



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2024 by S Wilson LL.B. MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J9497/D/24/3339411

Yellowmead Farm, Princetown, Yelverton, Devon PL20 6SS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Patrick Scott against the decision of Dartmoor National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref is 0413/23.
 - The development proposed is proposed side extension to house, a new staircase and rear single storey lean-to extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, with specific regard to its size and the special character of the Dartmoor National Park (NP).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. In order to, amongst other things, safeguard the intrinsic special qualities and rural character of the NP, the National Park Authority (NPA) seeks to restrict the individual or cumulative increase in the size of dwellings. To that end, Policy 3.7 of the Dartmoor Local Plan 2018-2036 (2021) (Local Plan) sets out that extensions will be permitted provided, amongst other things, that either individually or cumulatively they are appropriate to the original dwelling. Proposals must not increase floorspace of the original dwelling more than 30%. Exceptions include if the dwelling is below the size of the technical housing standard or if the minor increase in floorspace is necessary to conserve or enhance the dwellings special character.
5. The appellant has not contested that the original floorspace of Yellowmead was 86 square metres (sqm) and that subsequent extensions have added a further 33sqm, an increase of 38%. The proposal would not be necessary to conserve or enhance the dwelling nor is it below the size of the technical housing standard. Therefore, the proposed 16sqm increase which would take the

dwelling to 57% over the original, despite being a contextually small amount of additional floorspace in itself, would be contrary to Policy 3.7.

6. Yellowmead is a pleasant symmetrical two storey dwelling with a traditional simplicity to its appearance. This includes a centralised, pitched roof porch, shallow pitched roof and an even rhythm of windows. The historic farmstead is considered a non-designated heritage asset. There is a modern, double storey side extension that, despite its juxtaposed fenestration and detailing, fits well due to its subservient nature and use of matching materials. In these regards, the building contributes positively to the local area as one of quality and, by association and use of architecture, the special rural qualities of the NP. It is located outside of any settlement and is visible from open access land.
7. The side extension to the already extended farmhouse would, owing to its height and emphasised verticality due to its limited land take, further erode and unbalance its appearance. Detrimentially affecting the quality of its traditional elements. The single storey component would however be subservient, proportionate and thus respectful of the building's design and not be the source of harm. I have given some thought to recommending this element be allowed but such an approach would not sit well with my findings on the first main issue. Consequently, the appeal scheme would cause harm to the character and appearance of the appeal building and, by association, the area and the special qualities of the NP. The conservation and enhancement of the landscape and scenic beauty of which should be afforded great weight. This would lead to conflict with Policy 3.7 of the Local Plan. The aims of which I have set out above.

Other Matters

8. There are allowances for the erection of extensions under the relevant part and class the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO). This maybe something that would resemble the single storey rear element of the appeal scheme but, since I do not have a proposal under the GPDO before me I can't be certain. Such a proposal might also be subject to the prior approval process, the outcome of which I am also unclear about. In any case, a proposal under the GPDO would not consider the cumulative enlargement of the dwelling since it would not have the same regard to the development plan as the scheme subject of this appeal. I therefore attach limited weight to this position.
9. A family member requires adaptations to the dwelling, specifically staircase access, for mobility reasons. I cannot however be certain that the required access could not be provided by an internal staircase arrangement or any other, less harmful, means. Such an access appears to have been given permission under 0204/11, but never built. With these matters in mind, I can attach only limited weight to the personal circumstances.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight (including the approach of the Framework) that would indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend the appeal be dismissed.

S Wilson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR