



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2020

by Mrs H Nicholls MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N1160/D/19/3240857

46 Furzehatt Road, Plymouth PL9 8QT

- 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 G Triplett against the decision of Plymouth City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00386/FUL, dated 11 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is extend existing roof pitch over side two storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extend existing roof pitch over side two storey extension at 46 Furzehatt Road, Plymouth, PL9 8QT, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00386/FUL, dated 11 March 2019, 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: Location Plan, Block Plan and Existing and Proposed Roof Plan and Elevations dated Feb 2019.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed to match those used in the existing dwelling.

Preliminary Matter

2. The submitted plan, 'Existing and Proposed Roof Plan and Elevations', includes both an existing and proposed rear elevation although both are labelled 'Existing Rear Elevation'. As this is a typographical error, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the submitted plan which is otherwise unambiguous.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider streetscene.

Reasons

4. Furzehatt Road has dwellings set predominantly in semi-detached pairs along its northern side. The dwellings, whilst almost exclusively two storey, present a degree of variation in their form and character. Some semi-detached pairs have symmetrical roofs. Where some individual dwellings have been extended over time, the symmetry has been lost. The streetscene therefore comprises a linear arrangement of two storey dwellings which include pitched, hipped, gabled and monopitch roof forms.

5. Unlike proposals for new side extensions, the proposal only involves adding a pitched roof over an existing two storey side extension which currently has a flat roof and which has a front wall flush with that of the host dwelling. The current flat roof is incongruous within the streetscene, and from the rear of the dwelling, due to the additional rearward projection, appears to lack any cohesion with the host dwelling.
6. The new roof form would extend over from the same eaves and ridge heights and the element over the rearward projection would be hipped.
7. The Plymouth Design Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (adopted 2013) requires new side extensions to be set down a minimum of 1 metre from the front wall of the house. It also requires that the roof element is set down from that of the main house to ensure that the extension is subordinate. In respect of roof extensions, paragraphs 2.2.52-53 of the SPD note that roof extensions to the side can be particularly sensitive because of their prominence and impact on symmetry.
8. In the current case, the walls of the extension already exist and the front wall is flush with the main house. There is no ability to create a setback. The Council has not drawn my attention to any specific guidelines in relation to the setting down of roof extensions, although it appears that this is what it was seeking to achieve. Whilst I appreciate that a lowered roof may be desirable in some cases, the current proposal adds to an existing extension which detracts from the character and appearance of the building. It would provide the dwelling with a more coherent and symmetrical appearance, without unbalancing the relationship with its adjoining neighbour.
9. I note that the Council refer to other recent extensions that have incorporated walls and roofs that are set back and down. These contrast with the more dated examples at Nos 26 and 28 which appear very similar to the proposed scheme. This highlights that there are examples of both styles within the streetscene, and that this proposal will not be unique or more prominent than either style. Given the specific circumstances of this case, I do not consider that it would set a harmful precedent for the consideration of other proposals to which the SPD Guidelines may more strictly apply.
10. Consequently, the proposal is considered to improve the character of the host dwelling and wider streetscene, in compliance with Policy DEV20 of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan 2014 – 2034 (adopted 2019). This Policy seeks to ensure that development contributes positively to an area's identity in terms of scale, density and layout.

Conditions

11. In addition to the statutory time limit, it is necessary to condition the approved plans in the interests of certainty. In the interests of the area's character and appearance, it is also necessary to impose a matching materials condition.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed.

Hollie Nicholls

INSPECTOR