



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2019

by David Wyborn BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N1160/D/19/3232875

11 Grimspound Close, Plymouth PL6 8NY

- 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 Rickard against the decision of Plymouth City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00285/FUL, dated 26 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a small single storey extension to front of house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Grimspound Close consists of a number of residential terraces set on a sloping hillside together with areas of car parking and grassed public space. No 11 Grimspound Close forms part of a terrace and is set back in a stagger from the attached property, 12 Grimspound Close. Because of the slope of the land, No 11 is set on a higher level than the properties within the terrace broadly to the north. With its open and sloping garden, the frontage of No 11 is prominent within some areas in front of the terrace.
4. The extension would project a reasonable distance from the main front wall of the property and would be readily apparent from public view points. The top of the roof would approach the underside of the first floor windows and as the slope of the land drops this would necessitate a supporting base wall at the front of the extension. As a consequence, the extension would appear relatively high in relation to the main face of the building and, with it extending across much of the dwelling, the addition would dominate this principal elevation of the property. This bulk and dominance of the extension would be at odds with the generally consistent form and appearance of the properties in the adjoining terrace. I am not satisfied that the construction of the extension in the space next to the side of No 12 would mitigate this impact.
5. Furthermore, the large, full height windows would be an incongruous addition that would draw the eye and would add to the overall appearance of the extension as visually discordant in its context.

6. For these reasons, the extension would not be a sympathetic addition to the property and would be out of character with the appearance of the adjoining terrace properties and therefore with the immediate area as a whole.
7. As a consequence, the proposal would not meet the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requirement that development should add to the overall quality of the area and be visually attractive as a result of good architecture.
8. I have taken into account the policy references from the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan (2014-2034) (the Local Plan) which are intended to help to provide housing to meet local needs and that the Local Plan highlights that property in the area is very highly priced relative to average household income. It is explained that the extension is to provide suitable accommodation for the resident family, however, while I acknowledge this justification for the size and appearance of the proposal, this does not outweigh the harm I have found to the character and appearance of the area that would result.
9. My attention has also been drawn to other extensions within the wider area which are said to be examples that help to justify the design and appearance of the proposal. Also, at my site visit I noted a wide variety of other extensions that had been added to dwellings. However, it seems from my observations that the situation in this case is somewhat different because of the slope of the land would lead to a more dominant addition and it would be discordant in the context of the generally consistent appearance of the adjoining terrace properties. In any case, I have considered this proposal on its merits and therefore I attribute these other extensions limited weight in my decision.
10. In the light of the above analysis, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and therefore would conflict with Policy DEV20 of the Local Plan, the general approach for the design of front extensions in the Development Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document First Review (2013) and the Framework which seek, amongst other things, to meet good standards of design, contributing positively to townscape.

Conclusion

11. Having regard to the above, and taking all other matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Wyborn

INSPECTOR