
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 October 2019

by S Leonard BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/J9497/W/19/3230984

Kenwyn, Road From Ford Cross to Zeal Head Cross, South Zeal EX20 2JL

- 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 and Mrs Faraday against the decision of Dartmoor National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref 0646/18, dated 6 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 10 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is replacement dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The plans listed as refused in the decision notice include "1352/P10 Rev H, 352/P11 Rev G, 1352 P20 Rev H received 12 February 2019". These drawing references differ from those in the appeal form List of Drawings and Documents as Determined, which includes drawings 1352/P10 Rev J, 1352/P11 Rev J and 1352/P20 Rev K. The Council has subsequently confirmed that the latter three plan references are correct. Accordingly, my decision is based on the development as shown on drawings 1352/P10 Rev J, 1352/P11 Rev J and 1352/P20 Rev K which show the rear projection reduced by 500mm.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, including whether or not it would conserve or enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the Dartmoor National Park (DNP).

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on the northwest edge of the small settlement of South Zeal within the DNP and on the northwest side of the B3260 approach road to the village from Ford Cross. The site is occupied by a detached single storey dwelling, with rendered walls under a pitched tiled roof. The bungalow is positioned at the rear of the site and has several ad-hoc additions/outbuildings to its rear. Taken together, the buildings extend across the full width of the plot. There is a detached pitched roof timber garage in the front garden, which is accessed from the unnamed road in

- front of the site. Both the dwelling and the garage are in an elevated position relative to the street.
5. The bungalow forms part of a row of single and two storey dwellings on the northwest side of the road, which are similarly positioned towards the rear of their plots, backing onto open fields to the rear, and with parking/garaging in their front gardens. Notwithstanding their elevated position in relation to the road, the dwellings appear recessive when viewed from the street due to a combination of their set-back position and the presence of frontage vegetation. The opposite side of the road is characterised by detached single storey pitched and hipped roof dwellings. These tend to be positioned at the front of their plots, at a lower ground level than the street, and behind vegetated frontages, so that the built form is not visually dominant in the street scene.
 6. The appeal site property is unoccupied and in a poor state of repair, as detailed in the Building Fabric Report submitted with the planning application. The Council has agreed the principle of replacing the building, subject to the new dwelling enhancing the local environment and being of a scale that is sympathetic to its location.
 7. Notwithstanding its condition and the unsympathetic additions to its rear, the existing building, nonetheless, has a traditional, simple, strong, linear form, with uncluttered roof slopes, which is characteristic of the neighbouring dwellings on both sides of the road. To the southwest of the site and on the opposite side of the road, dwellings are predominantly single storey, positioned across their plots and with simple pitched or hipped roofs. To the northeast, there are full two storey dwellings with simple, uncluttered roof forms.
 8. The proposed dwelling would be of a transitional height in comparison with the bungalows to the southwest and houses to the northeast of the appeal site. However, the design and scale of the new building would not be in keeping with either the bungalow or houses within the immediate locality. The proposed chalet-style dwelling would stand out as an anomaly to the simple dwelling form typical of the area. It would have a wide, shallow, pitched roof form, with an eaves to ridge depth of about one and a half times that of the ground to eaves building height. As a result, the scale and bulk of the new roof would not relate well to the ground floor of the dwelling, appearing top-heavy and over-dominant in relation to it.
 9. This overbearing roof form would be exacerbated by the proposed front and rear dormer windows and rear building projection which would take up a large proportion of the front and rear roof slopes. The proposed dormers, due to a combination of their swept roof form, and window widths in comparison to the ground floor fenestration below, would appear overly bulky within the roof slopes and not subservient to the fenestration below. During my site inspection, I found most street facing roof slopes within the vicinity of the appeal site to be free of dormers, so that the proposed dormers would appear as a discordant element within the street scene.
 10. Furthermore, when viewed from both the sides and rear, the proposed rear projection would appear as an incongruous and visually dominant addition to the building. It would compete visually with the main building, due to its contrasting roof form and its proposed height and depth, so that it would

not appear as subservient to the main building. The visual prominence of the dormers and rear projection would be exacerbated by the proposed timber cladding walls on the rear projection and standing seam metallic roof finish on the dormers and part of the rear projection, which would be in contrast to the materials of the main part of the dwelling. The resulting over-dominant, cluttered roof form would be at odds with the simple, plain, proportionate roof forms prevalent within the surrounding area.

11. The appellant contends that the proposed dwelling would accord with the Dartmoor Design Guide, with particular reference to design details including the front porch, modest window sizes for the front and side elevations, dormer window design, eaves, fascia and chimney details and dwelling materials. However, the inclusion of such design details is not sufficient in itself to overcome the aforementioned concerns regarding the scale, bulk and design of the new dwelling.
12. Notwithstanding the position of the proposed garage at the front of the site and closer to the road frontage than the existing garage, I find that the replacement garage would not have a materially harmful impact on the street scene. In reaching this conclusion, I have observed that the existing pitched roof garage is visually prominent within the street scene, and that the replacement garage would have a similar footprint size and would be partly set down into the ground, with a flat, green roof. Also, during my site inspection I observed several other garages in similar positions at the front of properties on the appeal site side of the road.
13. Notwithstanding my conclusion regarding the proposed garage, for the reasons stated above, I find that the appeal proposal would not be sensitive to the prevailing form of built development in the surrounding area and would not make a positive contribution to the aforementioned positive and distinctive characteristics of the locality. Accordingly, the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of this part of South Zeal and would not conserve or enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the wider DNP within which it is located.
14. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to Policies COR1 and COR4 of the Dartmoor National Park Authority Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2008; Policies DMD5 and DMD7 of the Dartmoor National Park Authority Development Management and Delivery Development Plan Document 2013; the Dartmoor National Park Design Guide 2011 and paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Collectively these policies require new development to be of a high-quality design, to demonstrate a scale and layout appropriate to the site and its surroundings, to sustain local distinctiveness, character, townscape and setting of settlements, to respect and enhance the character and quality of local landscapes and the wider countryside and to conserve and enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of National Parks.

Other Matters

15. The benefits of the improved thermal capacity, sustainability and health and safety for the future occupants of the proposed replacement building are acknowledged. However, these matters are not of sufficient magnitude to outweigh my conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Leonard

INSPECTOR