



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 July 2021

by C J Ford BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N1160/D/21/3274319

5 Lockington Avenue, Plymouth PL3 5QR

- 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 Kalam against the decision of Plymouth City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00301/FUL, dated 18 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 April 2021.
 - The development is described as 'Two no. free standing light weight open structures in garden – verandahs'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. While the planning application form notes that works had been started, at the time of my site visit the proposed development had been carried out. I have therefore considered the appeal as seeking retrospective planning permission.
3. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in July 2021. However, the substance of the Framework as it is relevant to the main issue has not changed from the 2019 version. Therefore, as it would not prejudice their cases, I have proceeded without needing to consult the main parties. It is the 2021 Framework that is referred to in my decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located in a predominantly residential area and comprises a corner plot that is prominently located alongside the junction of Lockington Avenue with Bainbridge Avenue. The site accommodates a large turn of the twentieth century two-storey detached house which has further accommodation in the roof. While the building has been extended towards the north and there have been recent modernisation works, it has largely retained its distinctive form and character. As such, it makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the locality.
6. An important feature of the building on the principal Lockington Avenue elevation is the dominance of an ornamented front entrance projection which is two stories over a deeper single storey element. In contrast, the Bainbridge

Avenue façade is dominated by a full height gable fronted projection on its eastern side, while the roof of the building is characterised by its fairly steep pitches and flat roofed dormer windows.

7. Given the verandah erected on the Lockington Avenue elevation is both wider and deeper than the front entrance that it is positioned alongside, it has become the dominant feature of the principal elevation. In relegating the front entrance in this respect, it has significantly undermined the distinctive form and character of the building.
8. Although the second verandah on the Bainbridge Avenue elevation is shallower, its roof profile is taller and it is positioned higher on the building. As a result, the house has an unbalanced appearance when viewed from the neighbouring junction, notwithstanding any variation in the ground levels. Furthermore, the shallow pitched roof form of the verandahs and the small gable ended dummy dormers significantly diverge from the characteristic steeply pitched roof of the building and the flat roofed dormers. The uPVC cladding to the cheeks of the verandahs is also an uncharacteristic facing material which sits as an uncomfortable contrast to the building.
9. Consequently, the verandahs appear as awkward and incongruous additions which greatly harm the form and architectural integrity of the building. Moreover, both verandahs align with large pairs of gates within the perimeter wall which have the appearance of providing vehicular access. Due to a combination of the scale of the verandahs and their relationship with the gates, it is visually unclear from outside the site whether they are designed to serve as traditional verandahs, or whether they are intended to function as shallow car ports. The arising visual confusion further emphasises their incongruous appearance.
10. While it is acknowledged the dwellings in the area have a varied style, character and layout, the harm to the character and appearance of the area derives from the unsympathetic relationship of the verandahs to the host building and the detrimental impact on the otherwise positive contribution that it makes to the locality.
11. Accordingly, the development has an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area. As such, it conflicts with Policy DEV20 of the Plymouth & South West Devon Joint Local Plan 2019. This policy requires development to meet good standards of design that protects and improves the quality of the built environment. It also conflicts with section 12 of the Framework which promotes development that is visually attractive as a result of good architecture and which adds to the overall quality of an area. Similarly, it conflicts with paragraph 13.6 of the Plymouth & South West Devon Joint Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document 2020, which sets out that extensions and alterations should relate well to the main dwelling and should generally follow the same architectural style and use the same materials.

Other Matters

12. While the development provides the appellant with covered external amenity spaces, this benefit is not sufficient to outweigh the identified harm and the subsequent conflict with the development plan, which is afforded significant weight.

Conclusion

13. The development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations, including relevant advice within the Framework, which would indicate that the decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

C J Ford

INSPECTOR