



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2020 by Scott Britnell MSc FdA MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P1133/D/20/3251968

29 Underhay Close, Dawlish EX7 0FA

- 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 Patricia Bailey against the decision of Teignbridge District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00348/FUL, dated 19 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Front entrance porch, sited onto slab with no walls, PVCu windows and doors, plus hipped tiled roof to blend with main dwelling, and other properties in the vicinity, plus ensuring the new porch does not protrude past the most forward part of some existing new dwellings nearby'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. At the time of my visit, I observed that a porch had been largely constructed at the appeal property. However, this does not match the proposal before me in terms of its form, design, width and height. Moreover, the proposed porch would not have a hipped roof as described by the appellant in the banner header above. For clarity, I have assessed the proposal based on the plans submitted with the application.
4. The appellant has submitted a number of documents to support her case. However, other than the appeal statement none of these are in a condition that makes them possible to read. I had requested that the appellant resubmit these documents but no further copies have been submitted. Consequently, I have proceeded on this basis.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site forms one half of a semi-detached pair of dwellings within a recently constructed residential development. The appeal property and its attached neighbour are modest in size but are well proportioned and make a positive contribute to a pleasant streetscene. Although within the wider development there are variations in house types, the palette of materials and common features such as open canopy porches have resulted in a coherent and uniformed appearance.
7. The proposed porch would project approximately twice the depth from the front elevation of the host dwelling than the original canopy and would have a gabled roof. It would also be enclosed. While there would be an extensive use of glazing, these elements in conjunction with the width of the proposed porch would result in a bulky and disproportionate addition to the property. Moreover, due to its design, form and enclosed nature I find that it would appear incongruous within the streetscene and would unbalance the symmetry of the semi-detached pair of which it forms part.
8. Consequently, I find that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The use of materials to match the existing property would not mitigate the identified harm.
9. The appellant suggests that the proposed porch would benefit her living conditions as the existing property lacks daylight. However, the porch would be unlikely to increase levels of daylight into the main living areas of the property and would be unlikely to provide sufficient indoor space for use as an additional room. The appellant also suggests that the proposal would benefit her work with a local charity. However, I consider that the provision of the porch would be a principally private benefit. Moreover, I am unable to read the information that the appellant indicates has been submitted in support of this suggestion for the reasons I have set out earlier. I afford these matters limited weight in my assessment of the appeal proposal.
10. The appellant indicates that the proposed porch would be within the normal size limits for Permitted Development and suggests that it only requires planning permission to be obtained from the Council as it is within 2 metres of the public pathway. However, I have assessed the proposal on the basis that it requires planning permission. I also note that there were no objections from Dawlish Town Council and that the appellant suggests that there have been letters in support of the proposal, although no copies of these have been provided, unless they are among the documents that I am unable to read. In any case, these matters are a neutral factor in my assessment of the appeal as the harm that I have identified would still exist.
11. I conclude that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. There would be conflict with Policy WE8 of the Teignbridge Local Plan 2013-2033 Adopted 6 May 2014 which requires, among other things, that development proposals maintain or enhance the character and appearance of affected street scenes and buildings. There would also be conflict with the aims of Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework relating to '*Achieving well-designed places*'. There are no material considerations which indicate that I should determine the proposal other than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Scott Britnell

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR