
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2020

by JP Longmuir BA (Hons) DipUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/K1128/D/20/3245226

Rowan Orchard, Road from Stoke Road to Post Office Farm, Bridgend, Noss Mayo PL8 IDX

- 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 N Sobey against the decision of South Hams District Council.
 - The application Ref 2466/19/HHO, dated 24 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is to replace front porch with two storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, including the AONB and the setting of the listed Quay Cottage.

Reasons

3. The site lies on the edge of Noss Mayo, within the South Devon Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). This is a village on a hillside overlooking Newton Creek, which is a narrowing inlet from the open sea a couple of miles away. A road runs around the periphery of the creek and provides a link with the neighbouring village Newtown Ferrers. The two sides of the creek are inter-visible and the quayside together with the adjoining Quay Cottage are a feature. There are also notable views along the creek, not least of which is Noss Mayo, fragmented by woodland above which the church forms another landmark feature.
4. The appeal site is at the eastern end of Noss Mayo by Bridgend and the quayside. The buildings here are tightly knit and narrowly follow the waterfront on a through road, however the appeal site is sited above where the buildings are more dispersed.
5. The existing house is low height and split level, built into the hillside. It has a pronouncedly sloping roof towards the creek, which is prominent in public views.
6. The proposal is for a two storey extension to the side of the dwelling in place of the existing entrance porch. Part of the extension would be a pitched slate roof

and timber clad side wall. In contrast, the other part of the extension would have an almost flat roof element at the first floor, with full length glazed walls, which would face towards the creek.

7. The Design and Access Statement for the planning application suggests that this oak framed glazed element would add interest and provide daylighting. The structure appears to be intended to serve a dining room with borrowed light reaching into the adjoining kitchen.
8. In terms of scale, the height of the extension would be lower than the ridge of the existing dwelling. Its width would be relatively narrow compared to the existing dwelling and its length would be comparable to the existing.
9. The design in terms of massing and detailing however, would amount to a significant change. The dwelling current has an unusually long sloping roof with limited fenestration which gives a very muted appearance and blends with the woodland above. However, the proposed new second storey flat roof addition would protrude significantly thereby breaking up the pleasant smooth plane of the existing roofline. Its glazed sides would have a different texture and a visual lightness compared to the roof. The proposal would create an element which would be at odds with the form and materials of the existing dwelling. As a consequence, in spite of its modest proportions, the extension would appear as a discordant feature, at odds with and harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.
10. Given the site's prominence, the proposal's awkward appearance would harm the character and appearance of the area around the host property. The AONB is characterised by the interspersed nature of deferential buildings within the landscape. In this immediate area, there is a sensitive relationship between the buildings, the creek and vegetation, and the proposal would upset this balance.
11. The Parish Council raise concerns about the light emanating from the glazing. This could happen at any time when curtains or blinds were not drawn, and the resulting glare would be distracting to the overall impression of the village.
12. The Council's decision notice refers to a historic environment policy and the case officer's report alludes to impact on the setting of the Grade II Quay Cottage. The appellants' heritage statement notes this has a timber shingle roof and includes the adjoining building. I observed on my site visit that it has a very simple form and detailing, in particular the windows are modest in relation to the walls. It appears to have kept its traditional character.
13. Quay Cottage fronts the quayside and waterfront and due to its simplicity, appears harmonious with the views of the creek. It is also seen in conjunction with other houses in the village, including the appeal site which is on the hillside just above. Currently the appeal building is deferential to the setting of the listed building. However, the proposal would create a distinctive and prominent feature, which would detract from the views of Quay Cottage. Consequently, the proposal would harm the setting of the listed building.
14. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area thereby failing to conserve and enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of this part of the AONB. Policies SPT1, SPT2, SPT11, SPT12, Dev20, Dev21, Dev23, Dev24 and Dev25 of the Plymouth and South Devon Joint Local Plan, 2014-2034, seek to promote sustainability, appropriate

design, protect heritage and the landscape including the AONB. The Newtown and Noss Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2034 policies N3P-1, N3P-4, N3P-8 and N3P-9 similarly seeks to promote design, heritage and protection of the landscape. Paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) affirms great weight to the conservation and enhancement of the AONB, whilst paragraph 173 protects heritage coasts, paragraph 184 and paragraph 127 promotes quality design in conjunction with the National Design Guide, October 2019. I therefore conclude the proposal would conflict with the above policies.

15. Paragraph 196 of the Framework requires that less than substantial harm to a heritage asset to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including where appropriate its optimum viable use. Special regard must also be given to the listed building. The public benefits of the proposal are very limited and do not outweigh the harm to the setting of the listed building.

Conclusion

16. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Longmuir

INSPECTOR