

Planning responses: PCM 6 March 2023

0365/23/NMM Bolt View

Thurlestone Parish Council objected to this non-material minor amendment on the basis that the proposed extension would have a detrimental effect/impact on the neighbouring property, 24 Court Park, contrary to Section 96A(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Further, the relevant planning consent for the purposes of this application is 3777/19/HH0 which approved the replacement of the existing smaller, single-storey detached garage with a 2-storey double garage and store/office above and the relevant approved drawings are ACL.1206.205 and ACL.1206.203A. The more recent planning consent 0921/21/VAR referred to in the description dealt solely with the cladding of the dwelling and garage.

1. The dimensions of the garage were an important consideration when 3777/19/HHO was determined due to the close proximity of 24 Court Park. The Parish Council's support was subject to the planning officer being satisfied that the replacement garage would not have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of 24 Court Park (contrary to NP Policy TP1.1); and in her report, the officer stated that the proposed replacement garage was not considered to harm the amenity of the neighbouring property, 24 Court Park, due to the orientation of the two buildings against one another, and the position and scale of the proposed garage building.

2. The proposed one-metre extension, whilst seemingly negligible, would have an unacceptable, detrimental impact on the amenity of 24 Court Park. Due to the configuration of the two buildings, the proposed extension would restrict the amount of light entering the neighbours' living room and have an unacceptable overbearing effect on the household's outlook (contrary to the Supplementary Planning Document 2020).

3. The proposed one-metre extension is to provide additional space to store solar panel batteries. Councillors questioned why the batteries cannot be mounted on the garage wall, stored under the staircase leading to the 1st floor or on the 1st floor.

4. Neighbouring 24 Court Park is a dwelling occupied year-round, whilst the replacement garage is an ancillary building providing additional parking and a store/office for the dwelling (Bolt View) which already has an integral double garage.

Councillors therefore considered that the proposed extension to the garage was not acceptable due to the detrimental effect/impact it would have on the amenity of 24 Court Park and that the application should be refused.

4393/22/HHO Clanacombe Lodge

No additional comments.

0322/23/HHO 31 Court Park

Thurlestone Parish Council unanimously supported this resubmitted application. Councillors welcomed the removal of the overbearing 2-storey entrance hall with vertical larch cladding on the principal elevation and agreed that the entrance on the lower ground floor and extended first floor terrace above with frameless glass balustrade would improve the character and appearance of the property and would be in keeping with other properties in the area (NP Policy 1.2). The proposed extensions were subordinate in scale and the materials used – painted render, natural stone, weatherboard cladding and standing seam zinc dormer roofs - reflected the style and character of the local area. Concerns remained,

however, about the amount of glazing on all the elevations which would detrimentally impact on the AONB, given the edge of settlement location. A reduction in glazing was requested and the installation of low emissivity glass, particularly on the South and East elevations, to mitigate the light spill (in accordance with the Parish's dark skies policy, NP Policy TP1.4). Conditions dealing with landscaping and parking were also requested, given the edge of settlement location.

4405/22/HHO 24 Mead Lane

Thurlestone Parish Council unanimously supported this application. The proposed alterations were mainly internal to improve the habitable accommodation and there had been no change in the footprint of the existing dwelling. The access steps on the W elevation, the horizontal cladding on the 1st floor of the principal elevation and the replacement windows and sills were all welcomed and the proposed extension to the depth of the terrace with balustrade and privacy screen was considered unlikely to impact on the adjoining property. The ASHP had also been appropriately located away from the neighbours and there was a negligible increase in the amount of glazing. They did, however, have an issue with the location of the flue for the wood burning stove which is too close to the adjoining property (22 Mead Lane) and below the ridge level of both the property itself and the adjoining neighbouring property. Neither the flue nor the cladding is specified in the description of development.

0412/23/HHO 21 Mead Lane

Thurlestone Parish Council unanimously supported this resubmitted application. Councillors welcomed the removal of all seven roof lights and the 1st floor window on the East elevation. They did, however, repeat their request for a privacy screen on the SW extremity of the balcony which is in close proximity to neighbouring 23 Mead Lane.