



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2020

by Tobias Gethin BA (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X1165/D/20/3246551

25 Luscombe Crescent, Blathcombe, Paignton TQ3 3TW

- 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 Ben Clark against the decision of Torbay Council.
 - The application Ref P/2019/1186, dated 6 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as re-work pitched roof/dormer, rework flat to roof to existing extension & interior layout.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Alterations to roof to include enlargement of loft, dormer & pitched roof at 25 Luscombe Crescent, Blathcombe, Paignton TQ3 3TW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2019/1186, dated 6 November 2019, and 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: Drawing Nos BCP 10, BCP 11, BCP 12, BCP 13, BCP 14, BCP 15 and BCP 16.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, the appeal form includes different wording which reflects the description in the Council's decision notice. I have used this revised description as it better captures the development's scope.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Forming a corner plot, the appeal site faces the junction of Luscombe Crescent and High Field Crescent. With its hipped roof, small dormer and flat roof rear projection, and combined with the junction between the flat and hipped roofs, the semi-detached property on the site has a somewhat cluttered and

disjointed appearance. The surrounding area contains residential properties with a varied appearance and a mix of hipped and pitched roofs, gables and dormers.

5. The hip to gable alteration would change the appearance of the property, including when viewed from High Field Crescent and the junction with Luscombe Crescent. However, the gable extension would not be significant or particularly bulky and the change from hip to gable would be relatively unobtrusive. It would therefore not dominate or harm the appearance of the host building or the adjoining semi-detached property, and the resulting gabled stepped roof would appear as an acceptably designed and appropriate feature given the area's topography. The presence of other gables in the locality and the similar orientation of the proposed gable means that it would also not appear as an incongruous feature in the locality.
6. The Council consider that the proposed alterations to the existing flat roof and dormer would improve the appearance of the property. From the evidence before me and from my observations on my site visit, I concur with this view.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. I therefore find that it accords with Policies DE1 and DE5 of the Torbay Local Plan 2012-2030 and Policy PNP1(c) of the Paignton Neighbourhood Plan. Amongst other aspects, these require well-designed development which is in keeping with the surroundings, does not dominate the character or appearance of the original and neighbouring properties, and which respect and reflect the surrounding built environment in terms of scale, height, massing and design.

Conclusion and Conditions

8. For the above reasons, the appeal is allowed.
9. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of certainty. A condition covering the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the surrounding area. However, given the varied appearance and design of properties in the locality, a condition requiring the colour of the roof tiles to be changed, as suggested by the appellant, is not necessary to make the development acceptable.

Tobias Gethin

INSPECTOR