



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2020

by M Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/K1128/D/19/3236294
37 Churchfields, Dartmouth TQ6 9HH

- 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 Peter Knight against the decision of South Hams District Council.
 - The application Ref 0499/19/HHO, dated 15 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is the alteration and extension to existing dwelling to provide an additional bedroom with en-suite and large living area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue raised in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing terrace of properties.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a residential street, comprising short terraces of two storey properties set back from the highway behind front gardens. There is a consistency in the design of dwellings in the road, with the use of hanging tiles to front and rear elevations, together with large expanses of glazing within the elevations. Consequently, the design and layout of dwellings creates a sense of regularity within the streetscene, notwithstanding that there are additions to the front elevations of a small number of properties.
4. The appeal scheme proposes the addition of extensions to both the side and front elevations, as well as the rendering of the property. A single storey extension with a flat roof would protrude from the front elevation. Whilst the site is located at the end of the innermost terrace along the street, the front garden area is visible, and the front addition would be an obvious feature in the streetscene. It would not be unsubstantial in its scale and would protrude considerably from the elevation. Furthermore, the use of the flat roof at this location would highlight the addition as an incongruous feature. It would be a significant component disrupting the rhythm of the existing terrace. As I refer to above, I acknowledge that there are other front additions to properties in the area. However, I consider the context and design of each of these to be different from that which is before me. As such, they do not provide a justification for the proposal. I also accept that the area is not one which is free

from change, in terms of alterations and extensions to properties. However, for the reasons I discuss above, I consider that the addition of the front extension in this instance would be harmful.

5. The use of render for the elevations of the front extension, together with the rendering of the remainder of the dwelling, would eliminate the affinity which the property currently shares with the remainder of the terrace, diminishing the attractive consistency which the terrace currently exhibits. This would have a harmful visual effect. I acknowledge that there are other rendered properties near to the appeal site and in the wider vicinity, however these are clearly distinct from the terrace of properties of which the appeal site forms part. As such, they do little to convince me that the use of render within the appeal scheme would not be harmful.
6. The appellant references permitted development rights that would allow for the rendering of a dwelling, but further accepts that given the sites location within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, that these permitted development rights do not apply to the appeal property. As such, this does not dissuade me from finding that the application of render would, in this instance, be harmful.
7. The side extension would be two storeys in height, with a predominantly flat roof other than a small sloping section to the rear, following the pitch of the roof over the existing dwelling. From the front of the dwelling, this would appear as a subservient addition to the property. The flat roof would not replicate the pitch of the existing roof, however given its inconspicuous location at the end of a terrace of properties, when viewed from any vantage points to the front, it would not be a discordant addition to the terrace.
8. There are also views from the road to the rear of the property, which is at an elevated position and allows views over the appeal site. Within these views, the side addition would be clearly visible, however the use of a small section of sloping roof, tying into that of the main dwelling, would serve to reinforce the integration of the extension with the host property. Whilst the flat roof would be visible, in my view, it would have the appearance of a modern addition to the house, which given its position on a secondary elevation, would not be harmful. Whilst I have found that the rendering of the front extension and remainder of the dwelling would be harmful, I find that the use of render on the side extension would be acceptable, given its location to the side of the property, as it would serve to clearly define this element of the scheme as a new addition, without interfering with the appearance of the front elevation and adjoining terrace.
9. Accordingly, I find that the scheme would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the existing terrace of properties. Thus, the proposal conflict with Policies DEV20 and DEV23 of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan (adopted 2019). Together, and amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that development protects and improves the quality of the built environment, as well as reinforcing local distinctiveness. The scheme would also conflict with the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. The appellant refers to inconsistencies within correspondence with the Council and the advice given on the proposals. However, such matters are between the parties and do not impact the planning merits of the scheme that is before me.

Conclusion

11. Whilst I have found the side extension in isolation to be acceptable, I find that the front extension and rendering of the property would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing terrace of properties.
12. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR