



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2023

by J White BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/X1165/D/22/3306384

1 Venford Close, Churston with Galmpton, Paignton TQ4 7SE

- 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 Ian Davies against the decision of Torbay Council.
 - The application Ref P/2022/0254, dated 1 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 4 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is side extension with tiled roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for side extension with tiled roof at 1 Venford Close, Churston with Galmpton, Paignton TQ4 7SE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2022/0254, dated 1 February 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan, Front elevation plan, Floor plans, Side elevation plans.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area; and, whether the occupants of the dwelling would experience satisfactory living conditions with particular regard to internal floorspace.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site comprises an end of terrace dwelling in a corner plot with garden space to the rear and a strip of land beside the pavement to the side of the dwelling. The area is residential with a mix of single and two storey dwellings of similar age, style and design. The terrace has a stepped frontage and roof line. The dwellings have a relatively narrow width, which is accentuated by porches with lean-to roofs along the front of the terrace.
4. Although the proposed extension would have a narrow width, this would respond to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the terrace.

Due to the corner position of the site and its single storey scale, the extension would not appear as uncharacteristic in the surrounding context. Its recess and scale would reflect the architectural vernacular of the terrace, rather than appearing cramped or overdeveloped, despite its proximity to the edge of the pavement.

5. Constructed from matching materials and of modest scale, it would not represent a dominant or incongruous addition to the dwelling. Having regard to the scale and proportions of the existing terrace, the proposed extension would appear as a proportionate addition to one side, without causing harm to the building line of the terrace.
6. For the above reasons, I find that the proposed development would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would comply with Policies DE1 and DE5 of the Torbay Local Plan 2012 to 2030 (TLP) and Policy PNP1(c) of the Paignton Neighbourhood Plan 2019 (PNP) which together, amongst other things, require development to be well designed, seek to avoid cramped or over-developed sites and strengthen local identity. I also find no conflict with the provisions in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in relation to achieving well-designed places.

Living conditions

7. The extension, due to the narrow width of the site would comprise rooms with limited width. The Council raises concern that the bedroom would not meet the size standards within the Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard 2015 (the THS). However, the THS addresses new dwellings and, as such, the minimum bedroom sizes are not directly applicable to extensions. Nonetheless, Policy DE3 of the TLP requires, amongst other things, development to provide a good level of amenity for future residents or occupiers. It requires that adequate floorspace should be provided in residential development to achieve a pleasant and healthy living environment. The supporting text for the policy explains that regard will be had to the THS when considering development proposals and that these space standards are intended to be operated flexibly with regard to viability and other considerations.
8. The existing dwelling comprises ground and first floors and has previously been extended to the rear with a conservatory. The proposed extension would provide additional living space for occupiers of the dwelling. As can be seen from the plans accompanying the appeal documents, the extension would accommodate two rooms. The larger of the rooms is labelled as a bedroom, although the occupants could easily choose to occupy it with a different function. In any case, the bedroom, whilst narrower than the standard within the THS, would be provided with a window that would have an outlook over the rear garden. This would provide a sense of space and well-being within the room and the accommodation would have access to the existing living accommodation within the dwelling.
9. Overall, the proposal would extend the space available to the existing dwelling and support a sense of space in the house generally. I find that it would contribute towards a good level of amenity for the occupants of the dwelling, despite the somewhat restricted width and the guidance within the THS. I thus conclude on this issue that the proposal would provide the occupants of the

dwelling with adequate living conditions having particular regard to internal floorspace. Consequently, I find no conflict with Policy DE3 of the TLP. I am also satisfied that the proposal would comply with the residential amenity aims of Policies DE1 and DE5 of the TLP, Policy PNP1(c) of the PNP and the provisions in the Framework in relation to creating a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time condition, I have specified the approved plans in the interests of certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area, I have also imposed a condition requiring that materials to be used in the construction of the proposed development match those of the existing building.

Conclusion

11. The development would accord with the development plan and the Framework. As such, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J White

INSPECTOR