

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2021

by Mrs H Nicholls FdA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J9497/D/21/3279428

Glazebrook Farm, Road from Cheston Railway Bridge to Beggars Bush, South Brent, TQ10 9JE

- 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 Peter Davies against the decision of Dartmoor National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref 0198/21, dated 9 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is extensions to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are whether the scale would accord with local policies which seek to limit the additions to dwellings within the National Park and the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Scale of extensions

3. The existing dwelling is a part two-storey, rendered blockwork, pitched slate roof building which has a part-single storey projection from the northern elevation, and also has a separate 1.5 storey, pitched roof, timber-clad element which was converted from a detached double garage. These two main components are joined by a narrow, single storey, flat roof link extension.
4. The dwelling stands within a generous curtilage at the end of a long, unmade, tree-lined driveway and adjacent to some business units which, from the evidence, were once farm buildings. The rural area is within the Dartmoor National Park (DNP) and has picturesque views in a northerly direction towards the hilly landscape which contributes to the special qualities of the DNP.
5. The proposal seeks to add an extension to the first floor above an existing roof terrace and also extend the ground floor through widening the narrow link extension. The proposal would add a further bedroom and living space. The entrance to the dwelling would also be reorientated to have its entrance on the north facing elevation.
6. Policy DMD24 of the Development Management and Delivery Plan (DMD) (2013) indicates, amongst other things, that extensions and alterations to dwellings will not be permitted where the total habitable floorspace of the

dwelling would be increased by more than 30% (which includes garage conversions).

7. From the evidence, the proposal seeks to add a total of 59 sqm additional floorspace, over two floors. From the Council's evidence, the original dwelling had a floor area of 72 sqm. The single storey extension, converted garage (albeit under permitted development rights) and the allegedly unauthorised link extension have cumulatively added more than the permissible 30% additional habitable accommodation. The Council asserts that the resultant dwelling, if the appeal were allowed, would amount to 191 sqm of habitable floor area, representing a 165% increase above the original floorspace.
8. Other than asserting that the calculations offered by the Council have been incorrectly calculated, the appellant does not dispute that the proposal would exceed the 30% increase tolerance set out in DMD Policy DMD24. The proposal therefore conflicts with the Policy. Despite the desire to rebalance the living areas with the bedrooms, there do not appear to be 'clear design considerations' that indicate that a departure from this Policy is warranted.

Character and appearance

9. Owing to its pattern of fenestration, including large sections of glazing, its form with the linking flat roof elements, combination of sleek rendered walls, slate roof and adjoining timber element, the building has a contemporary aesthetic. It does not share many characteristics of dwellings typically found elsewhere in the DNP but is well-presented and appears generously proportioned, capable of accommodating a family given that it has 3 – 4 bedrooms.
10. The proposed first floor extension would be above an existing roof terrace and thus, within the footprint of the existing building. However, it would create a new dominant built feature, including Juliet balcony, projecting from eaves level to form a new principal elevation. Additionally, the proposed ground floor extension would more than double the depth of the existing link extension. With the combined scale, form and massing of the extensions proposed, added to the elongated form of the already generously-proportioned dwelling, the resultant effect would be to make the building a very individualised, large, sprawling building that would appear dominant in its setting.
11. Whilst I note the appellant's suggestion that the location is of a more mixed character, quite peripheral to the designated area of the DNP, it is still within the DNP and to take such an approach would be to the detriment of the DNP's coherent character and appearance. The proposal is clearly designed to take advantage of its relationship with the special attributes of the DNP, and so cannot so readily detach itself from being a part thereof.
12. For the reasons given above, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to, in particular, Policies DMD3, DMD4, DMD7 and DMD24 of the DMD, in addition to Policies COR1 and COR4 of the DNPA Core Strategy (2008). These Policies collectively seek to ensure that new development avoids detracting from the special qualities of the area, demonstrates a scale and layout appropriate to the site and its surroundings, conserves and enhances the character of the local built environment, and in respect of extensions to dwellings, would not adversely affect the appearance of the dwelling, its curtilage or immediate surroundings, even if not generally visible from public viewpoints.

Other Matters

13. I am mindful that the proposal would have no harmful effects on neighbouring occupiers, though as there are none sufficiently close that could be affected in any event, this is only a neutral aspect of the proposal.

Conclusion

14. The proposal conflicts with the development plan, when considered as a whole. In the absence of considerations of sufficient materiality to indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance therewith, the appeal is dismissed.

Hollie Nicholls

INSPECTOR