



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 June 2025

by H Faulkner BSc (Hons) MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K1128/D/24/3357113

5 Crossways, Wembury, Plymouth, PL9 0EY

- 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 Mike Le Couteur Bisson against the decision of South Hams District Council.
 - The application Ref is 2250/24/HHO.
 - The development proposed is described as “Enlarge existing dormer roof, and turn from an apex roof to a flat roof square box construction to create a room, not exceeding original dormer footprint dimensions, not exceeding original ridge height of roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description on the decision notice is ‘Householder application for enlarged roof dormer and other associated roof alterations’. I have used the original description in the banner heading above as an alternative has not been agreed between the parties.
3. The application form states the development was started on 24 June 2024. I saw during my site visit that the dormer had been partially constructed. This appears to accord with the plans before me. While retrospective, my assessment of the proposal is based on the plans before the Council at the time of the planning application.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

5. Crossways and Valley Drive consists mainly of bungalows, some with accommodation in the roof and dormer windows are present on a number of properties. Although there is variation between the properties they follow a broadly similar design, with pitched roofs and some with front gable projections. Properties are generally finished in render although there are houses with cladding in the vicinity.
6. The proposed extension is described as an enlarged dormer, however, due to the way it would extend upwards from the single storey extension below, and

connection to the ridge of the bungalow, it would appear as a first floor extension with a flat roof.

7. First floor extensions of this style are not common in the area. Even as a dormer, its form and size would be inconsistent with the other dormers in the area. Whilst the extension may not expand across the full extent of the roof it does not sit comfortably within the roof slope due to the limited set down from the ridge and not being set up from the eaves. It would appear as an incongruous addition to the property, an effect which is exacerbated by having two blank elevations making it appear even bulkier. Due to the location of the property, by the turning head, the extension would be highly visible and therefore have a particularly detrimental effect on the appearance of the area.
8. The dormer window at Southland Crescent, whilst large, is set within the roof slope and in a less prominent position in terms of views from the street. Similarly, 67 Church Road is also less visible and does not incorporate a lower floor extension. The extensions to 5 Valley Road appear as a sympathetic small dormer window and gabled fronted extension, which is in keeping with the style of properties in the area. The alterations to the property on the corner of Valley Road and Crossways are not comparable as they do not include a flat roof dormer or a large first floor addition.
9. Overall, the proposed extension would appear top heavy on the dwelling, with a design which is not sympathetic to the dwelling, resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the property and the wider area. It is not considered to be a locally distinctive design and it does not integrate, respect or complement the character of the area and would therefore be contrary to Policy DEV20 of the Plymouth and South West Joint Local Plan (2014-2034).

Other Matters

10. I appreciate that the proposed extension is needed to accommodate a staircase in accordance with building regulations and would create a larger room. However, these reasons do not outweigh the concerns in respect of the visual harms identified.
11. Reference is made to an existing dormer with a comparison in respect of footprint. However, the plans provided show an existing single storey gable fronted projection but no dormer on the roof slope where the alterations are proposed.
12. The site is within the South Devon National Landscape (NL) and under Section 245 (Protected Landscapes) of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 relevant authorities must 'seek to further' the statutory purposes of Protected Landscapes. The Council concluded that the proposed extension would not impact the NL due to being set within an already built-up area. Notwithstanding my findings in respect of the effect on the character and appearance of the area, from my own observations on site and upon reviewing the evidence I agree that the proposals would not harm the main statutory purposes of the designation, to conserve and enhance natural beauty.
13. I note the lack of objection to the proposal, including from the Parish Council, however, this carries limited weight.

Conclusion

14. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations which indicate my decision should be made other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

H Faulkner

INSPECTOR