measures in association with the development.

### 11. HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

The development has been assessed against the provisions of the Human Rights Act, and in particular Article 1 of the First Protocol and Article 8 of the Act itself. This Act gives further effect to the rights included in the European Convention on Human Rights. In arriving at this recommendation, due regard has been given to the applicant's reasonable development rights and expectations which have been balanced and weighed against the wider community interests, as expressed through third party interests / the Development Plan and Central Government Guidance.