



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2020

by Mrs H Nicholls FdA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P1133/D/20/3257044

25 Seymour Road, Newton Abbot TQ12 2PT

- 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 C Evans against the decision of Teignbridge District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00497/FUL, dated 16 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is enlargement of garage with studio over.
-

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. Dwellings within Seymour Road take a variety of forms but a commonality is that they are set back from the highway, fully or partly behind boundary walls. Garages are either integral to the dwellings or where separate, are set back and are subservient in scale to the dwellings that they serve.
4. No 25 Seymour Road is a large detached dwelling set back from and slightly lower than the highway. As one of only a limited number of similar instances, its domestic garage is detached and set closer to the road than the dwelling itself. The current proportions of the garage are generous and it is set within a spacious ancillary hardsurfaced area. Due to the deliberate height of the adjoining stone boundary wall with its 'cock and hen' coping, the lower floor level and the flat roof of the garage, it is largely concealed from the streetscene.
5. The proposal involves rebuilding the garage to enlarge the ground floor footprint and also add a pitched roof form providing studio accommodation within the roofspace. It would be constructed from rendered blockwork with cedar clad upper and an interlocking concrete tiled roof.
6. Owing to its scale, form and siting, the pitched roof element of the proposal would substantially protrude above the height of the boundary wall. Consequently, it would appear as an incongruous feature within the streetscene, interrupting the sense of order that exists where dwellings appear as the dominant built elements and garages as ancillary structures, and where a sense of space is maintained between all buildings and the public realm.

7. For the above reasons, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to, in particular, Policies S2 and WE8 of the Teignbridge Local Plan (adopted 2014). These Policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure new development is of high quality design, specific to the place, and where involving the adaptation of ancillary domestic buildings, seek to ensure they complement the character of existing residential areas and do not have a dominant or overbearing impact on the street-scene.

Other Matters

8. Whilst the proposal would deliver a home office solution which is purportedly required by the appellant, I am not convinced that the appeal proposal is the only means of securing such an outcome. Similarly, the garage may be in need of enhancements or replacement, but the detrimental effects on the wider character and appearance would not be outweighed by the more limited improvements to the garage which would be less obvious in the streetscene.
9. Though I note that the scale and bulk has been reduced in size from an earlier proposal, the current scheme would still have harmful effects not outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme. The alleged lack of proactivity of the Council is not apparent from the evidence and nor has it affected my assessment of the scheme based on its own merits.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

Hollie Nicholls

INSPECTOR