

## PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

**Case Officer:** Bryony Hanlon

**Parish:** Salcombe **Ward:** Salcombe and Thurlestone

**Application No:** 2914/22/FUL

### Agent:

Mr Nigel Dalton  
Nigel Dalton Architectural  
Unit 4H  
South Hams Business Park  
Churchstow  
Kingsbridge  
TQ7 3QH

### Applicant:

Mr E & D Basham  
Rendoc  
Herbert Road  
Salcombe  
TQ8 8HW

**Site Address:** Rendoc, Herbert Road, Salcombe, Devon, TQ8 8HW



**Development:** (Original application) Demolition of existing lower ground floor basement flat (separate) to 1No. dwelling to be replaced with 2No. new proposed dwellings.

READVERTISEMENT (Revised plans) Demolition of existing building & replacement with two residential units.

**Recommendation:** Conditional approval

### Conditions:

1. Time limit
2. Accord with plans
3. Surface water drainage
4. Natural slate sample

5. Privacy screens
6. Timber louvres
7. Air source heat pump
8. Solar panels
9. Low carbon measures
10. Accord with ecological mitigation
11. Garages and driveways to be retained for the parking of motor vehicles
12. Removal of PD rights

**Key issues for consideration:**

Principle of development, design, scale and massing, neighbour amenity, drainage, biodiversity, highways, low carbon.

**Reason for call in:**

Cllr Pearce wishes the Committee to consider the issue of bedrooms in the basement with no external windows, plus the safety implications for the pool arrangement relative to the new dwelling. Cllr Long wishes the Committee to consider the scale, massing, design, materials, street scene impact and internal configuration.

---

**Site Description:**

The site is located within the built form of Salcombe, c. 0.45km south west of the town centre, on the northern side of Herbert Road. The site hosts a detached building, which hosts two dwellings; one of which comprises the main part of the house, with other a flat in the basement. Vehicular access and parking is available at the front of the dwelling, with an integral garage provided in the eastern part of the building. The building has been extended and altered during its lifetime; it has a hipped roof with flat roofed dormers, flat roofed side and rear extensions, along with a small balcony to the rear. The building is finished in painted render, concrete tile and slate. There is a larger rear garden partly laid to lawn with open air swimming pool, Jacuzzi and shed.

**The Proposal:**

The original application comprised;

- The demolition of the existing building and the replacement with two detached dwellings
- The dwellings are of a contemporary design, of simple, pitched roof form, with first floor rear balconies
- Reconfigured vehicular access to provide for one access for each dwelling, with off-road parking and garaging
- The provision of a small paved yard at the front of each dwelling, with steps down from Rendoc Road, an area for the storage of bins and a small area for planting

During the life of the application, the plans were revised and readvertised. The main changes comprised:

- Addition of timber louvres on the glazing on the principal elevation of both dwellings facing Herbert Road
- Addition of 1.8m high obscure glazed privacy screens on the first floor rear balconies of each of the dwellings
- Provision of EV charging points, solar PV panels and an air source heat pump to each dwelling
- Provision of a communal access to the rear gardens via a shared pathway between the two dwellings

One minor correction to the plans was received after the consultation period had closed; this amendment retracted the eaves of the westernmost dwelling in order that it did not overhang the boundary with St. Malo.

## Consultations:

- DCC Highways Authority (original application) Refer to standing advice
- Town Council (original application) Objection  
Objection as this was overdevelopment of the site and the ridge heights were too high. The three storey design together with the loss of the front garden would have an adverse impact on the streetscene. The design did not tie in with neighbouring properties which was contrary to NDP policy B3(b). The proposed development went right up to the boundary edge which would impact neighbours and the additional height would also impact the light amenity of Corner Acre. The existing property consisted of a main house and a small one bedroom flat which did not receive planning permission but had subsequently been granted a Certificate of Lawfulness. For this reason alone it did not appear 'in the spirit of planning law' that a one bedroomed flat could then become a 4 bedroomed house and escape the provisions of NDP policy H3 re Principal Housing. If approval was given there needed to be a condition that the two houses could not be subdivided into smaller units in perpetuity.
- Town Council (revised application) Objection  
Objection - apart from the addition of solar panels and minor amendments to the street elevation, nothing has really changed. On that basis our objection is as before, it is overdevelopment of the site and the ridge heights are too high. The three storey design together with the loss of the front garden will have an adverse impact on the streetscene. The design does not tie in with neighbouring properties which is contrary to NDP policy B1 para 3(b). The proposed development goes right up to the boundary edge which will impact neighbours and the additional height will also impact the light amenity of Corner Acre. The existing property consists of a main house and a small one bedroom flat which did not receive planning permission but had subsequently been granted a Certificate of Lawfulness. For this reason alone it does not appear 'in the spirit of planning law' that a one bedroomed flat could then become a 4 bedroomed house and escape the provisions of NDP policy H3 re Principal Housing. If approval is given there needs to be a condition that the two houses could not be subdivided into smaller units in perpetuity.

## Representations:

### Representations from Residents

One letter of support was received for the original scheme and includes the following points:

- Notwithstanding the details of the proposed plans, I support the redevelopment of the site. This redevelopment will not only enhance the street scene, but will create housing that will be lived in, within the residential area of Herbert Road.

Four letters of objection were received for the original scheme and include the following points:

- This proposal is overdevelopment of the site with excessive scale, height and massing. Herbert Road is turning from an area of detached houses set back from the road in gardens into an uncoordinated terrace with all new developments trying to build boundary to boundary.
- Number of properties :- the planning design and access statement states the scheme proposes no change in the number of dwellings on the site How does turning the basement of the original house into a small s/c unit justify the creation of an additional property more than 50% larger than the size of the whole current dwelling?
- Increase in size:- This proposal is a massive increase in bulk compared to the current sizeable property. Doc 8881256 shows that the existing floor space is 170sq m , each proposed unit is
- 264sq m an increase of 358sq m. Each proposed unit is more than 50% bigger than the current building (which is designated as 2 dwellings!)
- Height:- the proposed roof height is raised more than 1m and will be 1.3m above its neighbour Codner Acre.
- Unit 2 is proposed right on the upper site boundary. Being greatly taller and without the slope of the current roof and with the neighbouring property set well back, and the massive bulk of the building extending into the back garden this will be very block like and will affect the vistas of the hills from people walking down Herbert Road.

- Building line :- the block plan of the site proposal show that the building is well forward of the building line which crosses just in front of St Valery's garage.
- Design :- this is harsh, block like and the grey cladding especially looks industrial. With this appearance and the additional height it is important that the buildings are set back from the road as much as possible to reduce their effect.
- Excessive glazing to the front of the property facing Herbert Road will cause light pollution, overlook to properties across the street and be a hazard to birds.
- The garage in Unit 1 is smaller, is it long enough to park a large SUV, the standard car for Salcombe visitors?
- The three storey design resulting in an increase in ridge height, together with the loss of garden area would have an adverse impact on the street. In addition, there is insufficient parking allowance to cater for two, four bedroom houses.
- There appears to be no access to the rear of the properties other than through the living area.
- The bins are on display at the front of the properties.
- Rear balconies affecting neighbours amenity.

Three letters of objection were received for the revised scheme and include the following points:

- Overdevelopment to the detriment of neighbouring dwellings and the character of Salcombe.
- One dwelling with an unauthorised one bedroom unit is now proposed to be turned into two, three storey dwellings. The height of the roof should be reduced. The existing dwelling is certainly ugly and would benefit from improvement but more thought should be given to parking and landscaping in keeping with other properties.
- Whilst we're submitting an 'objection', (in relation to the roof ridge heights and concerns about over-development) we believe that the current planning issues that the application presents, may be resolved with a reconsideration of some aspects of the design itself.
- For example, a semi-detached arrangement might begin to address some of the following aspects:
  1. Unit 2, presently proposed to be constructed against the shared boundary with neighbouring St. Valery, could be re-sited and constructed against the proposed Unit 1 dwelling to create a semi-detached structure. This would create a clear separation from the boundary line.
  2. The overall height of the proposed Unit 2 in relation to the existing building - Moving Unit 2 down the sloping site on Herbert Road will lower the height of the present proposed ridge and therefore could bring the new ridge height below the existing building's ridge.
  3. The massing/overdevelopment still inherent in a semi-detached structure, could be mitigated by off- setting one of the Units by setting it back a little from the road thus breaking up the elevation.
  4. Amenity issues – The above would allow more possible space for enhanced amenity on the Herbert Rd side in terms of planting in the front of the unit which is set back.

### Relevant Planning History

Planning Application Reference	Proposal	Site Address	Decision	Appeal
41/0696/77/3: FUL	New enclosure to private swimming pool	Rendoc Herbert Road Salcombe	Refusal: 19 Jul 77	
41/1650/78/3: FUL	Dormer rooms in roof.	Rendoc Herbert Road Salcombe	Conditional approval: 03 Jan 79	
2433/17/FUL	Demolition of existing single dwelling to provide 4 new dwelling units	Rendoc Herbert Road Salcombe	Withdrawn	
2193/18/FUL	Demolition of existing single dwelling to provide 4 new dwelling units (Re-submission of 2433/17/FUL)	Rendoc Herbert Road Salcombe	Refusal: 04 Sep 18	Dismissed (refusal): 23 May 19

3761/20/PR4	Scoping Only - Pre Application Enquiry For - Demolition of existing dwelling to provide 2 new dwellings	Rendoc Herbert Road Salcombe	Pre-application: (Partial support) 11 Mar 21	
0475/22/CLE	Certificate of Lawfulness for existing use of lower ground floor (basement) flat as a separate, independent dwelling	Rendoc Herbert Road Salcombe	Cert of Lawfulness (Existing) Certified: 07 Apr 22	

## ANALYSIS

### 1.0 Principle of Development/Sustainability

1.1 The site is located within the built form of Salcombe and hosts two dwellings contained within a single building; the principle of development within this context is therefore established, subject to compliance with the other protective designations relevant to this highly sensitive location.

1.2 Objections have been received on the basis that the proposal is not within the “spirit” of the law, given that the application seeks to replace a dwelling that had become lawful through the passage of time. While these comments are noted, a Certificate of Lawfulness (0475/22/CLE) confirmed that the dwelling was lawfully used as a self-contained independent dwelling and that Officers do not have any scope for discretion in the matter. As such, the planning application has been determined on the basis that the site hosts two independent dwellings which will be replaced by two such dwellings; policy H3 of the Salcombe Neighbourhood Plan is therefore not triggered and no dwelling is subject to a principal residence requirement.

1.3 The Town Council have requested that the units are conditioned to ensure that they are not further subdivided. Section 55 (2B) (3) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) states that; “For the avoidance of doubt it is hereby declared that for the purposes of this section—

- (a) the use as two or more separate dwellinghouses of any building previously used as a single dwellinghouse involves a material change in the use of the building and of each part of it which is so used”

On this basis, any such subdivision would require express permission and Officers do not consider that a condition is necessary.

1.4 The proposal has been considered against the provisions of DEV8, which require that developments provide a mix of housing sizes, types and tenure appropriate to the area. The policy also recognises particular needs associated with redressing an imbalance within the housing stock, households with specific need and for dwellings most suited to younger people, working families and older people who wish to retain a sense of self-sufficiency.

1.5 The Strategic Housing Market Needs Assessment that underpins the housing mix policies within the JLP places suggests that household change to 2034 will present a need for smaller homes that meet the needs of a broader cross-section of our communities, particularly couples with no children and single person households.

1.6 Housing data from the 2011 Census indicate that Salcombe has a relatively balanced spread of housing types available (flats 33%, detached dwellings 29%, semi-detached 16%, terraced 22%), and a relatively good spread of housing sizes (1 bedroom 10%, 2 bedrooms 25%, 3 bedrooms, 37%, 4 bedrooms 28%); the replacement of one four bedroomed dwelling with another would have a neutral impact and the replacement of one one bedroomed flat with a four bedroomed dwelling would have a minor adverse impact in terms of bedroom size. Officers recognise local concerns associated with the replacement of a one bedroomed flat with a four bedroomed dwelling but that in the context of the data available, and the modest current over-provision of flats within the Salcombe housing mix at present,

the adverse impacts of the proposal were not, on balance, considered harmful enough to merit using DEV8 as a reason for refusal.

## 2.0 Design, Scale and Massing

2.1 The proposal centres around the demolition of an existing dormer bungalow with basement flat and its replacement with two detached, two storey dwellings. The proposal has generated significant objection to the scheme in terms of the increase in floorspace, ridge height and massing of development on the site, along with the projection forward of the building line of the existing structure. Officers would note that the existing plot is particularly generous and that two dwellings, with parking, garaging and outdoor amenity space can be accommodated within the site boundary and still comply with Nationally Described Space Standards and the SPD, without appearing as an overdevelopment of the site. While the dwellings do provide an increase in the floorspace for each dwelling compared to the existing two units on the site, there are no fixed upper limits for any increase in floorspace for sited within the towns within the current policy framework, it is just one of the elements that is considered in the planning balance.

2.2 Objectors have also commented that the contemporary design is out of keeping with the street scene. The residential area surrounding Herbert Road is a well-established part of Salcombe; there are a wide variety of dwellings in this area, but most of them are individually designed and sited on their respective plots, with the streets arranged in a grid pattern. Officers would note that the existing building is representative of its time and that it is not of significant architectural value in its own right such that it would warrant retention. Officers acknowledge that the proposal will result in an increase in development on the plot but consider that the development in the area surrounding the site is sufficiently varied that the proposal will not appear incongruous. The contemporary design has attracted both criticism and praise; the current policy framework does not preclude a contemporary design and Officers consider that the simple form and clean lines of the design will not appear unduly visually prominent within the street scene.

2.3 The original scheme attracted objection based on the existent of glazing on the principal elevation facing Herbert road. Officers requested that the applicant add timber louvers over the glazing; this still allows light into the rooms and provides additional privacy for the occupants but helps to break up the expanse of glazing and to reduce light spill within the street scene. Officers consider it necessary to secure the details of the timber louvers by condition, in the interests of visual amenity. While timber cladding is not part of the local vernacular in Salcombe where its use is proposed, each case will be considered on its own merits. In this instance, the area to be clad is comparatively small relative to the whole building and having regard to the use of the cladding to break up the glazing for the reasons set out above, in combination with the general architectural quality of the surrounding area, it is not considered that the use of cladding is so significantly harmful as to warrant refusal.

2.4 The applicant has proposed the use of natural slate within the scheme; this is welcomed, with the details to be secured by condition in the interests of visual amenity.

2.5 It is noted that concerns have been raised regarding the visibility of bins at the front of the dwellings; it is not uncommon for bins to be visible within residential areas and Officers do not consider that this element would result in a significant detrimental appearance within the street scene.

2.6 Officers are satisfied that both dwellings are provided with sufficient outdoor amenity space and that the dwellings have been designed to minimise impacts on adjoining neighbours and each other. Officers would also note that the dwellings have been designed as a complementary pair, each with their own variation of the shared contemporary design themes. However, given the generous floorspace available for each dwelling and in order to ensure that any future development on the site did not erode the original design intent of the scheme such that the design was compromised or that residential amenity was eroded, Officers consider it necessary to remove permitted development rights for each of the dwellings.

2.7 On this basis, the proposal is considered to accord with the provisions of DEV1, DEV10, DEV20, DEV23 and SALC B1.

### 3.0 South Devon AONB

3.1 Policy DEV25 requires that proposals “conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the protected landscape with particular reference to their special qualities and distinctive characteristics or valued attributes”. The proposal meets the first policy test, in that the design and palette of materials have a neutral impact on the AONB itself, as the proposal is located well within the built form of Salcombe and changes to character and appearance of the residential area will be localised only, thereby conserving the natural beauty of the AONB. While it does not offer enhancement, given the small scale of the proposal and having regard to the current condition of the site, including the presence of an existing residential dwelling, the proposal is considered acceptable with regard to the provisions of DEV25 and SALC ENV1.

### 4.0 Neighbour Amenity

4.1 The original scheme included first floor rear balconies on both dwellings and a number of concerns were raised on this basis; Officers requested that 1.8 m high obscure glazed privacy screens be added, which the applicant agreed to during the revisions to the scheme. Officers consider that these screens are sufficient to mitigate overlooking, with the details to be secured by condition in the interests of the residential privacy and amenity of adjoining occupiers. On this basis, the proposal is considered to accord with the provisions of DEV1.

4.2 In a similar vein, objectors noted that the original scheme did not provide for access to the rear garden of both dwellings without going through the house itself. Whilst this matter is not determinative, this has been rectified through the revised scheme, which includes a shared pedestrian path between the two buildings.

### 5.0 Highways/Access:

5.1 The proposal includes reconfigured access arrangements compared to the existing to provide one separate access for each dwelling. Officers would note that the Devon County Council Highways Engineer has referenced Standing Advice in the response; Officers would note that in this assessment, Herbert Road is identified as an unclassified (Class Z) road. On this basis, the applicant is not required to provide a turning facility within the site boundary.

5.2 Concerns have been raised that the dwellings are not provided with sufficient parking spaces; it is widely acknowledged that parking in this part of Salcombe is limited and that there are double yellow lines outside the application site on Herbert Road. The driveway to Unit 1 is c. 10.6 m x 4.5 m, which would allow for two cars to park in tandem in front of the garage, with a further car inside the garage, which measures 4.7m x 6.6m (allowing for the internal access door). The garage, with its EV charging point, and the driveway meet the SPD guidance in terms of the space available to accommodate three cars for a four bedrooled dwelling (paragraphs 8.4-8.11).

5.3 Unit 2 is also a four bedrooled dwelling; the driveway measures c. 8.4m x 4.4m and the garage c. 8.9m x 4.7m. While the driveway is a little short of the space required by the SPD, Officers do not consider that this would have a significant impact on highways safety in its own right.

5.4 Officers consider it necessary to secure the garages and driveways for parking through condition, to ensure that adequate parking facilities are available to accommodate traffic associated with the development. On this basis, the proposal is considered to accord with the provisions of DEV29, T1 and the guidance contained within the SPD.

### 6.0 Drainage

6.1 The applicant has provided a copy of South West Water's acceptance of foul and surface water drainage connections, in the event that a soakaway cannot be provided within the rear garden for dwelling two. Dwelling one cannot accommodate a soakaway as the open air swimming pool is being retained and there is insufficient space remaining to accommodate a soakaway and comply with

Building Regulations. Officers consider that this approach is acceptable, with details of soakaway testing for dwelling two, plus details of flow attenuation for both dwellings to be secured by condition to ensure surface water runoff does not increase to the detriment of the public highway or other local properties as a result of the development. On this basis, the proposal is considered to accord with the provisions of DEV35.

## 7.0 Low Carbon

7.1 The applicant has included the provision of an air source heat pump within the proposal. While the principle of this element is acceptable, full details of the ASHP must be secured by condition in order to safeguard the interests of residential amenity and the natural environment. On this basis, the proposal is considered to accord with the provisions of DEV1, DEV2, DEV26, DEV28 and DEV32.

7.2 The applicant has also included solar panels on the eastern roof plane of each of the dwellings; this is considered acceptable, with the details to be secured through condition in the interests of visual amenity and to ensure the development contributes toward delivering a low carbon future and supports the Plan Area target to halve 2005 levels of carbon emissions by 2034 and increase the use and production of decentralised energy; and in accordance with policy DEV32.

7.3 The applicant has also provided a copy of the DEV32 checklist which details the measures included within the design and build of the dwellings in order to reduce the carbon footprint associated with the project and comply with the provisions of DEV32. It is considered necessary to secure these details through condition in order to ensure the development contributes toward delivering a low carbon future and supports the Plan Area target to halve 2005 levels of carbon emissions by 2034 and increase the use and production of decentralised energy; and in accordance with policy DEV32.

7.4 For clarity, Officers would note that as the application was submitted prior to 01 December 2022 the provisions of the Climate Emergency Planning Statement with respect to the carbon impact of the demolition phase do not apply.

## 8.0 Biodiversity

8.1 The applicant has provided a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal to confirm that there are no ecological constraints to development on the site. The Appraisal contains a number of precautionary recommendations and measures to deliver biodiversity net gain, in order to safeguard the interests of protected species, which are necessary to secure through condition. On this basis, the proposal is considered to accord with the provisions of DEV26.

## 9.0 Conclusion

9.1 Officers note that the proposal challenges the limits of acceptability under the current policy framework but it is not considered that the proposal would result in demonstrable harm given the site constraints and context. On balance, the proposal is considered acceptable and it is therefore recommended that the application be granted conditional approval.

***This application has been considered in accordance with Section 38 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.***

## **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 26 March 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 14 January 2022 the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities published the HDT 2021 measurement. This confirmed the Plymouth, South Hams and West Devon's joint HDT measurement as 128% 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 5.97 years at end of March 2022 (the 2022 Monitoring Point). This is set out in the Plymouth, South Hams & West Devon Local Planning Authorities' Housing Position Statement 2022 (published 19 December 2022).

[\*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 21 March 2019 and West Devon Borough Council on 26 March 2019.**

SPT1 Delivering sustainable development  
SPT2 Sustainable linked neighbourhoods and sustainable rural communities  
SPT3 Provision for new homes  
SPT9 Strategic principles for transport planning and strategy  
SPT10 Balanced transport strategy for growth and healthy and sustainable communities  
SPT12 Strategic approach to the natural environment  
TTV1 Prioritising growth through a hierarchy of sustainable settlements  
TTV2 Delivering sustainable development in the Thriving Towns and Villages Policy Area  
DEV1 Protecting health and amenity  
DEV2 Air, water, soil, noise, land and light  
DEV8 Meeting local housing need in the Thriving Towns and Villages Policy Area  
DEV9 Meeting local housing need in the Plan Area  
DEV10 Delivering high quality housing  
DEV20 Place shaping and the quality of the built environment  
DEV23 Landscape character  
DEV25 Nationally protected landscapes  
DEV26 Protecting and enhancing biodiversity and geological conservation  
DEV28 Trees, woodlands and hedgerows  
DEV29 Specific provisions relating to transport  
DEV31 Waste management  
DEV32 Delivering low carbon development  
DEV35 Managing flood risk and Water Quality Impacts

### **Neighbourhood Plan**

Following a successful referendum, the Salcombe Neighbourhood Plan was made at Executive Committee on 19 September 2019. It now forms part of the Development Plan for South Hams District and is used when determining planning applications within the Salcombe Neighbourhood Area. It is not considered that the proposal conflicts with the policies below;

SALC ENV1 Impact on the South Devon Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty  
SALC ENV2 Green Infrastructure throughout the Parish  
SALC B1 Design Quality and safeguarding Heritage Assets  
SALC T1 Car and trailer parking in Salcombe  
SALC H3 Principal Residence

Other material considerations include the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and guidance within the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Additionally, the following planning documents are also material considerations in the determination of the application: Plymouth and South

### **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.

### **Conditions**

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which this permission is granted.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby approved shall in all respects accord strictly with drawing numbers;

Site Location Plan 1102.21.01

Proposed Drainage Plan 22.016 03.00 Rev A

Received by the Local Planning Authority on 26 September 2022

Proposed Sections 1102.21.10 revision B

Proposed Site Plan 1102.21.04 revision B

Proposed Long Elevations 1102.21.05 revision B

Proposed Elevations (unit 1) 1102.21.06 revision B

Proposed Elevations (unit 2) 1102.21.07 revision B

Proposed Plans (unit 1) 1102.21.08 revision B

Proposed Plans (unit 2) 1102.21.09 revision B

Received by the Local Planning Authority on 16 February 2023

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development is carried out in accordance with the drawings forming part of the application to which this approval relates.

3. Notwithstanding the submitted details, prior to the installation of any part of the surface water management scheme or before development continues above ground level, whichever is the sooner, full details of the most sustainable drainage option shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (LPA). Design steps as below:

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 40%).

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 40%).

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.

6. The drainage scheme shall be installed in strict accordance with the approved plans, maintained and retained in accordance with the agreed details for the life of the development.

Reason: To ensure surface water runoff does not increase to the detriment of the public highway or other local properties as a result of the development.

4. Prior to their installation details (such as a product brochure, technical specification sheet and colour photographs) of the natural roofing slate to be used in the construction of the proposed development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The natural slate used on all new buildings with pitched roofs must accord with the hierarchy of origin as well as meeting the requirements to be compatible with local vernacular and design:

- Reclaimed UK or European slates where available with proof of origin from supplier
- New UK derived slates with proof of origin from supplier
- New European derived slates with proof of origin from supplier
- No other natural slate products will be considered acceptable

All new roof slates and natural stone must be covered by a minimum warranty period of 50 years. Where possible, a product should be obtained that has an Environmental Product Declaration (EPD). If an EPD is not available, a verifiable certificate of origin or provenance will need to be supplied.

The development shall then be carried out in accordance with those samples as approved. The slates shall be fixed in the traditional manner using nails not hooks and retained and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

5. The 1.8m high obscure glazed privacy screens as detailed on drawings 1102.21.06 Rev B and 1102.21.07 Rev B on the north east and south west elevations of each of the first floor rear balconies hereby permitted shall be installed prior to the use of any balcony and shall thereafter be retained and maintained.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenity and privacy of adjoining occupiers.

6. Prior to occupation of any building hereby approved, the timber louvres on the south east elevation of each of the dwellings shall be installed. The timber louvres shall be retained and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

7. Notwithstanding the information submitted, prior to installation full details of the Air Source Heat Pump hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The equipment shall then be installed, maintained and retained in accordance with those details for the lifetime of the development, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA. The Air Source Heat Pump must be removed as soon as reasonably practicable when no longer required.

Reason: In order to safeguard the interests of residential amenity and the natural environment.

8. Prior to their installation, details of the solar panels to be used in the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The panels shall be of a visually recessive design. Prior to occupation of any building hereby approved, the panels shall be installed in accordance with those details as approved and retained and maintained for the lifetime of the development. The panels shall be removed as soon as reasonably practicable when no longer required.

Reason: (1) In the interests of visual amenity.

(2) To ensure the development contributes toward delivering a low carbon future and supports the Plan Area target to halve 2005 levels of carbon emissions by 2034 and increase the use and production of decentralised energy; and in accordance with policy DEV32.

9. The low carbon measures identified in the DEV32 Checklist shall be implemented in order to achieve regulated carbon emissions levels of at least 20 per cent less than that required to comply with Building Regulations Part L. 2013. Development shall take place in accordance with the approved details prior

to the first use of any building to which they relate and shall be retained and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure the development contributes toward delivering a low carbon future and supports the Plan Area target to halve 2005 levels of carbon emissions by 2034 and increase the use and production of decentralised energy; and in accordance with policy DEV32.

10. The recommendations, mitigation and enhancement measures of the Ecological Report, by Butler Ecology on 12 August 2022, shall be fully implemented prior to the commencement of the use hereby approved and adhered to at all times. In the event that it is not possible to do so all work shall immediately cease and not recommence until such time as an alternative strategy has been agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the interests of protected species.

11. The garages and driveways hereby permitted shall be kept available at all times for the parking of motor vehicles by the occupants of the dwellings and their visitors and for no other purpose.

Reason: To ensure that adequate parking facilities are available to accommodate traffic associated with the development.

12. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order, 2015, as amended (and any Order revoking and re-enacting this Order), no development of the types described in the following Classes of Schedule 2 and 14 shall be undertaken without the express consent in writing of the Local Planning Authority other than those expressly authorised by this permission:-

- (a) Part 1, Class A (extensions and alterations)
  - (b) Part 1, Class AA (enlargement of a dwellinghouse by construction of additional storeys)
  - (c) Part 1, Classes B and C (roof addition or alteration)
  - (d) Part 1, Class D (porch)
  - (e) Part 1, Class E (a) swimming pools and buildings incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse and; (b) container used for domestic heating purposes/oil or liquid petroleum gas)
  - (f) Part 1, Class F (hardsurfaces)
  - (g) Part 1, Class G (chimney, flue or soil and vent pipe)
  - (h) Part 1, Class H (microwave antenna)
- Schedule 2
- (i) Part 2, Class A (means of enclosure)
- Part 14 Renewable energy
- (j) Class A (solar equipment)
  - (k) Class B (stand alone solar equipment)
  - (l) Class C (ground source heat pumps)
  - (m) Class E (installation or alteration of flue for biomass heating) (n) Class F (installation or alteration of flue for combined heat and power)
  - (o) Class G (installation or alteration of air source heat pumps)
  - (p) Class H (installation or alteration of wind turbine)
  - (q) Class I (installation or alteration of stand alone wind turbine)

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to exercise control over development which could materially harm the character and visual amenities of the development and locality.