
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2019

by James Taylor BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P1133/D/19/3228527

12 Applegarth Avenue, Newton Abbot TQ12 1RP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs James & Imogen Anderson against the decision of Teignbridge District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00110/FUL, dated 19 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is the removal of existing garage and conservatory and extensions to the south and east elevations of the existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the removal of existing garage and conservatory and extensions to the south and east elevations of the existing dwelling at 12 Applegarth Avenue, Newton Abbot TQ12 1RP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00110/FUL, dated 19 January 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 105/PR/001B, 105/PR/002B, 105/PR/003B, 105/PR/004B, 105/PR/005A, 105/PR/006B and 105/PR/007B.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr & Mrs James & Imogen Anderson against Teignbridge District Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is occupied by a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling that forms part of a symmetrical pair. The external materials for the existing dwelling are brick to the ground floor, render to the first floor and concrete tiles to the roof. The dwelling has a detached single garage to the side, sited up to the

boundary, and a conservatory at the rear. The dwelling is positioned within a street scene of similar properties, many of which have been subject to extensions and alterations.

5. The proposal is to demolish the existing detached single garage and conservatory. The scheme involves the erection of a 2-storey side extension flush with the front elevation. It would project at the rear at ground and first floor level, with the single storey element wrapping around the rear with a lean-to roof form.
6. The adopted 6 May 2014 Teignbridge Local Plan 2013-2033 policies S2 and WE8 are criterion based and in broad terms seek high quality design and to protect the character and appearance of the plan area. WE8 specifically relates to residential extensions. It specifies development ought to have a design and materials that are complimentary to the character of the area. Furthermore, its scale should be appropriate to the existing building, and avoid overdevelopment and dominant impacts on the street scene. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.
7. The proposal would add a 2-storey side extension to the dwelling leaving a pedestrian access at the side, approximately 900mm wide at the front and 1300mm at the rear. At the front, the extension would continue the eaves and ridge details of the existing house, and utilise a pitched hipped roof form and materials to match the existing. The alterations to the rear include a 2-storey projecting gable designed to reflect the details on the front of the dwelling. The single storey alterations would be modest in scale and form. The rear of the dwelling is not a prominent part of the public realm. I find that the design, materials and scale of the extensions would be sympathetic to the existing building.
8. Additionally, I observed several examples of similar extensions within the street scene, including that under construction next door (14 Applegarth Avenue). From the advanced stage of building works, I have noted it to be of a flush 2-storey design set in from the side boundary by about a metre. Other extensions in the immediate street scene exhibit the same common features. As such, I find that the proposal would be in keeping with the character of the existing residential area and would not be a dominant feature.
9. Furthermore, whilst the spaces to the side of the dwellings are also a feature of the street scene, I do not consider this to be a consistent characteristic. The spaces have been eroded by the varied extensions and alterations at ground and first floor level. The proposal would retain a gap of approximately 900mm to the side boundary and have a hipped roof form sloping away from the side boundary. I note that the neighbouring development would provide a similar gap and form. In this specific circumstance I find that the existing dwelling would continue to be read as part of a semi-detached pair, distinct from 14 Applegarth Avenue. Moreover, I find that the proposal would not overdevelop the site.
10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposal would cause no harm to the character and appearance of the area and would not conflict with policies WE8 and S2 of the adopted Teignbridge Local Plan 2013-2033 or the Framework.

11. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interest of certainty. I note the hereby approved plans adequately detail the external materials to be used in the development and so I find a further condition unnecessary in this case.
12. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions listed above.

James Taylor

INSPECTOR