

Ward Budleigh And Raleigh

Reference 20/0918/FUL

Applicant Mr H Headon

Location 2 The Cedars Exmouth Road Colaton Raleigh Sidmouth EX10 0LB

Proposal Proposed conversion of the roof space of a residential property to a two bedroom flat



RECOMMENDATION:

1. Adopt the Appropriate Assessment forming part of this report; and
2. Approve with conditions



		Committee Date: 6th January 2021
Budleigh And Raleigh (Colaton Raleigh)	20/0918/FUL	Target Date: 15.07.2020
Applicant:	Mr H Headon	
Location:	2 The Cedars Exmouth Road	
Proposal:	Proposed conversion of the roof space of a residential property to a two bedroom flat	

RECOMMENDATION:

- 1. Adopt the Appropriate Assessment forming part of this report; and**
- 2. Approve with conditions**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This application is before Member because the recommendation is contrary to the views of one of the Ward Members.

The proposal is to convert the unused attic space of a first floor flat to an additional flat, making three in the building as a whole. The subdivision of dwellings in this way is one of the exceptions provided for in the Local Plan which allows for new dwellings in countryside locations. Although it does not have a Built-up Area Boundary, Colaton Raleigh is well provided for in terms of services and facilities and this site is particularly well located in relation to local amenities. For a countryside location, the village performs strongly in terms of accessibility, as acknowledged in two recent appeal decisions. The proposal is therefore acceptable in principle.

Externally the proposal involves new windows on the front and side and a full width dormer on the rear. Public views of the dormer would be limited to side-on views and therefore it would not be conspicuous in the streetscene in spite of the prominent location of the building. There would be no detrimental overlooking from the dormer window to the rear, and no greater overlooking than already occurs.

The number of parking spaces would not change and therefore Flat 2 and the new flat would have one space each. Although it is likely that the occupants of the flats would own a car, a reduction on the standard in Policy TC9, which is only guidance, is justified in this case because of the availability of local amenities and access to public transport.

Although the site is adjacent to a stream, the risk of flooding has been assessed as being equivalent to Flood Zone 1 and therefore the sequential test does not need to be applied.

Subject to conditions to secure a good quality finish in the interests of the character and appearance of the area, the proposal is in full conformity with the Local Plan and is therefore supported.

CONSULTATIONS

Local Consultations

Budleigh And Raleigh - Cllr Alan Dent

Having visited the site I have considerable concerns regarding this proposed development.

1. The proposed development is sited within the centre of the village which is designated 'Open Countryside' and accessed from a busy main road with a bus stop at the front of the property.
2. The development within the roof space creates additional affordable accommodation which whilst welcome intensifies the use of the existing building.
3. The proposed large dormer windows at the rear of the property will overlook the gardens of adjacent neighbours and create a considerable and - in my view - loss of privacy.
4. The proposal creates a building which is out of proportion to existing properties and is out of character with the streetscene.
5. The scale and mass proposed will be a dominating feature which will also adversely affect the neighbouring properties.
6. At the front of the property there is a proposal to park three vehicles in addition to the parking spaces currently available for the neighbouring property 'Skylarks'. The frontage has limited visibility on to the busy road and it will be dangerous for vehicles (up to five as proposed) exiting the site especially if reversing into the flow of traffic.

I will reserve my final judgement until all the facts and arguments have been fully explored.

Parish/Town Council

Councillors have a number of concerns and Object to the application for the following reasons.

1. The proposed scale of the development is considered overbearing to surrounding properties and out of character with the village.
2. Adjacent properties will be affected by a loss of privacy created by the large dormer windows proposed at the rear.
3. The proposals for car parking at the front of the building are considered to be inadequate. Space is limited and plans allow for one parking space per flat with no provision for visitor parking.
4. The frontage has limited visibility for vehicles when exiting onto the busy Exmouth Road, with a bus stop immediately adjacent to the property. The

potential for accidents is considered to be high, especially if vehicles reverse onto this road.

5. There is a visibility mirror situated at the front of the property to assist vehicles exiting the junction of Exmouth Road/Church Road which is opposite the site. If large vehicles are allowed to park in front of this mirror it will be obscured and create a considerable hazard for road users at this junction

Other Representations

One neighbour has supported the proposal.

Two objections and one representation have been received raising the following concerns:

- There is insufficient parking on site and little on-street parking available as an alternative
- The parking arrangements are unsafe
- Vehicles entering or leaving the site would conflict with busses at the bus stop
- Parked vehicles could obscure the mirror used by people joining the main road from Church Road
- The dormer is out of scale
- The proposal would result in a loss of privacy

Technical Consultations

Environment Agency

23/10/2020 - We have no objection to this proposal.

Reason

The Environment Agency have been closely involved with the preparation of the flood risk assessment, written by Dennis Gedge (dated October 2020), for this development.

We agree with the conclusions and recommendations of the assessment and as such, have no objections.

Advice

In progressing the development, it is important that any planning permission ensures that suitable flood barriers can be provided to the ground floor and non-return valves are fitted to the drainage.

13/11/2020 - We agree.

Our maps show that this site falls into Flood Zone 3.

13/11/2020 - I am the flood risk engineer for the Environment Agency who has been providing the historic flood risk commentary for the proposed development at The Cedars in Colaton Raleigh under application 20/0918/FUL.

I have just been made aware of the commentary between yourself and Chris Angell, in our Sustainable Places team, as shown in the attachment.

Whilst my colleague Chris is correct in stating that the development site is shown at Flood Zone 3 on the current published Flood Map for Planning, we have to understand

that these maps are indicative and not suitable for in-depth interrogation for site specific flood risk assessments. The assessment prepared by Dennis Gedge has correctly defined a 'design flood level' for the development using an accurate topographic survey procured specifically for the assessment and the Environment Agency's depth grid mapping, which provides a far higher resolution of mapping than the standard flood map. Coupled with this, the quoted design flood level takes account of climate change over the lifetime of the development through using the flooding depth-grid data for the 1-in-1000 year (i.e. 0.1%) AEP flood event, which corresponds to Flood Zone 2. This is deemed to be a very conservative approach in allowing for climate change, when no specific data is available from a hydraulic model, and effectively represents the worst case scenario which would be well in excess of the impacts realised from the flooding attributable to Flood Zone 3 (i.e. 1-in-100 year AEP event without climate change). I would therefore see the quoted design flood level as incorporating a more than acceptable allowance for any margin of error.

The wider conclusions of the flood risk assessment demonstrate that flood risks to the development can be safely managed over its lifetime.

I would be grateful if you could review your thoughts in light of my comments. I am more than happy to discuss this matter if that would be helpful.

17/11/2020 - Further to our earlier telephone conversation, I am happy to confirm that the conclusions of the flood risk assessment align the 'design flood level' with Flood Zone 1. A precautionary approach has been adopted in evaluating the 'design flood level', taking climate change into account over the lifetime of the development, so I would be content with the LPA treating the site as Flood Zone 1 for the purposes of the sequential test.

Devon County Highway Authority

Observations:

The access is existing with sufficient dropped kerbs to allow for the additional parking space, which appears to be in use currently. As the access is existing, off-carriageway space for vehicles to turn would not be required.

Therefore the County Highway Authority has no objection to this planning application.

Recommendation:

THE HEAD OF PLANNING, TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENT, ON BEHALF OF DEVON COUNTY COUNCIL, AS LOCAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY, HAS NO OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING HISTORY

None.

POLICIES

Adopted East Devon Local Plan 2013-2031 Policies

Strategy 7 (Development in the Countryside)

Strategy 46 (Landscape Conservation and Enhancement and AONBs)

Strategy 47 (Nature Conservation and Geology)

D1 (Design and Local Distinctiveness)

D2 (Landscape Requirements)

D8 (Re-use of Rural Buildings Outside of Settlements)

H3 (Conversion of Existing Dwellings and Other Buildings to Flats)

EN14 (Control of Pollution)

EN22 (Surface Run-Off Implications of New Development)

TC2 (Accessibility of New Development)

TC7 (Adequacy of Road Network and Site Access)

TC9 (Parking Provision in New Development)

Government Planning Documents

NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework 2019)

National Planning Practice Guidance

Site Location and Description

The Cedars is a relatively modern two storey pitched roof building which is divided horizontally into two flats. It is located on Exmouth Road in Colaton Raleigh, directly opposite Church Road and adjacent to the bus stop. There are parking spaces in front of the building and there are gardens to the south and rear. A stream defines the southern boundary and separates the site from the adjacent village shop. The northern wall of the building defines the boundary with the neighbouring residential property. The site is in flood zone 3, according to the Environment Agency map, and is within the East Devon AONB. This application relates to the first floor flat which is known as Flat 2. The ground floor flat is not affected by this proposal.

Proposal

This application seeks planning permission to convert the loft space above flat 2 to an additional flat which would be accessed by making internal alterations to flat 2 to create a first floor lobby and staircase.

In addition to the internal works, it is proposed to add a full width dormer to the rear elevation, three rooflights to the front elevation and a larger window in the southern gable. Outside the building it is proposed to give the new flat part of the garden belonging to flat 2; to formalise the parking area so that there are three allocated spaces; and to provide dedicated bin storage.

ANALYSIS

The main issues in the determination of this application are whether the location is acceptable having regard to the spatial strategy of the Local Plan; the risk of flooding; and the impact on living conditions.

Location and principle of development

Colaton Raleigh is a village which does not have a Built-up Area Boundary and therefore the site is in the countryside for planning policy purposes. In such locations there are limited circumstances in which the Local Plan supports new dwellings and these broadly mirror the circumstances listed in paragraph 79 of the NPPF. Of relevance to this proposal is Local Plan Policy H3 (Conversion of Existing Dwellings and Other Buildings to Flats) which is similar to NPPF paragraph 79 that supports "development [that] would involve the subdivision of an existing residential dwelling".

Being in a village, The Cedars is not in an isolated location, and therefore paragraph 79 is not directly applicable to the proposal. Policy H3, however, is applicable because it deals with buildings in all locations and of all types, including undeveloped attic space and flats. For buildings outside Built-up Area Boundaries, the policy supports subdivision subject to a number of criteria, each of which is addressed in the following paragraphs.

1. The proposed conversion will not materially adversely affect the character and amenities of the surrounding area or the building itself.

The village is characterised by its mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced houses, including some historic brick and cob properties. Although there are some listed buildings in the village, notably Place Court and the parish church, both of which are grade 2 star buildings, there is no conservation area. Like most villages, flats are not commonplace but the outward appearance of this building is compatible with the local architecture. As a result of this development there would be indications of the intensification of the use of the property, such as the dormer and rooflights, the parking and bin storage arrangements and the additional activity, but the change in character associated with one additional flat would be minor.

Because the building is set back from the road, in public views the sides of the dormer would be the only visible parts, with the main view being across the forecourt of the village shop. Subject to an appropriate choice of cladding material, this would not be a prominent feature in the streetscene. Given the limited scale of the proposal and the established character of the property, there would be no material harm to the character and amenities of the area or the building.

2. Development is located close to a range of accessible services and facilities to meet the everyday needs of residents.

Colaton Raleigh does not have a Built-up Area Boundary because it lacks a school and a doctor's surgery. However, it does benefit from a shop, pub, bus service, church, village hall and a small industrial estate, all of which are close to the site. These factors have been acknowledged by different Planning Inspectors in two recent decisions and

although one of the appeals was dismissed for other reasons, both sites were considered to satisfy Policy TC2 - Accessibility of New Development.

At Paradise Barn (18/1456/FUL), the Inspector concluded "I find that the development would be accessible by a range of transport modes that would minimise the need to travel by car. Therefore, I find that the scheme accords with the terms of EDLP Policy TCD2" (meaning Policy TC2).

At Pendor (19/1525/FUL), which is behind The Cedars, the Inspector concluded "for a rural context, the appeal site performs strongly against policy TC2."

A third appeal at Hardys Court (19/0821/FUL) was dismissed on accessibility grounds but only because walking or cycling from that site was not considered to be particularly appealing or safe owing to the need to traverse the main road between Hawkerland Road and Church Road to access local amenities.

The test in this case is not whether the occupants would have access to all the amenities that would justify a Built-up Area Boundary; it is whether for a rural location there are reasonable alternatives to travelling elsewhere by car. Having regard to the Inspectors' comments and paragraph 103 of the NPPF which says "opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas", the proposal is considered to satisfy the second criterion of Policy H3. In fact this site is considered to be in one of the most accessible countryside locations where development could be supported under this policy.

3. Provision is made for adequate bicycle storage and car parking. Hard surfacing of front gardens to facilitate car parking will not be permitted where this would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the appearance of the area or on flooding.

No specific provision for bicycle storage has been made but future occupants would benefit from a private garden within which there is adequate space for dedicated storage.

The space available for car parking would not change although it would be shared by three flats rather than two. The number of spaces proposed - one space per flat plus a garage for the ground floor flat - is a reduction on the two spaces per flat currently available. Whereas the current arrangement complies with the guidance in Policy TC9, the proposed provision falls short.

The amount of parking available has been raised as a concern by local residents, the Parish Council and one of the Ward Members. Their concern is based on the limited availability of on-street parking which is already in high demand from properties that have no private parking.

In spite of the comments above regarding the availability of local amenities and a bus service, the occupants of all of the flats are likely to own a car to access a wider range of amenities elsewhere. However, the availability of local facilities and a good bus service justify a reduction in the parking standard in this case. On that basis the provision of one space per flat (plus a garage for flat 1) is considered acceptable.

In the interests of ensuring that each flat has access to a dedicated space it would be reasonable and necessary to secure a parking scheme for the land in front of the building and this could incorporate hard and soft landscaping which would benefit the character and appearance of this prominent forecourt and ensure that surface water is managed appropriately.

4. Provision is made for storage of refuse.

The site plan indicates a dedicated bin storage facility in an unobtrusive but accessible location at the front of the building. Further details of the design could be secured by condition.

Additional requirements

Although not listed as a numbered criterion, a further requirement of Policy H3 is that the conversion must be "compatible with environment policies of the plan regulating building conversions in the open countryside." This indicates that the scheme must also satisfy the requirements of Policy D8 - Re-use of Rural Buildings Outside of Settlements. There is a large amount of duplication between the policies but the main additional criterion to satisfy is that the building should be "capable of conversion without the need for substantial extension, alteration or reconstruction and any alterations protect or enhance the character of the building and its setting".

For the avoidance of doubt, it is this specific criterion which is considered to potentially provide support for enlarging the building. Without this support, the proposal would not be compatible with the Local Plan because 'subdivision' would be taken to mean subdivision without extension. The provision for extensions in Policy D8 is therefore a significant consideration.

In this case the volume of the dormer adds 36% to the volume of the existing roof space and adds 26% to the usable floor area. Without the dormer the loft would still be capable of conversion but it would only comfortably provide space for a 1-bed flat.

Given that a conversion could take place with or without the extension, the test is whether the extension is proportionate to the existing building. In comparison to the existing roof space, the enlargement is considered to be towards the upper end of what is acceptable. However, compared to the scale of the building as a whole, the dormer only adds a modest volume. Furthermore, although a conversion could be achieved with a smaller dormer or no dormer at all, this would not offer any material advantage in terms of the character of the area because the visual impact is so limited. There is also no guarantee that a smaller flat would generate less demand for parking because a 1-bed flat would still provide space for two people. In light of these considerations, the proposed dormer is considered to satisfy the requirements of Policies H3 and D8

Having regard to these conclusions, the proposal is in conformity with the provisions of Policies H3 and D8 and therefore also with Strategy 7 which permits development in the countryside if there is specific policy support.

Risk of flooding

Owing to its close proximity to a watercourse, the site is in flood zone 3, according to the Environment Agency's flood map. On learning that the proposal would fail the sequential test based on the information available, the applicant engaged a consulting engineer to produce a flood risk assessment (FRA). In collaboration with the Environment Agency and drawing on more detailed sources of information, the consultant was able to conclude that the site could be classed as Flood Zone 1. The reasons for this conclusion are not fully explained in the FRA but it is a conclusion which is endorsed by the Environment Agency and which they have justified in further consultation responses. It is now understood that the main reason for the conclusion is that ground levels within the site are at or above the predicted flood level (known as the 'design flood level'). This was the same conclusion reached on the neighbouring site (then known as 'Greenaways Shed', now 'Skylarks') when an application for a new dwelling was approved in 2012.

In light of the conclusions of the FRA and the endorsement by the Environment Agency, the sequential test does not need to be applied in this case. There are, however, a number of recommendations in the FRA, namely the fitting of removable flood barriers to the ground floor door, and non-return valves to the drains. It is also recommended that the occupants sign up to the Government's flood alert service. The implementation of these measures, including the preparation of a flood plan to be provided to the occupants, can be secured by condition.

Living conditions

The introduction of new windows at roof level has given rise to objections from several neighbours who are concerned about overlooking.

The front of the building faces Church Road and a property called Little Mead, which is on the southern corner of Church Road and Exmouth Road. Three rooflights would be added to the front roof slope of The Cedars, two of which would serve the living room and the third would serve a bedroom. The lower edge of the windows would be 1.3m above floor level and the upper edge would be about 2.2m above floor level, thereby allowing a view out and down from a standing position. The distance between the nearest window and the nearest part of the boundary of Little Mead would be about 25m. This is more than sufficient to avoid an intrusive impact.

The southern gable of The Cedars faces over the garden and the stream towards the side of the village shop where there are external stairs to a first floor door. Between the side of the shop and the stream there is a shed and decked area which are for use by customers of the shop. The distance to the shed is about 13m and to the side of the shop is about 19m. The new window would be the only source of natural light for the landing and it would be above first floor windows currently serving a bedroom, kitchen and stairwell in flat 2. Given the existing degree of overlooking, the absence of any private amenity spaces and the fact that the window would not serve a habitable room, the relationship to the south is acceptable. This neighbour also supports the proposal.

The rear of the building faces the lower end of the garden of Skylarks where there is an outbuilding which is let as holiday accommodation known as 'Jar Lodge'. Beyond

that is the stream and then the access to the rear of Pendor where planning permission was recently granted at appeal for a new dwelling in the garden. Beyond the access is a second area of garden associated with Pendor and then agricultural land screened by trees. The decking outside Jar Lodge is only a few metres from the rear of The Cedars and therefore the second floor windows in the new dormer would mainly look straight over the top. It is unlikely that they would appear any more intrusive than the existing first floor windows. The first strip of land beyond Jar Lodge is used for access and parking and therefore there would be no loss of privacy to any sensitive amenity space. The next area of land is a parcel of garden associated with Pendor which is separate to the garden immediately adjacent to the house. This would be transferred to the new dwelling and would remain separate to the main garden around the new house. From this area of land the dormer would be prominent above the existing first floor windows but the separation distance would be at least 21 metres. The main garden for Pendor (and for the future new dwelling) begins further north and the separation distance is at least 30m at an oblique angle. As a consequence there would be no material loss of privacy to the current or future users of the garden areas.

In the northern gable there is currently a small window providing light to the loft space. A north elevation drawing has not been provided but it appears from the existing and proposed floor plans that this window would not change. The window would serve as a secondary window to the living room and would face the rear of Quashbrook Cottages, with Skylarks in between. Skylarks would provide some screening of the gardens and beyond that the separation distance is of the order of 20m, increasing to 23m at the rear elevation of Quashbrook Cottages. In view of the separation distance and the lack of any change to the window, there would be no intrusive impact as a result of the conversion. However, it would be necessary for the avoidance of doubt to impose a condition clarifying that permission is not granted for any changes to this window.

In addition to concerns about overlooking, some concerns have been raised about the dormer being dominant or overbearing. However, in view of the scale of the existing building and the separation distance to surrounding amenity space, the dormer would not appear dominant or overbearing.

In summary, the conversion would not result in any harm to the living conditions of the occupants of any neighbouring property. Furthermore, because the property is a flat, no changes or additional windows could be installed in future without planning permission.

Other matters

Highway safety has been raised as a concern by local residents, the Parish Council and one of the Ward Members. Although the proposal would intensify the use of the property and potentially the number of vehicle movements, the parking arrangements would remain the same and users would need to continue to take care around buses using the bus stop. Similarly the proposal would not lead to any interference with the traffic mirror. Having reviewed the proposal and the existing arrangements the Highway Authority has raised no objection and therefore it would not be reasonable to refuse the development on highway safety grounds.

The designation of the landscape as an AONB means that householders do not benefit from permitted development rights to add a dormer to their roof. As a consequence there are very few dormers in the village and those that exist are mainly on purpose built chalet bungalows. In spite of that the proposed dormer would neither be conspicuous in the streetscene nor out of character with the architecture of the building. For these reason and those given in relation to Policy H3, the proposal would not harm the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB.

For the avoidance of doubt, the building cannot be enlarged or replaced using the Government's recently granted permitted development rights because they do not apply in an AONB (or conservation area or world heritage site). There is therefore no extant fallback position.

Habitats Regulation Assessment and Appropriate Assessment

The nature of this application and its location close to the Exe Estuary and Pebblebed Heaths and their European Habitat designations is such that the proposal requires a Habitat Regulations Assessment. This section of the report forms the Appropriate Assessment required as a result of the Habitat Regulations Assessment and Likely Significant Effects from the proposal. In partnership with Natural England, the council and its neighbouring authorities of Exeter City Council and Teignbridge District Council have determined that housing and tourist accommodation developments in their areas will in-combination have a detrimental impact on the Exe Estuary and Pebblebed Heaths through impacts from recreational use. The impacts are highest from developments within 10 kilometres of these designations. It is therefore essential that mitigation is secured to make such developments permissible. This mitigation is secured via a combination of funding secured via the Community Infrastructure Levy and contributions collected from residential developments within 10km of the designations. This development will be CIL liable and the financial contribution has been secured. On this basis, and as the joint authorities are working in partnership to deliver the required mitigation in accordance with the South-East Devon European Site Mitigation Strategy, this proposal will not give rise to likely significant effects.

CONCLUSION

This proposal complies with all the requirements of Policy H3 of the Local Plan and therefore in spite of its 'countryside' location, the creation of a new dwelling through the subdivision of the existing flat is acceptable in principle and is in accordance with Strategy 7. The size of the dormer and the number of parking spaces available are both on the limit of acceptability but are nevertheless compatible with the relevant policy requirements and the principle that each case must be assessed on its merits. A reduced scheme providing a 1-bed flat may appear more favourable but is not before the Committee. The 2-bed scheme being considered satisfies all the policy requirements and is therefore supported subject to a number of conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

1. Adopt the Appropriate Assessment forming part of this report; and
2. APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission and shall be carried out as approved.
(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 permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed at the end of this decision notice.
(Reason - For the avoidance of doubt.)
3. Notwithstanding the drawings hereby permitted, no development above existing roof level shall take place until details of the materials to be used externally in the construction of the dormer have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be built in the materials approved.
(Reason - To ensure that the materials are sympathetic to the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policy D1 - Design and Local Distinctiveness of the East Devon Local Plan 2013-2031.)
4. No development shall take place above existing roof level until details of arrangements for the storage of refuse and recycling have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved storage facilities shall be made available before the flat hereby permitted is occupied and shall be retained thereafter.
(Reason - To ensure that early consideration is given to the provision of refuse storage facilities for the residents in the interest of health and hygiene in accordance with Policies D1- Design and Local Distinctiveness, H3 - Conversion of Existing Dwellings and Other Buildings to Flats and EN14 - Control of Pollution of the East Devon Local Plan 2013-2031.)
5. No development shall take place above existing roof level until details of the construction, drainage and surfacing of the parking area have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The flat hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the parking area has been completed in accordance with the approved details. Thereafter at all times the parking area shall be kept free of obstruction and available for use for these purposes by residents of the building and visitors to the building.
(Reason - To ensure adequate and safe provision is made for the occupiers and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with the requirements of Policy TC7 - Adequacy of Road Network and Site Access of the East Devon Local Plan 2013-2031.)
6. No development above existing roof level shall take place until a landscaping scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; such a scheme to include the planting of trees, hedges, shrubs, herbaceous plants and areas to be grassed. The scheme shall also give details of any proposed walls, fences and other boundary treatment. The landscaping scheme shall be carried out in the first planting season after commencement of the development above roof level unless any alternative phasing of the landscaping is agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the

landscaping shall be maintained for a period of 5 years. Any trees or other plants which die during this period shall be replaced during the next planting season with specimens of the same size and species unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

(Reason - To ensure that the details are planned and considered at an early stage in the interests of amenity and to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policies D1 - Design and Local Distinctiveness and D2 - Landscape Requirements of the East Devon Local Plan 2013-2031.)

7. No development shall take place above existing roof level until details of flood avoidance and mitigation measures have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include a flood barrier for the external door to the upper floor flats, non-return valves for the drains and a flood plan for the occupants of the flat hereby permitted. The measures shall be put in place before the flat is occupied and shall be retained thereafter and the flood plan shall be provided to all future occupants of the flat.

(Reason - To limit the effects of flooding in accordance with Policy EN21 - River and Coastal Flooding of the East Devon Local Plan 2013-2031.)

8. The existing attic window in the north elevation of the building shall not be enlarged.

(Reason - To clarify the extent of the development hereby permitted and in the interests of amenity in accordance with Policy D1 - Design and Local Distinctiveness of the East Devon Local Plan 2013-2031.)

NOTE FOR APPLICANT

Informative:

In accordance with the requirements of Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 in determining this application, East Devon District Council has worked positively with the applicant to ensure that all relevant planning concerns have been appropriately resolved.

Plans relating to this application:

20005-14	Proposed Site Plan	04.05.20
20005-13	Proposed Combined Plans	04.05.20
20005-12	Proposed Elevation	04.05.20
20005-11	Proposed Combined Plans	04.05.20
20005-10	Proposed Floor Plans	04.05.20
20005-SLP	Location Plan	04.05.20

List of Background Papers

Application file, consultations and policy documents referred to in the report.