



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 19 October 2021

by M Bale BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N1160/D/21/3276965

2 Woodford Road, Plymouth PL6 7HX

- 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 James Jewell against the decision of Plymouth City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00374/FUL, dated 1 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is single-storey extension to side elevation to form enlarged kitchen and lounge area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single-storey extension to side elevation to form enlarged kitchen and lounge area at 2 Woodford Road, Plymouth PL6 7HX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00374/FUL, dated 1 March 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; Block Plan; Existing and Proposed GF Plans and Elevations.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
 - 4) No windows or other openings shall be constructed in the rear elevation (as so labelled on the Existing and Proposed GF Plans and Elevations drawing) of the extension hereby permitted.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Glenholt Road is lined with a variety of dwellings of differing appearance in a suburban residential environment. On the opposite side of the road to the appeal site, dwellings are generally of small scale, which combined with the topography, affords views across their roofs, making them recessive in the street scene and creating a spacious and open character.

4. The site side of the road is more enclosed, dwellings being generally closer to the highway, with some of larger scale. While built attached to No.36 Glenholt Road, the appeal site is a corner plot with a different appearance, facing Woodford Road. It has a relatively long front garden. The proposal would bring the side elevation practically up to the site boundary with Glenholt Road, and closer than a similarly sited dwelling at the nearby Glenholt Road and Holtwood Road junction.
5. Nevertheless, the presence of the front garden area would maintain a spaciousness about the plot. The dwelling would be seen in three-dimensions with a clear primary relationship to Woodford Road. As such, the proposal would not have a discordant or dominating effect, such as may result from extensions to a front elevation. A window would avoid the presence of a plain, oppressive wall in the street scene.
6. Importantly, with regard to the features that contribute to the spaciousness of Glenholt Road, the overall character and appearance of the area would not be harmed. There would, therefore, be no conflict with the aims of LP Policy DEV20 of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan that seek to ensure development contributes positively to the townscape, protecting and improving the quality of the built environment.
7. The extension would be close to the boundary with No.36. There are established off-site trees in the front garden of the neighbouring dwelling that may be disturbed during construction works, including through alterations to the soil conditions. However, there is no substantive evidence that such harm would arise. In any case, these trees do not make a fundamental contribution to the overall character and appearance of the area, so potential effects on them are of little weight in my decision.
8. Clear-glass ground floor front windows at No.36 are some distance from the boundary and so the proposal would not harm the outlook of this neighbour. As an otherwise open frontage to the street would be retained, I find no harm to living conditions, including in combination with other extensions at the appeal site.
9. Nevertheless, a condition should be used to prevent windows being inserted into the wall facing No.36, to protect privacy. A plans condition is required in the interests of certainty, and a condition requiring materials to match the existing dwelling is required in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
10. With regard to the above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

M Bale

INSPECTOR