



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2020

by Mrs H Nicholls FdA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P1133/W/20/3248058

16 Broadlands Avenue, Newton Abbot TQ12 1SJ

- 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 & Mrs Michael Perry against the decision of Teignbridge District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01502/FUL, dated 13 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is change of use, separate existing four bed house into a three bed house and a one bed house. Externally: Provide an extra parking space for three bed house via a dropped kerb. Create a bin storage area. Create a new front door for the one bed house. Internally block up two doorways, create staircase, creation of a kitchen area for the one bed and create a rear door to garden in three bed house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The surrounding area predominantly comprises two storey semi-detached dwellings constructed from red brick, which are fairly regularly spaced apart and set back from the road with a shallow front garden. Some have attached garages or side extensions which take a range of forms and which have resulted in narrowed gaps between the respective buildings. The appeal dwelling has an attached two storey side extension which is in the order of half of the width of the host dwelling. Its hipped roof provides a balance to the roof profile it shares with the attached dwelling at No 14.
4. The proposal would involve the subdivision of the extension from the host dwelling internally, and insertion of a front door on the principal elevation. An area of garden would be created to the rear. A parking area would be created to the front of No 16 to remove cars associated therewith from the frontage of the proposed dwelling.
5. Notwithstanding that the extension exists and no additional built mass would be added, the proposed dwelling would be evidently narrower and it would appear cramped and contrived in comparison to the more regular layout of the semi-detached pairs. The arrangement of window and door openings within the front elevation would appear cluttered and clumsy, and the increase in

hardsurfacing to the front of the host dwelling would also further erode the existing modest sense of space that the front garden provides.

6. My attention has been drawn to two other examples where another dwelling has been added to a semi-detached pair of dwellings. The example at No 69A is where a dwelling is set back and tucked into a corner. It also has a more comfortable width in comparison with its adjoining host dwelling than could be achieved by the appeal scheme. The example at No 32A is of a dwelling with a dual frontage which again appears wider than that proposed by the current scheme, maintaining a better rhythm and sense of proportion within the streetscene. However, with both examples there is a degree of compromise with the arrangement of the garden or parking, highlighting that they were not conceived as part of the originally planned layout.
7. The examples of dwellings at Nos 99 and 99A is of little relevance given that it is a building that has been split horizontally, with the door to the second flat set to one side of the building. This does not appear irregular in the streetscene in any way. The examples of side extensions to dwellings, whilst altering the original form of the semi-detached pairs, do not undermine the cohesion of the wider character of the area. It is clear that some alterations and extensions have been built that relate well to their respective host dwelling, which is likely to have been the rationale for the acceptance of the current extension.
8. In view of this main issue, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies S1, S1A and S2 of the Teignbridge Local Plan 2013 – 2033 (adopted 2014). Collectively, amongst other things, these Policies seek to secure a high quality of design, taking account of the need for development to integrate with and, where possible, enhance the character of the built and natural environment. Though not specifically cited in the Council's decision notice, the proposal would also conflict with Policy NANDP2 of the Newton Abbot Neighbourhood Development Plan 2016 – 2033 (adopted 2016) which seeks to secure new development of a high standard, which reflects local character and creates a strong sense of place.

Other Matters

9. Given the limited size of the site, I accept that there is some inevitability that a bin store would be provided to the front of the middle dwelling. However, were I to find the proposal acceptable in other regards, a planning condition could be used to secure the form and location of the bin store that may be acceptable within the frontage.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

10. I am mindful of the location of the site in an area which is well served by facilities and services. It is also accepted on the basis of the limited evidence provided that there is a need for smaller dwellings in the area. The delivery of an additional dwelling to the local housing stock in such a sustainable location is a social benefit of the scheme. There would also be limited economic benefits from the minor construction works and longer term economic benefits through the occupation of the dwelling by the future occupants.
11. However, the proposal conflicts with the Development Plan, considered as a whole. None of the benefits or other matters raised, including that there may

be limited local support for the proposal, is of sufficient materiality to outweigh the identified harm.

12. For the reasons detailed above, the appeal is dismissed.

Hollie Nicholls

INSPECTOR