



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: 04 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K1128/D/21/3277334

Panorama, Crescent Road, Ivybridge PL21 0BP

- 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 Michael Grieveson against the decision of South Hams District Council.
 - The application Ref 1972/20/HHO, dated 29 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of wood framed bespoke shed (part retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal has been partially constructed. The submitted plans appear to accord with the structure that is currently present on the site.
3. While the application was being considered by the Council, amended plans were submitted proposing a modified building, set back from the highway edge with planting between the road and the building. However, those plans do not appear to have been subject to public consultation, or considered in the Council's decision.
4. It is important that the plans considered at appeal are those on which the application was determined by the Council. The absence of consultation opportunity, in particular, means that interested parties could suffer injustice if I were to consider the amended plans. Therefore, I have considered the proposal on the basis of the original application.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

6. Crescent Road is set against steeply rising land. As seen from the road, Panorama, like its neighbours to the left, is set above road level with a sloping, open frontage, largely given over to parking.
7. While a supplementary planning document relating to garages may not expressly prohibit all buildings to the front of a dwelling, the finished structure would present a relatively high, stark wall on the edge of the highway, in contrast to the soft hedge boundary of the neighbour to the right and otherwise

- open frontages. Although the shed would be subservient in scale and set to the side of the main front elevation, when standing close to the site, the building would be prominent, at odds with the general open nature of the street at this point.
8. The dwelling to the right is set on a slight angle, at a point where buildings begin to be located closer to the road, creating a more enclosed street scene. The substantial hedge adjacent to the boundary with the appeal site currently forms the end of the open frontage section. Seen against this the modest shed, finished with a sedum roof and mellow coloured walls, would be relatively unobtrusive in views along the street.
 9. However, site's location at the transition to the more enclosed section of Crescent Road is a consequence of the hedge on the neighbouring land. If this were removed, the transition would be across the frontage of the next property and the shed would stand exposed, separate to other built form. There is no mechanism before me that would safeguard this landscaping in perpetuity. Moreover, it does not address the incongruity of the shed when viewed at close range.
 10. I, therefore, find that the proposal before me would harm the character and appearance of the area. This would be in conflict with those aims of Policies SPT1, DEV20 and DEV23 of the Plymouth & South West Devon Joint Local Plan 2014-2034 that seek to ensure that development contributes positively to the townscape and respects local distinctiveness.
 11. I understand that the topography of the site affords limited opportunities for enclosed storage facilities. However, this does not, in itself, justify the creation of an unscreened building so close to the highway edge. I understand that the appellant did not appreciate the need for planning permission, but that has little to do with the merits of the case.
 12. I, therefore, conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Bale

INSPECTOR