
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2020

by A Spencer-Peet BSc(Hons) PGDip.LP Solicitor (Non Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/K1128/D/20/3248098

The Drey, Farthing Lane, Westerland, Marldon TQ3 1RR

- 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 Mountford and the Personal Representative of Mr Mountford Deceased against the decision of South Hams District Council.
 - The application Ref 4086/19/HHO, was received by the Local Planning Authority on 13 December 2019 and was refused by notice dated 11 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is the repositioning of existing conservatory, construction of two storey extension and dormer roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Planning Inspectorate was advised that Mr Mountford had passed away during the appeal process and it has been confirmed that the Personal Representative of the Late Mr Mountford wishes to continue to act as a party in this appeal.
3. The planning application which has been submitted as part of the appeal, does not appear to have been dated. I have therefore used the date upon which the Council received the planning application in the banner heading above.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and on the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached bungalow with accommodation space in the loft, and which is set within a generously sized plot. The rear garden area slopes downhill away from the appeal building. The appeal building is located at the edge of Marldon and set back from the adjacent narrow single track lane. There is nearby residential development to the southeast of the appeal site, comprising a pair of well-proportioned semi-detached dwellings. By reason of its location at the periphery of the settlement and due to the presence of adjacent and nearby residential and agricultural buildings, the surrounding area is semi-rural in character and appearance and would not be located within the countryside for planning purposes.

6. The appeal scheme proposes a two storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling and a dormer roof extension. The proposed dormer would extend to almost the full length of the existing roof space and would replicate similar additions to dwellings within the surrounding area in terms of its scale and mass. In this regard, I find that the proposed dormer extension would not, on its own, unbalance or adversely affect the character or appearance of the host building, and would appear as a subservient addition to the existing dwelling.
7. However, the proposed two storey rear extension would appear as a bulky addition to the appeal building, extending out from the existing dwelling to a significant degree, incorporating a large section of flat roof and would have a somewhat box like appearance. The proposed two storey extension would, in my view, appear as a highly dominant addition to the host building due to its overall design, bulk and mass. By reason of its dominance, the rear extension would not be identifiable as a later subservient addition to the dwelling and would appear an incongruous addition which would unbalance and adversely affect the character and appearance of the host building.
8. Whilst I acknowledge that the appeal scheme would be partially screened from views within Farthing Lane by vegetation, the proposed extensions would still be visible to those travelling within Farthing Lane past the site in both directions, and particularly prominent in views for those travelling south within Farthing Lane towards the junction with the Totnes Road. Furthermore, given the sloping nature of the appeal site it is likely that the proposed two storey extension would be visible and prominent from within the surrounding area south and west of the site.
9. The prominence of the proposed extensions would be accentuated by the proposed materials and high degree of glazing that would be used in the construction of the appeal scheme, which would sharply contrast with the appearance of the host building and the appearance of nearby residential development. Given the contrasting nature of the proposed materials, the design and overall bulk and mass of the proposal, together with its visual prominence, leads me to conclude that the proposed extension would detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
10. For the above reasons, the appeal scheme would be in conflict with Policies DEV10 and DEV20 of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan 2014-2034 (March 2019) (the Local Plan) which, amongst other matters, requires that development is of high quality design which respects and reflects local character in terms of scale and materials. For the same reasons, the appeal proposal would not accord with the provisions of paragraphs 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires development to be of a high quality design which is sympathetic to local character.
11. Within the reasons given for refusal, the Council has also cited Policy TTV29 of the Local Plan. This policy concerns residential extensions and replacement dwellings in the countryside. For the reasons given above, whilst the appeal site is situated towards the edge of Marldon, the appeal site is not located within the countryside for planning purposes. Consequently, assessment of the proposal against Policy TTV29 of the Local Plan is not required in relation to the appeal scheme.
12. I note and acknowledge the efforts, time and money that has been invested in the proposal and the desire to provide additional accommodation and views of

the surrounding area. However, while I sympathise with these circumstances, they are not sufficient to outweigh the conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole and the resulting harm which I have identified above.

Conclusions

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal scheme conflicts with the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework when taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that would lead me to reach a determination other than in accordance with the development plan. As such, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Spencer-Peet

INSPECTOR