
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2019

by Nick Fagan BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 9th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P1133/W/19/3228112

Greenway, 4 Landscore Road, Teignmouth, Devon TQ14 9JU

- 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 E Corbett against the decision of Teignbridge District Council.
 - The application Ref 18/02508/FUL, dated 7 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 11 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor extension to provide an additional bedroom and reinstate an external stairway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I am aware that an application for listed building consent was also made to the Council and refused at the same time as this planning application. But, as far as I am aware, that refusal has not been appealed.

Main Issue

3. Whether the proposals would harm the character and appearance of the property and area; specifically, whether they would preserve the significance of the listed building (LB), and the character and appearance of the Teignmouth St James Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey building in residential use, one of a pair of originally semi-detached dwellings jointly listed Grade II in 1983 when both were occupied as the Greenway Nursing Home. No 4 appears to be in use as two non-self-contained flats. No 3 is still occupied as a retirement/nursing home. Both properties lie within the CA. The Landscore area of the CA comprises predominantly large Victorian villas, of which these two properties are some of the best examples.
5. The listing description highlights the form and elevations of this pair of buildings. Consequently, I judge that their significance derives from their external form and elevational appearance, especially the series of different roof forms including to their northern elevations.
6. The Act sets out that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a LB or its setting, the decision maker shall have

special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. It also states that with respect to any buildings in a CA, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.¹

7. There are two elements to the proposals. The first is to erect a flat-roofed first-floor extension above an existing ground level extension on the northern elevation. There is a similar but even deeper extension to No 3 that is prominent in the view from the front of the building. But that extension harms the form of the original building because of its bulk and alien flat-roofed design. Inflicting similar harm to No 4 does not justify the proposed scheme – replicating such harm to No 4 would merely double the harm to the LB overall (since both Nos 3 and 4 together comprise the LB here). Neither does the appellants' justification for the extension (that the rear door has less than standard headroom), because this door is clearly used on a regular basis.
8. The second element of the proposals is the erection of an external staircase to serve the first floor flat. The appellants claim that this would replace a previous staircase to the north of the main portico entrance on the building's side elevation. That may well be the case but there is no remnant of any such staircase on site. The proposed staircase shown on submitted drawing 181206/6 Rev A and in the Heritage Statement appears to be very functional in appearance. Its upper part would be hidden from the access drive by the main entrance portico. But its lower half would not and it would be seen in its entirety from the southern garden area of the property. Its functional appearance and impact on this principal elevation of the LB would be significantly adverse and unacceptable. The fact it may replace a similarly unacceptable staircase does not justify it.
9. I saw on my visit that an entrance doorway already exists at first floor level from the portico, so I disagree with the Council's Conservation Officer that there would be any loss of historic fabric in this area. Nonetheless, that does not constitute a justification for the new external staircase.
10. For the above reasons I conclude that both elements of the proposals would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the property and area as a whole. Specifically, they would fail to preserve the significance of the LB and the character and appearance of the CA.
11. As such they would be contrary to Policies S1, S2, EN5 and WE8 of the Teignbridge Local Plan 2013-2033 that together require such development to preserve or enhance heritage assets and the distinctive character of the District's area, as well as contrary to relevant similar policy in Chapters 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Nick Fagan

INSPECTOR

¹ S66(1) & 72(1) Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990