



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2019

by M Harris BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P1133/D/19/3234996

36 Teign View Road, Bishopsteignton TQ14 9SZ

- 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 Davis against the decision of Teignbridge District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01023/FUL, dated 22 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension and replacement garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension and replacement garage at 36 Teign View Road, Bishopsteignton TQ14 9SZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/01023/FUL, dated 22 May 2019, and the plans submitted with it, 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:
 - 1838 P001 Location Plan
 - 1838 P012 Rev B Proposed Site Plan
 - 1838 P013 Rev B Proposed Floor Plans
 - 1838 P014 Rev B Proposed Elevations
 - 1838 P018 Views from Road
 - 3) No development above slab level shall be carried out until samples of the materials to be used on the roof and walls of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 4) No site clearance, preparatory work or development shall take place until a scheme for the protection of the retained trees and hedges (the tree protection plan) and the appropriate working methods (the arboricultural method statement) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme for the protection of the retained trees shall be carried out as approved.

- 5) Prior to works above slab level, details of any external lighting associated with the extension, including the external deck area, shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Any such lighting shall be installed and retained in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of development on the character and appearance of the original property, street scene and the Bishopsteignton Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is set in an elevated position within a spacious plot above Teign View Road. There is an existing garage at street level, reflective of others on the upper side of the road. Properties on the opposite side generally turn away from the road and are set at a lower level, reflecting the steeply sloping local topography.
4. There are a broad of range of styles of dwelling evident along the road with materials including brick, wood and render under slate or concrete tiled roofs. Roof forms are similarly varied in their style and form.
5. The site sits outside of but adjacent to the Bishopsteignton Conservation Area. This is designated for the general quality of the architecture and the historic plan of the settlement, noted within the Council's appraisal to be 'an intrinsic part of the settlement's charm which should not be eroded further by infill or backland development, as gardens were integral to the historic plan'. Being outside of the designated area, the appeal site plays no specific role although the spacious setting of the plot is reflective of the wider area.
6. The proposal is in two parts. Firstly, the replacement garage is sited in the same general position as the existing. Whilst appearing larger, it would not be so different as to fundamentally alter any existing impact. The Council's recommendation finds the garage to be acceptable and I agree with this.
7. The second element relates to the existing dwelling itself, a simple two storey, rendered dwelling set under a hipped tiled roof with a single storey extension to the front in a similar style. The proposal would remove the extension on the front elevation and extend beyond its footprint, together with introducing a mono pitched roof.
8. In respect of the scale of the proposal, whilst the addition would extend beyond the existing line of the front elevation, given that the host dwelling and plot are large, I consider that they have the capacity to absorb the proposal. It does not in my judgement represent a disproportionate extension and given the spacious context of the plot, would not represent an overly dominant addition.
9. Whilst the materials, including larger glazing panels set in grey aluminium frames and a grey standing seam, mono pitched roof and vertical cladding, are different to the existing dwelling, given the simple architecture of both the original building and the subtle detailing of the proposed works, the proposal would not harm the original property. Whilst clearly of a more modern style, I do not consider that the extent of glazing on the front elevation is inherently

- harmful and, together with the mono pitched roof, they are not dissimilar to features on other properties in the wider area.
10. With regard to the impact on the street scene, it is evident that there is significant variation along this section of Teign View Road, and the range of architectural styles is something acknowledged within the Conservation Area Character Appraisal. The section of Teign View Road in the vicinity of the appeal site features properties which are set back and raised above the street line with the buildings generally screened behind vegetation. In general, the simple arrangement of garages set into the slope is what defines the street, not the dwellings, and in light of this I do not consider that the proposal would have a harmful impact on the street scene.
 11. I am mindful of my responsibilities under section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the designated area. As noted by the Council, the value of the Conservation Area arises from the historic plan of the village and the architectural quality of buildings within it.
 12. Within this context, the site is outside of, but closely aligned with the boundary. However, the proposal does not result in an appreciable impact on the general arrangement of the plot and as it would not be infill or backland development it does not impact upon this aspect of the designation. Furthermore, in my view, the proposals would improve the appearance of the property and therefore I do not consider that the proposal would be harmful.
 13. For the reasons set out above, I do not find that the proposal would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the original property, street scene or the Bishopsteignton Conservation Area.
 14. As such, there is no conflict with the Teignbridge Local Plan 2013 - 2033 (adopted 6 May 2014), specifically Policies S2 which seeks to deliver quality development which enhances the character of the built environment, WE8 regarding ensuring that proposals complement the existing building in scale and material choice and finally EN5 which seeks to protect and enhance the area's heritage, including in relation to Conservation Areas.

Conditions

15. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council, having regard to the six tests set out in the Framework. For the sake of clarity and enforceability, I have amended the conditions as necessary. The appellant has confirmed that they agree to the conditions.
16. Conditions 1 and 2 confirm the timescales and approved plans in order to ensure the development is delivered in accordance with the submitted details. Condition 3 is necessary in order to ensure that the materials indicated on the plans are appropriate in the specific context of the site and to ensure that they protect character and appearance.
17. Condition 4 is necessary to ensure the protection of existing trees and hedging, including in respect of both nesting birds and the outlook of neighbours. Condition 5 is also in response to evidence from neighbouring occupiers and is required in order to ensure that they do not suffer from unreasonable

disturbance from any lighting associated with the development, specifically the external deck.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

M Harris

INSPECTOR