



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 May 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) Bsc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1153/D/25/3362925

32 Trelawny Road, Tavistock, Devon PL19 0EN

- 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 D Hassett against the decision of West Devon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. is 3357/24/HHO.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey rear extension to provide additional kitchen and bathroom accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a two-storey rear extension to provide additional kitchen and bathroom accommodation at 32 Trelawny Road, Tavistock, Devon PL19 0EN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 3357/24/HHO and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this Decision;
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. 2592 S – [01] & 2592 PL- [01] F; 2592;
 - 3) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the actions set out in the detailed Bat and Nesting Bird Surveys by Pan Ecology Services Ltd dated 2nd June 2023 and any measures required under licence from Natural England. Prior to the commencement of use, the recommendations, mitigation, compensation, net gain and enhancement measures shall be fully implemented and thereafter retained for the life of the development.

Preliminary Matter

2. The grounds of appeal refer to a potential costs application by the appellant but this does not appear to have been pursued.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, neighbouring houses, and the Tavistock Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal proposal is a follow-on application from the appeal decision in May 2024 to refuse permission for a very similar two-storey extension to infill the northern corner of the building. The majority of the Inspector's description and analysis of the Heritage considerations remain relevant to this current scheme and I see no reason to repeat them. However, I have full cognisance of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area ('the CA') and that the host dwelling and terraces are considered to be non-designated heritage assets ('NDHA').
5. In paragraph 9 of the previous decision the Inspector essentially agreed with the Officer's report in stating his concern that narrow window openings at ground and first floor levels and the use of hanging slates as an external finish would be out of keeping and would additionally accentuate the bulk and mass of the proposed extension. In turn this would fail to make the extension subservient and unbalance the building's appearance. Furthermore, when paragraph 9 is read with paragraphs 8 and 10, it is clear that it was essentially the windows and the external finish that were the deciding factors in the appeal.
6. In its consideration of the current scheme, the Council has introduced the issue of a use of render rather than stone in the extension wall and also that the development is considered to affect the front elevation as opposed to the rear of the building (the latter as referred to in the application description and without any earlier challenge or dispute). There is additionally a reference to a lack of symmetry with Nos. 33 and 29 and the disadvantage of infilling 'the distinctive plan form of the existing dwelling'.
7. However, whilst I accept that these comments have some legitimacy, they should clearly have formed part of the appraisal of the predecessor application or at least the subject of a negotiation for amended plans in the current scheme rather than a basis of refusal. I accept the appellant's view, in essence that the absence of one or both of these options is unreasonable, and also note that with the application's referral to the planning committee, Members had the opportunity to consider Councillor Moody's valid argument as to an inconsistency of approach.
8. Furthermore, the principle of infilling appears to have been previously accepted and the stonework is on the existing recessed part of the building as a contrast to the painted render on the more forward main wall. The appeal proposal matches the latter, arguably more appropriately than the use of stone, and the inclusion of the small 'notch' to allow the retention of the distinctive quoin detailing is a successful device to visually detach the extension from the existing wall.
9. I also accept the appellant's arguments as to the modest extent of the extension and the fact that the appeal dwelling and the terrace is for the most part seen in public only in longer distant views from Drake Road and Bannawell Street. Indeed, as I found on my visit, the fact that the immediate surroundings of the terraces are in the public realm and not private land is not readily perceptible.
10. When taken as a whole I find on balance that the appeal scheme would not cause harm to either the character or the appearance of the NDHA and the CA. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with Policies DEV20 & DEV21 of the Plymouth & South West Devon Joint Local Plan 2014-2034 adopted March 2019; Policy HER1 of the emerging Tavistock Neighbourhood Plan, or with Government

policy in Section 16: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment' of the National Planning Policy Framework, revised December 2024.

11. I shall therefore allow the appeal. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is needed for the avoidance of doubt and is in the interests of proper planning. A condition requiring compliance with an Ecological Appraisal published in 2023 will safeguard nature conservation and wildlife (this was prepared for the first application but remains relevant).

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR