



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 March 2025

by **John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P1133/D/24/3356910

9 Foresters Terrace, Teignmouth, Devon, TQ14 8BP

- 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 Tranckle against the decision of Teignbridge District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01140/HOU.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first-floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at 8 Foresters Terrace.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a small, end of terrace cottage located at the terminal end of a short, narrow residential street that leads down to the working river-beach at the mouth of the River Teign estuary. It sits within the West Teignmouth and River Frontage character zone of the Teignmouth Town Centre Conservation Area (CA); an area of mixed buildings and features that combine and contribute positively to Teignmouth's diverse and distinctive character as a seaside resort, port, and market town. The appeal property is identified within the *CA Character Appraisal* as a neutral or negative contributor to the CA's overall character.
4. The appeal property has an irregular shaped floor plan, tightly occupying an end, corner plot. It has a mono-pitched single-storey extension to the rear which spans almost the full width of its rear elevation, the full depth of the shallow plot, and which adjoins the side boundary shared with the attached property at 8 Foresters Terrace to the east. The proposal would add a first-floor extension over the existing footprint of the single-storey addition with a hipped roof over.
5. The floor plan for 8 Foresters Terrace mostly covers the property's entire plot, with a single-storey, flat roof projection to the rear and roof terrace over, which is accessed from a full-length glazed door at first-floor level positioned near to the shared side boundary with No 9. The rear elevations of the properties within the terrace to this side of the road are somewhat haphazard and piecemeal, however the presence of a first-floor roof terrace at No 8 is not unique amongst them. I also

observed that rear outdoor spaces to the properties are extremely limited in size and tightly constrained, typical in many ways of their origins as workers' cottages.

6. The proposed extension would flank the full length of the existing roof terrace at No 8. I accept that there would remain to be an outlook directly south from within the first-floor space and from the roof terrace, and east across the backs of neighbouring dwellings. I also accept that, due to the south facing orientation of the dwellings, the rear of No 8 would continue to enjoy direct sunlight for significant majority parts of the day. However, the extension would impose itself upon this outdoor amenity space as a mass of solid built form and at very close quarters. By virtue of its proximity, depth and height, the extension would create a visually dominant, overbearing, and intrusive sense of enclosure when experienced from the immediately adjoining roof terrace and in the rear outlook from within the first-floor internal space. Given the already compact living environment experienced to the rear of these properties, the impact would be severe and far greater than any visual harm arising from the existing extension to the rear of No 9, including from the height of its mono-pitched roof.
7. Overall, I find that the proposal would cause significant harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers. As a consequence, there would be clear conflict with Policy WE8 of the Teignbridge Local Plan 2013-2033, adopted in May 2014, as far as it seeks to protect the living conditions of neighbours from the impact of any domestic extension.

Other Matters

8. I have noted a significant number of objections raised by other interested parties and nearby occupiers relating particularly to the appearance of the extension and its impact upon the CA. Nevertheless, I share the Council's view that the addition would be appropriately in-keeping with the roof form and overall appearance of the existing dwelling. I am therefore satisfied that there would be no impact upon the character or appearance of the CA. As such, its significance as a designated heritage asset would be unaffected.
9. I note the appellant's suggestion of reverting to a flat roof over the extension, as was proposed when the planning application was originally submitted, but that would not alter any impact from the scale and proximity of the flank wall upon the neighbour's living conditions.
10. A suggestion by the appellant that the roof terrace at No 8 may not be lawful is not supported by any substantive evidence. Neither, I note from the officer's report, was it a matter that appeared to be considered as a possibility by the Council.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR