
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2020

by Adrian Hunter BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P1133/D/20/3250999

11 Grenville Avenue, Teignmouth, Devon TQ14 9NJ

- 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 Dale against the decision of Teignbridge District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02156/FUL, dated 3 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension, pitched roof over existing porch and cladding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. For the purposes of precision and clarity, I have used the description of development from the Council's decision notice.

Main issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises a semi-detached two storey dwelling and single storey garage. Grenville Avenue rises up steeply from Higher Combes Drive. As a result, the appeal property, which is set back from the road, occupies an elevated position, with the properties to the north continuing to rise up the hill. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, with the majority of the dwellings on Grenville Avenue being of a similar design. A key characteristic of the area is the provision of gaps between the properties. Given the surrounding topography, these gaps serve to break up the level of built development and provide views through and between the dwellings.
5. The appeal proposal would involve the conversion and extension of the existing garage and the provision of a first floor addition above, along with a new pitched roof across the existing front porch. The additions would sit flush with the host dwelling, with the roof line being similar to the existing property.
6. Considering the angle of the road and the elevated position of the appeal property, the proposed extension would be clearly visible within the street scene. Furthermore, due to its size and design, it would increase the overall

bulk of the appeal property when seen from the road. Therefore, as a result of its size, it would appear as a dominant form of development within the street scene.

7. Moreover, due to the size of the first floor element, it would close the gap between the appeal site and the neighbouring dwelling to such an extent that it would harm the rhythm and pattern of development along this part of the road. Consequently, the proposal would appear as an incongruous and dominant form of development, which due to its size and design, would harm the character and appearance of the area.
8. For the above reasons, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and, in this respect, would be contrary to Policy WE8 of the Teignbridge Local Plan and Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that the design of proposals does not have a dominant or overbearing impact on neighbouring properties or the street scene.

Other Matters

9. I have been referred to the recently granted side extension at 68 Higher Coombe Drive. I note the similarities with the appeal proposal, however, whilst filling a substantial portion of the gap between it and the adjoining property, the proposed extension in that instance has been set back from both the existing front line and roof level of the property. I have also been referred to the recent permission for a new dwelling adjacent to 2 Glenville Avenue, although I have not been provided with any further details of the case. In any event, I am required to determine the submitted appeal on its own merits.
10. I have also been referred to the design of a recently constructed property at 1a Haze House. The design of this dwelling appears to be different to the appeal property and those in the surrounding area, with the dwelling being specifically designed to fit the individual circumstances of the site. However, the site does not lie on Grenville Street, but is more closely related to the surrounding garage court, therefore I do not find that case to be comparable with the appeal proposal.
11. My attention has been drawn to the lack of objections to the appeal proposals from surrounding neighbours. Be this as it may, I am however required to determine the appeal against the relevant development plan policies.
12. Reference has been made to the proposed external materials, however I note that no mention of the materials was made within the Council's reason for refusal. In any event, such a matter could adequately be dealt with through a suitably worded planning condition.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Adrian Hunter

INSPECTOR