
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2020

by Neil Pope BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P1133/W/19/3241297

6, Church End Road, Kingkerswell, Newton Abbot, Devon, TQ12 5DS.

- 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 Mrs N Tucker against the decision of Teignbridge District Council.
 - The application Ref. 19/01080/FUL, dated 20 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal site lies within the Kingskerswell Conservation Area (KCA) and forms part of the setting of the Grade II* listed Church of St. Mary¹.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the KCA and preserve the setting of the Church of St. Mary.

Reasons

4. The KCA covers the historic core of the village. Its special architectural interest is derived mainly from the handful of listed buildings, including the circa 14th century Parish Church of St. Mary and the vernacular buildings with steeply pitched roofs. The special historic interest of this area includes the remains of a medieval manor house² to the rear of the church and the layout of the village with large villas in garden settings and the remains of orchards and meadows.
5. The Council's Conservation Area Appraisal³ identifies 6 Church End Road as making a positive contribution to the character of the KCA. These are defined as *"...unpretentious but attractive buildings of their type that do not necessarily demand individual attention, but possess considerable group value. Some may have been altered or extended in uncomplimentary ways, but the true character of these buildings could be restored."*
6. The heritage interest (significance) of the Church of St. Mary is derived mainly from its special architectural qualities, including its early 15th century nave and

¹ Sections 72(1) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 apply.

² A Scheduled Monument and a Grade II listed building.

³ The revised Appraisal was adopted by the Council in 2010. It has been subject to stakeholder consultation and can be given considerable weight.

south aisle, late 15th – early 16th north aisle, early 16th north porch, 15th century tower, windows and doors, as well as its special historic qualities, including its medieval fabric. The churchyard, grounds of the medieval manor house, as well as the surrounding fields and gardens contribute to an appreciation and understanding of the significance of this Parish Church.

7. As I saw during my visit, 6 Church End occupies a prominent position within the KCA on a bend in the road. It is visible from the roadside, the churchyard and the main entrance of the church. The existing lean-to kitchen, with its shallow mono-pitched pitched roof and expanse of solid wall below the north western facing window, appears as a rather bulky and unattractive component of this house and has little in common with the local vernacular. I agree with the Council's Conservation Officer that it is a negative element in the KCA.
8. Policy WE8 of the development plan⁴ is permissive of domestic extensions where the design is complimentary to the character of conservation areas. LP policy EN5 also requires development proposals to respect and draw inspiration from the local historic environment, including responding positively to the character and distinctiveness of the area.
9. The proposed extension would be narrower than the existing kitchen. It would be finished with painted rendered walls to match the host building and have rolled zinc sheeting on the roof. However, it would extend development along the north western elevation of the host building and increase the expanse of shallow sloping roof. It would not complement the character of the KCA or respect the quality of the vernacular buildings. The proposal would have a minor adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the KCA. In the context of the National Planning Policy Framework, this would amount to less than substantial harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset.
10. Whilst the proposal would be visible from the churchyard, there is nothing to substantiate the Council's concerns that it would harm the setting or significance of this Grade II* listed building. The setting of this building, which is of more than special interest, would be preserved. However, this does not outweigh the harm that I have identified above to the KCA.
11. The proposed development would not deliver any meaningful public benefits sufficient to outweigh the harm to the KCA. Whilst I note that there was a previous extension on the appeal building this appears to have had a different roof pitch/slope to the existing kitchen and was removed many years ago. I also note the flat roof addition to the Grade II listed building at Pitt House. However, that extension is less prominent within the KCA and I do not know the full circumstances which led to it being approved. The dormer windows and balcony window permitted at 10 Church End Road are materially different to what is before me and again, I do not know the full circumstances of that case. These other developments do not set a precedent that I must follow.
12. I conclude that the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the KCA and would conflict with LP policies WE8 and EN5. The appeal should not therefore succeed.

Neil Pope

Inspector

⁴ This includes the Teignbridge Local Plan 2013-2033 (LP).