



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 August 2024

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P1133/D/24/3347132

Kingfishers, Manor Mead, Bickington, Devon, TQ12 6JQ

- 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 and Mrs Mugford against the decision of Teignbridge District Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/01195/HOU.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a garage to the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached, chalet style dwelling with an 'L-shaped' footprint and forward projecting gabled limb which is set back from the plot's open front boundary by the width of a wedge-shaped single parking space. Manor Mead is a narrow, private no-through road with no pavements to its sides and which serves five residences in total positioned along one side of its fairly short length. The opposing side of the road is enclosed by a mix of tall evergreen trees and other vegetation. The proposal is to erect a garage attached to the front facing gable in favour of the existing hard-surfaced open parking space.
4. In May 2023, planning permission was refused on appeal at Kingfishers for a similar development described as '*a garage to the front*' (Ref APP/P1133/D/23/3316565). In that case the Inspector found that the siting, scale, and design of the proposed garage would be an incongruous addition to the property. The Inspector also found that the garage would create an enclosure to the road, and that overall, it would unacceptably dominate views along Manor Mead.
5. The current appeal proposal differs from the previous proposal as far as it would alter the originally proposed pitched roof with a dormer to a hipped roof with a flat crown. The footprint of the garage would be largely the same as previously proposed, projecting forward of the dwelling's front building line at this point, and marginally beyond its rear building line, but with a slight change

to its side elevation, where a roller shutter access for bicycle storage facing Manor Mead would be stepped into a shallow recess.

6. The alternative roof form that is now proposed would be slightly lower than the previous appeal proposal. However, despite the use of matching materials, in my judgement, and contrary to the appellants' view, the garage would appear as an incongruous adjunct, with its hipped roof, flat crown and projecting building lines showing little respect for and poorly related to the architectural composition of the existing dwelling. In addition, despite a minor recess in part, the garage would maintain its siting immediately adjoining the edge of the carriageway along Manor Mead. The harmful degree of enclosure to the street scene and the visual dominance of an incongruous addition identified by the previous Inspector has not been mitigated by the current proposal. I continue to share these concerns.
7. Overall, despite the continued support offered by the Parish Council and absence of any local opposition, the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the area means that there would be conflict with Policies S1, S2 and WE8 of the Teignbridge Local Plan 2013-2033, adopted in 2014 as far as they require good design that maintains and integrates with the character of the adjoining built environment, and which is complementary to the existing building and not dominate the street scene. For these same reasons there would be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed and beautiful places.
8. I appreciate the appellants' desire to cater for their needs but this does not outweigh the harm that I have identified and conflict with the development plan and national policy when these are each considered as a whole. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR