



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 March 2025

by H Faulkner BSc (Hons) MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W1145/W/24/3350676

7 Glebelands, Holsworthy, Devon EX22 6AQ

- 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 M Trenouth and Mrs J Hopgood against the decision of Torridge District Council.
 - The application Ref is 1/0261/2024/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of 1no. dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development provided in the application form has been updated from “proposed dwelling” in subsequent documents to “Erection of 1no. dwelling”. Accordingly, this has been adopted as the description of development as it is accurate and provides certainty of the proposal under consideration.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The site is to the rear of 7 Glebelands an end of terrace house with a long rear garden. The houses on this part of Glebelands face an open grassed area and parking. Properties are a mix of ‘Cornish Style’ and simple pitched roof houses and bungalows. Within the estate houses are generally arranged in short terraces and semi-detached pairs. There is a mix of bungalows and two storey houses with several garage/parking areas interspersed between the houses.
5. The prevailing pattern of development surrounding the site is that of properties facing towards the roads, in some cases with areas of grass between the houses and the road.
6. The proposed house, situated behind an existing house, would not front directly onto a road and would be accessed via a footpath or vehicular access through the garage court. This arrangement is not in keeping with the character of the area.
7. Plot sizes in the area vary, however, the terraces on this part of Glebelands (Nos 7 – 10) all have long rear gardens. Constructing a bungalow within one of these gardens would be inconsistent with the surrounding arrangement, especially since there are no detached bungalows with a similar layout nearby.

8. Although the single-storey nature of the proposed building and the site's levels would make it less visible from the surrounding area, it would still be seen from nearby properties, users of the footpath, garage court, and Glebe Meadow. Additionally, the main vehicular access from the garage court is incongruous and would not appear as a well-planned development. Consequently, the proposal would negatively impact the area's character and appearance.
9. While planning permission has been granted for a site on Sanctuary Road (Ref: APP/W/1145/W/19/3239774) which is relatively close to the appeal site, that case did not involve truncating the garden of a terrace property, and the immediate surrounding context differs in style, scale, and layout.
10. The siting of a detached bungalow in this location is not informed by the layout of the surrounding houses. Public views of the site would be available and overall, it would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies DM04 and ST04 of the North Devon and Torridge Local Plan 2011-2031 which, amongst other things, seek good design which is appropriate and sympathetic to setting in terms of scale, density, layout and relationships to other buildings, as well as developments which respond to the characteristics of a site and the wider context.

Planning Balance

11. The Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing land. The Torridge District Council Housing Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement Addendum (January 2025) states the supply to be 4.86 years. Consequently, due to the provisions of footnote 7, paragraph 11 d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is engaged. As such, the Framework dictates that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
12. The Framework encourages residential development in locations where it would support housing supply, where an efficient use of land can be achieved, and where jobs, shops and services are reasonably accessible by modes of transport other than the private car. The appeal scheme would be located close to the town centre and deliver some benefits to the local economy through short term construction and use of local shops. It would also contribute towards housing supply and choice. Although the appeal proposal would boost housing supply it is only for one new dwelling and therefore its contribution to future housing provision would be very small.
13. There would be some benefit to the natural surveillance of the garage area, however, this would not be significantly greater than the views available from the existing houses given the position of the proposed windows and the intervening fence.
14. Overall, the proposal would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area for the reasons given above. This weighs against the proposal. I consider that the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the relatively limited benefits resulting from the proposal when assessed against the Framework as a whole. There are no other material considerations which indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan, which I have already found conflict with.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

H Faulkner

INSPECTOR