
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 March 2023

by Rebecca McAndrew, BA Hons, MSc, PG Dip Urban Design, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/X1118/D/23/3318599

14 Andrew Road, Sticklepath, Devon EX31 3AE

- 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 and Mrs Robinson against the decision of North Devon Council.
 - The application Ref 76042, dated 28 September 2022 was refused by notice dated 3 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of a conservatory and the erection of single storey extensions and loft conversion with dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The planning application sought consent for a range of works, including a porch, a front dormer roof extension, decking, the demolition of a conservatory and the construction of a single storey rear extension. The Council's reason for refusal solely relates to the proposed rear dormer and the Officer Report confirms it has no objections to all other works proposed. Given that these other works are not a point of contention between the parties, and I have no reason to disagree, these proposals have not been determinative in considering this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed rear dormer roof extension on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The proposed flat roof rear dormer extension would be overly large. It would span almost the full width of the existing roof and would extend up vertically off the existing rear wall plate to the ridge height of the host property. Only limited areas of the original pitched roof form would remain. Due to its excessive height, width, depth and overall bulk, the proposed dormer would dominate the roof plane within which it would sit. It would be an obtrusive feature which would not appear subordinate to the host roof. Consequently, it would be at odds with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

5. I recognise the proposed rear dormer roof extension would not be widely visible in the street scene as it would be located on the rear of the appeal property. However, there would be glimpses between properties of this bulky structure from Andrew Road. It would also be overly prominent when viewed from the rear gardens of neighbouring properties and the lower-level farmland to the rear of the appeal site. On this basis, the proposed roof extension would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and the area.
6. On my site visit, I noted numerous flat roof dormer extensions in the area. I have also considered examples of other properties which the appellant has submitted in support of the scheme. However, these differ as they tend to be smaller structures which retain more of the original rear roof slope than the appeal proposal. Those roof extensions sit more comfortably within the context of the original dwellings, rather than appearing as an unsympathetic addition which dominates the host property, as is the case with the appeal scheme. Moreover, each proposal must be considered on its own merits. As such, I have found undue harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the area.
7. The proposal therefore fails to meet the requirements of Policies DM04 and DM25 of the North Devon and Torridge Local Plan 2011-2031 (2018) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Taken together, these seek to secure good quality design which respects the character and appearance of an existing dwelling and the wider area.

Other matters

8. I have considered several matters raised by the appellants in support of their proposal. I recognise that the appellants have a growing family and therefore need more living space. I also note that no neighbours have objected to the proposal. Also, I accept that an adequate level of off-road parking would be retained as part of the scheme. However, none of these matters, either on their own or when considered cumulatively, outweigh the significant harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR