



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2024

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P1133/D/24/3349321

13 Chockland Road, Kingsteignton, Devon, TQ12 3LZ

- 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 Matthew Newberry against the decision of Teignbridge District Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/01824/HOU.
 - The development proposed is remodel of existing bungalow to include new first floor, extension and internal alterations plus new double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have adopted the description of development from the application form.
3. On 12 December 2024 the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). However, the policies that are relevant to this appeal have not changed and I have not, therefore, sought the parties comments on the revised NPPF.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a detached bungalow located on the western side of Chockland Road within a spacious plot. Chockland Road is effectively two cul-de-sacs with the appeal site located in the northern part of the road where it forms a row of six properties, all located on its western side. The properties have similar spacious plots, with a mixture of bungalows and properties that have been extended or altered to comprise one and a half storeys. The road itself is private.
6. Most of the surrounding properties have hipped roofs though there are also examples of gable roofs facing the road. 19 Chockland Road (No.19) is an example of a property that has been extended and is located to the north of the appeal site. This property has a pitched roof facing the road with gable ends. Based on the plans included in the Appellants Statement of Case (SOC) the first floor was I understand facilitated by an approval for two new dormer windows on the front elevation. For 17 Chockland Road (No.17) the plans

included in the SOC show that approval was given to extend the roof on two occasions, with the first floor accommodated by raising the ridge, extending the roof and incorporating small hip ends at the front and rear. All of these approvals date from 2002 or earlier.

7. The SOC also refers to a 2021 approval to build a two storey rear extension and raise the roof to form an additional storey at 11 Chockland Road (No.11), to the south of the appeal site. The plans for that approval show that the proposal included raising the ridge, with gable ends to the front and rear. This approval has not been implemented and I am unclear as to whether it remains extant.
8. Overall, the properties in this part of the road vary in terms of their detailing, form, scale, design and pallet of materials. There is a mixture of bungalows and one and half storey properties, the latter the result of various approvals in the form of new dormers, extensions and increases in ridge height.
9. Dealing firstly with the proposed rear extensions and detached garage, I note that the Council have not objected to these elements of the scheme. Based on my observations on site, I concur with those findings. The spacious size of the plot is more than capable of accommodating these elements whilst at the same time safeguarding the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
10. Turning to the proposed first floor extension at the front, whilst I accept that there is no objection to the principle to remodelling the existing bungalow, I consider the design, scale and form of this element of the appeal proposal to be excessive. In that respect, I agree with the Council that cumulatively the extensions and alterations would represent a significant and harmful increase in overall scale and form compared to that of the existing host.
11. The original shallow hipped roof of the host property would be replaced by a large pitched roof with two storey gables at either end. The scale of these gable ends is accentuated by the significant increase in the existing main ridge height. As a result, they would be highly visible in the streetscene and would not integrate well with its neighbours, including the new roof form approved on No.11. Overall, this element of the appeal proposal would not be proportional to the host and would be out of keeping with the streetscene.
12. Whilst the submitted plans do not include any comparisons of the proposal with the existing host or with its neighbours, it is possible to obtain an impression of the changes in scale and form proposed through overlaying and comparing the existing and proposed elevations. In my view, this reaffirms the above findings that this element of the proposal would result in a design that is inappropriate and visually dominant within the streetscene. It would not be sympathetic to the host and would fail to respect the general character of the street. As such, the proposal would not sit comfortably on the appeal site leading to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host and surrounding area.
13. In view of the above findings, this element of the proposal would conflict with policies S1 (Sustainable Development Criteria), S2 (Quality Development) and WE8 (Domestic Extensions, Ancillary Domestic Curtilage Buildings & Boundary Treatments) of the Teignbridge Local Plan 2013 – 2033 (May 2014) (TLP). These policies seek, amongst other requirements, to ensure that new development is of a high quality design, demonstrates its compatibility with local character, that the design and materials are complementary to the

existing building, that the scale is appropriate to the existing building and does not have a dominant and overbearing impact on neighbouring properties or the streetscene.

14. These TLP policies pre-date those in the NPPF. However, a broadly similar approach is set out in the NPPF. Whilst paragraph 135 of the latter does state that being sympathetic to local character should not prevent or discourage appropriate innovation or change, the appeal proposal results in a development that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. Although that assessment involves an element of judgement, there is, unfortunately, nothing innovative in the design of the remodelling of the existing bungalow or any other considerations that would lead me to reach a different finding on this issue.
15. As I confirmed earlier, there are examples of one and a half storey properties in this part of the road. However, the evidence before me indicates that those alterations were on a smaller and more appropriate scale and have not resulted in harm to the character and appearance of the street. Whilst I accept the Appellants point that the width of the proposal would be consistent with that of the host, I do not agree with their contention that the proposal is similar to that approved at No's 11 and 17.
16. I note that the Appellants states that the proposal largely conforms with these approved developments. Even so, there is no evidence before me to support or substantiate that statement. As I confirmed earlier, the evidence available indicates that the proposed scale and form of the remodelling of the bungalow is significant and excessive. Moreover, that it would result in a design whose appearance is more akin to that of a two storey property rather than additions to the roof and increases in ridge heights that result, as in the case of the recent approval at No.11, in a more sympathetic and proportional development to the original host, its neighbours and the streetscene.
17. I can, of course, only consider the proposal that is before me and as is required determine it on its individual merits, having regard to the circumstance of the case and prevailing development plan policies. None of the existing examples or the approval at No.11 affect, therefore, the findings I have reached on this issue.
18. Accordingly, I find that the appeal proposal would fail to comply with policies S1, S2 and WE8 of the TLP and the corresponding policies of the NPPF.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above and having taken all the other matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Roberts

INSPECTOR