
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2021

by Adrian Hunter BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N1160/D/20/3261047

4 Parade Road, Plymouth PL5 2NJ

- 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 Findlay Black against the decision of Plymouth City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00478/FUL, dated 17 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is construction of new porch and entrance steps.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the living conditions of the residents of No. 56 Kings Road.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling, which lies within a predominately residential area. The appeal site is positioned on a crossroads within the estate, where the properties are set back and positioned at an angle towards the road, with clear open frontages. As such, the character of the surrounding area is defined by a clear sense and feel of openness around the junction, along with a clearly defined building line.
4. The proposed porch would extend a substantial distance from the front elevation of the house and protrude into the front garden area. As a consequence of the location and prominence of the appeal site within the street scene and, due to the overall size and scale of the proposed development, it would be clearly visible. As a result, it would appear as a dominant form of development that would harm the open aspects of this part of the estate. It would therefore appear as an incongruous form of development, which would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
5. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the appeal proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and, in this respect, would be contrary to DEV20 of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan 2014-2034 (JLP), Paragraphs 6.37, 13.35 and 13.36 of the Plymouth and

South West Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Living conditions

6. The adjoining property, No. 56 Kings Road, is a semi-detached dwelling, similar in design and appearance to the appeal property, with a front entrance and windows facing towards the road.
7. The proposal would introduce a blank, flank wall along the common boundary between the appeal property and the neighbouring dwelling. Whilst this wall would contain no windows, it would appear as a large, oppressive brick wall, positioned immediately along the boundary, directly adjacent to a ground floor window and the main door of the adjoining property. As such, due to its position and size, it would represent a visually intrusive and overbearing form of development, that would create a significant feeling of enclosure to the neighbouring property. This would be detrimental to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 56.
8. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect upon the living conditions of the residents of No 56 Kings Road and, in this respect, would be contrary to Policy DEV1 of the JLP and Paragraph 127 of the Framework.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has highlighted that the appeal property could be extended using permitted development rights. Be that as it may, in my view, any such extension would not be as substantial as the proposal now before me.
10. Reference has been made in the appellant's submission to the future need for wheelchair access to the property as a justification for the size of the porch. However, no evidence is before me in this regard, therefore I have given this little weight.

Conclusion

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

Adrian Hunter

INSPECTOR