



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: 04 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P1133/D/21/3284961

Foxwarren, Longford Park, Kingsteignton TQ12 3LW

- 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 Andrew Morrell against the decision of Teignbridge District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01850/HOU, dated 11 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension to replace existing conservatory.
-

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 host building and area.

Reasons

3. Foxwarren is one of a number of dwellings positioned so that they have ridge heights that generally step up the hillside within this part of the settlement area. When viewed from the end of the cul-de-sac in Longford Park, Foxwarren has a reasonably high ridge line compared with the house further down the slope, Home Park. However, the space between these dwellings, together with the slope of the main roof of Foxwarren being angled away from Home Park, combine to provide an acceptable visual relationship. Overall the present form of Foxwarren within its surroundings respects the general bulk and height of buildings within this section of hillside.
4. The extension, even though the gables would be staggered and have lower ridges than the main dwelling, would when viewed from the end of Longford Park appear to be quite elevated because the extension would be constructed above a lower part of the slope. The addition would virtually extend across the whole width of this part of the property and with its height, bulk and position, in combination with the elevated appearance, would draw the eye and appear as an unduly dominant addition to the host building.
5. Furthermore, the top section of the addition would project forward of the present sloping roof of Foxwarren and, because of its height and position with the other parts of the extension, would erode part of the spacing to Home Park. Indeed I consider, when viewed from the end of Longford Park, the bulk and position of the extension would have a fairly imposing presence above this adjoining building, lower down the slope. This relationship of buildings would

- exacerbate the appearance of the extension being discordant with the character and appearance of the general surroundings.
6. As a consequence, when viewed from parts of the end of Longford Park, the proposal would appear as an unduly dominant addition that would not integrate successfully with the host building and surrounding properties within this part of the hillside. As a consequence, it would detract from the character and appearance of the area.
 7. Parts of the west elevation of Foxwarren are also visible from within a section of Avery Hill. In these views, the ridge of the existing property, although higher and slightly angled away, is seen in a general line with the adjoining properties in Avery Hill. From this area, the main roof sloping back and the separation to Home Park help to ensure that Foxwarren sits fairly comfortably with the neighbouring properties on this part of the hillside when viewed from this location.
 8. The gable additions would, when seen from the adjoining section of Avery Hill, give the appearance of the extension extending forward a fairly marked distance in front of the broad building line. Even with the lower ridges than the main building, because of its bulk, forward projection and height above the lower level of the slope, the extension would appear as an overly dominant addition to the host building. The consequence, when seen from this location, would be that the extension would unacceptably detract from the existing relationship with the adjoining properties in Avery Hill and Home Park, and thereby would harm the character and appearance of the area.
 9. The removal of the conservatory, including the end brick wall adjoining Avery Hill, would provide a small benefit to the visual appearance of the dwelling and area. However, the conservatory is a lower part of the dwelling and less apparent in public views. Consequently, the removal of the conservatory would only result in a minor visual improvement and this would not compensate for the harm that would result from the proposal.
 10. I appreciate that the appellant has discussed the scheme with neighbours, amended the plans so that there are no overlooking windows and changed the design so that the two staggered gables would, as a stand-alone concept in themselves, not be unreasonable. I also accept that no objections have been received from adjoining residents or the Parish Council and that the proposal would improve the living conditions for the occupants of the property now and in the future. I have taken all these matters into account, including the effect resulting from the removal of the conservatory, however, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified that would result to the host building and to the area from the proposal.
 11. In the light of the above analysis, I conclude that the scheme would harm the character and appearance of the host building and area. Accordingly, the scheme would not comply with Policies S1, S2 and WE8 of the Teignbridge Local Plan 2013–2033 which seek, amongst other things, that extensions do not have a dominant or overbearing impact on neighbouring properties or the street-scene.

Conclusion

12. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan in respect of the identified harm to the character and appearance of the host building and area. There are no other considerations which outweigh this conflict and so I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Wyborn

INSPECTOR