



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 February 2021

by C J Ford BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

a person appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K1128/D/20/3263157

3 Edwards Close, Thurlestone, Kingsbridge TQ7 3BP

- 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 David Gibby against the decision of South Hams District Council.
 - The application Ref 0857/20/HHO, dated 12 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension to form new study/hobby room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr David Gibby against South Hams District Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.

Reasons

4. Edwards Close comprises 11 modern detached houses which are of an individual design but with a commonly applied palette of materials. Although the dwellings are sizeable, a feeling of spaciousness is maintained across the development. This is due to the siting of the houses in relation to one another but also, significantly, due to the widespread use in the original design of subordinate projections from the main two storey parts of the dwellings. Consequently, the sense of spaciousness and the subordinate projections are important locally distinct characteristics of the development.
5. The appeal property has a central two storey section with a single storey projection on the western side. On the eastern side there is another projection which is initially two storey but then reduces in height to a single storey double garage with a steeply pitched roof. To the east of the site is No 4 which shares a courtyard access and parking area with the appeal property. Its main two storey bulk runs parallel with that of the appeal property and it has a double garage which almost mirrors No 3's. Despite the relatively close relationship of the two garages, their reduced height compared to the two storey elements creates a sense of spaciousness within the built form. An important

characteristic of the wider area is therefore evident between the two properties, notwithstanding its limited public visibility within a courtyard.

6. The appeal proposal would add a first floor extension spanning the full width of the garage. The ridge height of the adjoining two storey part of the dwelling would continue across and the roof would terminate in a hipped form with a 30 degree pitch. While the appellants draw attention to the fact the roof height of the eastern projection would remain lower than the main part of the house, this would only be insofar as sitting just below the principal ridge tiles. The height differential would therefore be insignificant and it would not convey any real sense of subordination.
7. The volume of the extension is such that it would be subordinate in scale to the existing house. However, within the courtyard the eastern projection including the extension would become more dominant than the front section of the main two storey part of the house due to its greater width and mass. It would therefore fundamentally change the form and balance of the dwelling. In doing so, it would harmfully erode an important characteristic of the host property and the wider Edwards Close development whereby the projections are subordinate. The extension would also significantly reduce the width of the high level gap with No 4, leading to a more cramped built form which would undermine the characteristic spaciousness of the development.
8. In light of the above, it is concluded the proposed extension would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area. It would therefore conflict with Policy DEV20 (parts 2, 3 and 4) of the 2019 Plymouth & South West Devon Joint Local Plan which requires good standards of design which protects the quality of the built environment through having proper regard to the pattern of local development in terms of style, local distinctiveness, layout and massing. It would also conflict with Policies TP1 (part 2) and TP7 (part 2.i) of the 2018 made Thurlestone Parish Neighbourhood Plan. The former expects the design of developments to be locally distinctive and reflect the style and character of the location. The latter seeks to ensure extensions are subordinate in scale and form to the existing dwelling.
9. While the Council's decision notice also referred to Policy DEV20 (part 1) which seeks resilient materials and design, as well as Policy TP1 (part 1) which seeks to protect residential amenity, it is considered there would be no conflict with the policies in those respects.
10. It is acknowledged that Policy TP7 (part 2) generally supports homeworking and the appeal proposal would provide a home study/hobby room. The proposal would also use materials which match the existing dwelling. However, these considerations do not outweigh the harm identified above. Additionally, while both the main parties have referred to potential alternative designs, the appeal scheme has been considered on its own merits.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

C J Ford PLANNING DECISION OFFICER