



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2022

by Mr A Spencer-Peet BSc(Hons) PGDip.LP Solicitor (Non Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P1133/D/21/3288084

30 Parkelands, Bovey Tracey, Newton Abbot TQ13 9BJ

- 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 J Langmead against the decision of Teignbridge District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01739/HOU, dated 27 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extensions to side and rear with related alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and on the host building; and,
 - The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of existing and future residents of 28 and 32 Parkelands.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site is located within a residential area, with the appeal property forming one of a pair of semi-detached dwellings. The detached and semi-detached dwellings within Parkelands have a uniform character and appearance in terms of their scale and design. Whilst there are a number of dwellings within this section of the road that appeared to have been altered and extended to the side, such extensions were single storey ground floor additions.
4. In respect of the rear extension element of the appeal proposal, by reason of the mass and width of the dwelling, and given the existing conservatory extension, I find that the extension would reflect the proportions of the appeal dwelling and through the use of complimentary materials, would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area or be harmful to the character or appearance of the host building.
5. However, the proposed first floor side projecting element of the extension would be positioned partly above and forward of the existing single storey

garage which serves the appeal property. Whilst the front of this element of the proposed extension would be set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling and would not be highly prominent in views from within the wider surrounding area, the first floor cantilevered extension is not a design feature replicated on the surrounding properties and, in my view, would appear awkward and would be out of place in the street setting. It would also create an incoherence which would sit uncomfortably with the host dwelling. The first floor cantilevered side extension would thereby be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would have a harmful impact on the street scene.

6. For the above reasons, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. In these respects, the appeal scheme would conflict with the aims and provisions of Policies S1, S2 and WE8 of the Teignbridge Local Plan 2013-2033 (May 2014) (the Local Plan) which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that development be of a high quality design which responds to the characteristics of the site, integrating with the character of the adjoining built environment.

Living Conditions

7. As noted above, the appeal building is one of a pair of semi-detached two storey dwellings located within a residential area. The evidence before me indicates that the side extension element would be cantilevered over the existing driveway and would project approximately 1.2 metres from the side elevation of the appeal dwelling, with the rear first floor extension element being positioned over and above an existing conservatory.
8. In terms of overshadowing and loss of light for residents at 28 Parkelands, whilst the appeal scheme would be conspicuous in views from the rear garden amenity area, the garden and habitable rooms at the rear of that dwelling have a relatively open aspect and the times of the day during which the appeal proposal would directly cause overshadowing, would be limited. In this respect, I find that the scheme would not have a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of existing or future residents at that neighbouring property.
9. Notwithstanding the above, and whilst the side projecting element of the proposed extension would not have any adverse effect on the living conditions of existing or future residents at 32 Parkelands, in my view the light that would be able to enter the rear of that neighbouring property would be significantly compromised as a result of the height, mass and proximity of the proposed rear extension element at the appeal building. Furthermore, and for the same reasons in terms of its height and position, the appeal scheme would dominate views from the rear garden as well as from the habitable rooms at the rear of that property, having a significant enclosing effect, and would be overbearing, resulting in unacceptable harm to the outlook for existing or future residents at 32 Parkelands.
10. In these respects, the proposal would be harmful to the living conditions of existing and future residents. Consequently, the appeal scheme would conflict with Policies S1, S1A and WE8 of the Local Plan which, amongst other matters, seeks to ensure that development including domestic extensions does not result in the undue loss of outlook or light to habitable rooms and does not have a dominant or overbearing impact on neighbouring properties. For the

same reasons, the appeal proposal would fail to accord with provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework which concern creating places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Other Matters

11. The Council Officer's report indicates that the site is located within a Landscape Connectivity Zone and is part of a movement corridor used by bats in connection with the South Hams Special Area of Conservation. However, I have not found it necessary to examine this matter in greater detail as, for the reasons outlined above in relation to the main issues, it does not alter my overall conclusion in relation to this appeal.

Conclusion

12. The proposed development would provide very limited benefits in terms of employment opportunity during construction, and it is acknowledged that there would be ecological benefits in terms of bird and bat box provision. However, the weight to be attached to those benefits would be limited by reason of the scale of the proposal and would not, in my view, outweigh the harm identified above in relation to character and appearance and in respect of adverse effects on the living conditions of residents, and the resulting conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole, to which I attach significant weight in the determination of this appeal.
13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mr A Spencer-Peet

INSPECTOR