



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2021

by David Wyborn BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P1133/D/21/3284843

7 Broadway Road, Kingsteignton TQ12 3EH

- 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 Rob Griffith against the decision of Teignbridge District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02401/HOU, dated 28 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a domestic garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. This section of Broadway Road, in the vicinity of the appeal site, generally has a verdant appearance because of the often extensive and established front boundary planting. This planting often partially screens the properties, and together with the lack of footways, provides this stretch of road with a generally pleasant, landscaped appearance within this part of the settlement area.
4. 7 Broadway Road lies within this general area of properties within fairly well landscaped plots. However, it has a reasonably low clipped hedge to the front and with the open vehicular access there are some clear and open views into the frontage area and towards the dwelling. The side boundary hedge to the west is higher and this assists with screening views of the frontage from the broadly west. However, No 7, and the new dwelling on the adjoining plot, are the main exceptions in this run of properties because of their more open and less landscaped frontages.
5. At the present time, there is a timber building within the frontage area of No 7. This is fairly conspicuous in the street scene, especially when approaching from the broadly east. The Planning Report explains that this building does not benefit from a planning permission and the proposed garage would replace this structure. The garage, while acceptably designed and modestly sized in itself, would be just as conspicuous a feature as the timber building within parts of the street scene. The low hedge and open views from in front of the site and from areas to the broadly east would ensure that the eye was drawn to the

- proposed garage building because of its forward position on the plot within this gap in the otherwise mainly more landscaped frontages.
6. The prominence of the garage building in this forward position on the plot, with the site effectively screened along only one side boundary, would not be sympathetic with the general appearance of buildings which are often softened by the verdant, landscaped character and appearance of this section of the road.
 7. There are no detailed and comprehensive landscaping proposals which form part of the scheme. Consequently, there is not the substantive evidence to help to show that the additional built form could be adequately softened within the street scene and thereby be successfully assimilated into the existing character and appearance of the more verdant surroundings. I am not satisfied that a suitable planting scheme could be the subject of a planning condition in any approval, including because of the extent of the existing hard surfaces within the frontage that could limit a comprehensive scheme and my uncertainty as to whether the frontage hedge is suitable to be grown up and could thereafter be so maintained.
 8. My attention has been drawn to other permitted and existing structures, including garages, within the frontages of the properties along this section of the road. They are, in principle, to some extent a feature of the area. However, the examples, such as the structures at Moongates, Maybridge, 1 Woolverton Drive and Moor Haven are generally within reasonably landscaped grounds and are therefore not especially prominent within the street scene. The garage to the front of the new dwelling next to the appeal site is set back in its plot being positioned alongside the dwelling at No 7 and is, therefore, not sited forward or as prominently as the appeal proposal. I am therefore not convinced that these other examples, when seen on the ground, are directly comparable with the appeal proposal which would be more exposed. I therefore attribute these other examples limited weight in my overall considerations.
 9. In the light of the above analysis, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and thereby it would conflict with Policies S2 and WE8 of the Teignbridge Local Plan 2013-2033 which seek, notably, that development integrates with and, where possible, enhances the character of the adjoining built and natural environment.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, there are no material considerations that indicate the proposal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Wyborn

INSPECTOR