



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2023

by S Harrington MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29TH November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/X1165/W/23/3316671

6 Norman Road, Paignton, Torbay TQ3 2BE

- 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 Joanne Mawdsley against the decision of Torbay Council.
 - The application Ref P/2022/0779, dated 29 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 2 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is a 'dorma' extension.
-

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. The appeal site is a mid-terrace property which features two existing flat roof dormer windows as well as an uninterrupted hip roof slope on a rear projection facing a public access road. This hip roof slope is half of a single hip roof and projection shared with the neighbouring property. Whilst there is an existing side facing dormer window, this does not diminish the visual appearance of a symmetrical roofscape provided by the rear facing hip roof. This symmetrical roofscape is replicated in the street-scene with two further 'pairs' of properties.
4. Notwithstanding, the rear elevations of surrounding properties, including one of the similar 'pairs', feature numerous historic alterations including dormer windows and flat roof extensions. Therefore, the overall character of the area is one of traditional built form which includes flat roof alterations. However, the importance of the remaining pitch and hipped roofs to the areas overall traditional character and appearance, is accentuated by the often visually inconsistent flat roof additions seen elsewhere.
5. The proposal would be a large addition to the roof of the host building and incorporate the existing side facing dormer window. Due to the overall size of the resulting dormer window, it would cover the majority of the hip and side slope of the roof. Whilst a part of the roof slope would be retained above the dormer window, and a small amount of eaves below, this would do little to reduce the bulky appearance of the proposal.
6. The resulting loss of the majority of the hipped roof of the host building would harmfully erode the remaining traditional roofscape in the area. Although views of the proposal are obscured by the neighbouring dwellings from the main

surrounding highway network, it nevertheless would be prominent when viewed from the access road to the rear and appear less subordinate to the host property than other existing dormers in the locality.

7. Whilst I have identified that existing dormer windows form a part of the character of the immediate area, those dormer windows and flat roof additions emphasise the importance of the remaining pitch roofscape.
8. Consequently, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with policies DE1 and DE5 of the Torbay Local Plan 2012-2030 and Policy PNP1(c) of the Paignton Neighbourhood Plan. These policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development is well designed, does not harm the character and appearance of the host property or street scene and strengthens local identity. The proposal would also be inconsistent with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to achieving well-designed places.

Other Matters

9. I note the appellant's comments about the Council's handling of the application. This has little to do with the planning merits of the case, which I have considered on the basis of the evidence before me.
10. I also acknowledge the proposal would result in additional bedroom space for the appellant's bed and breakfast business. Whilst this would result in some wider benefits, given the scale of the proposal, the benefits would be relatively limited. They would not outweigh the harm and conflict with the development plan I have identified above.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. No material considerations have been shown to have sufficient weight to indicate that a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S Harrington MA MRTPI

INSPECTOR