
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 29 July 2025

by **B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 August 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/P1133/W/25/3362001

27 FLAT 3 Courtenay Park, Newton Abbot, Devon TQ12 2HB

- 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 Rupert Heathcote against the decision of Teignbridge District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01370/FUL,
 - The development proposed is the extension of rear dormers, amendments to fenestration and proposed roof lights.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/P1133/Y/25/3362000

27 FLAT 3 Courtenay Park, Newton Abbot, Devon TQ12 2HB

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Rupert Heathcote against the decision of Teignbridge District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01371/LBC.
 - The works proposed are the extension of rear dormers, amendments to fenestration and proposed roof lights.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A: The appeal is dismissed
2. Appeal B: The appeal is dismissed

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeal site forms part of the Grade II listed building known as '25-29 Courtenay Park', which, as an entity, is comprised of a terrace of five former houses in the Newton Abbot Town Centre Conservation Area. In reaching my decisions, I have considered the statutory duties under sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 (the Act).
4. The appeals concern the same site and the same scheme. Although the remit of planning permission (Appeal A) and listed building consent (Appeal B) regimes are different, to reduce repetition, I have dealt with both appeals together in a single decision letter.

Main Issues

5. The main issue in both appeals is whether the proposal would preserve the listed building, or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses, in addition to whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Newton Abbot Town Centre Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

6. The appeal site consists of one of three apartment conversions within No 27 Courteney Park Road, a mid-terraced building facing Courteney Park that is Grade II listed (Nos 25-29). The terrace was added to the statutory list in 1975 and consists of 5 mid-19th Century painted stucco properties, with a continuous slate roof with moulded stacks and party walls. Each former house within the terrace retains a number of elaborate large steep front gables with timber mullions and transoms creating a strong sense of verticality. No 27 also has a prominent and substantial gabled porch. The listing description¹ identifies the terrace as part of the Courtenay Park development, laid out in 1854. Given the above, I find that the special interest and significance of the listed building to be primarily associated with its historic and architectural interests as a good illustration of consciously planned mid-19th century domestic architecture. Important contributors in these regards which are pertinent to the appeals are its architectural detailing, consistency, group value and planned setting around the park.
7. Despite its conversion to flats and subsequent internal alterations, No 27 retains these external architectural qualities. The rear of the terrace does not contribute to its special interest to the same extent as the decorative frontage. This is the conscious design factor in the status differentiation reflected in the building's front and rear elevations. Whilst the rear is not included in the list description, this does not indicate a lack of special interest or significance.
8. No 27 also does at present have some rear dormer additions. The historic form of the roof scale has therefore been somewhat compromised; however, these dormers are minor in scale and the generally consistent roof form of the rear retains the group value of the terrace. As a central dwelling, No 27 makes a valuable contribution to the architectural consistency of the rest of the listed terrace and is integral to the special architectural and historic interest, and group value, of Nos 25-29 as an entity.
9. The appeal site is located within the Newton Abbot Town Centre CA. The character and appearance and thus the special interest and significance of the CA are mainly derived from its surviving historic street pattern and the rich variety of historic buildings that denote its evolution. The significance of the Courteney Park and Devon Square element of the CA in part derives from its unified set piece character, which reflects its development as part of the Victorian town plan and importance as a gateway, near the train station, into Newton Abbott. The Supplementary Planning Document Newton Abbot Town Centre, Courtenay Park and Devon Square CA Character Appraisal describes the CA as a clear expression of the Victorian town planning.
10. As an integral part of a coherent focal point of planned 19th century residential townscape, No 25-29 Courteney Park Road contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole.
11. The proposal would significantly increase the scale of the rear dormers so that they would dominate the rear roof plane. This would result in structures that would interrupt and undermine the modest architectural composition of the building's rear elevation. Significant glazing and Juliet balconies would be introduced, increasing the visual prominence of the additions. The starkly and overtly contemporary

¹ List Entry Number: 1257196

design of the dormers would appear as an incongruous intervention into the retained historic roof form. The amount of glazing and width of the dormers would introduce a horizontal element that contrast with the vertical emphasis of the elevation. In cutting into the historic roofscape there would also be some loss of historic fabric.

12. The character and roof form of the building and wider terrace would be further compromised and harmed. A condition securing details of materials of the dormer windows/doors would not address the visual impact of their scale.
13. I conclude that the proposed works would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building, Nos 23 -29 Courteney Park and would harm its significance as a designated heritage asset.
14. The above harm to significance would result in some residual harmful effect to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole. Whilst less perceptible and prominent than the front elevation, I observed that the rear of the terrace is visible from Oak Place to the rear and side of the terrace. It would not therefore preserve the character and appearance of the CA as a whole and would harm its significance as a designated heritage asset.
15. Given the fairly localised nature of the development and works relative to the building and CA as a whole, I find the harm to both heritage assets to be, individually and cumulatively, at a moderate level of 'less than substantial'.
16. There are aspects of the scheme that would undoubtedly be positive and of public benefit. Heritage benefits would accrue from the removal of harmful features; in this case the upvc rooflights to the rear and windows to the front and their replacement with timber rooflights/windows.
17. These would, of themselves, sustain and enhance the listed building and preserve the character and appearance of the CA in which it sits. There would also be some economic benefits brought about through the investment into the property and the construction phase. In addition, social benefits would be gained through improvements to the local housing stock.
18. Given the scale of the development and works, any benefits from thermal performance, light levels and from addressing maintenance issues are each likely to be small. There is no substantive evidence which demonstrates that the proposal is required to secure the ongoing residential use of the asset.
19. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) indicates that, when considering the impact on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation irrespective of whether any harm amounts to less than substantial harm to significance. As such, harm carries considerable importance and weight. Consequently, the weight of public benefits associated with the works and development is small and does not outweigh the less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets that I have identified.
20. The examples of nearby development pointed to by the appellant do not involve alterations to the roof form of this listed building, but rather a rear outbuilding², or

² Application reference 19/02513/FUL

various development at different nearby buildings. As such they are not directly comparable to the proposal before me.

21. Consequently, the harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets in these appeals has not been supported by clear and convincing justification. The proposal would not preserve the Grade II listed building 25-29 Courtenay Park, and would not preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the Newton Abbot Town Centre CA. The works and development therefore fail to satisfy the historic environment conservation and enhancement policies of the Framework and would conflict with the statutory presumptions set out in sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Act. There is also conflict with Policies EN5 and S2 of the Teignbridge Local Plan 2013-2033 (2014) and Policies NANDP2 and NANDP11 of the Newton Abbot Neighbourhood Development Plan 2016-2033 (2016) insofar as these collectively require development to be of high-quality design and to integrate with and, where possible, enhance the character of the adjoining built and natural environment, particularly affected heritage assets.

Conclusions - both appeals

22. For the reasons given above, I conclude that both Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

B Phillips

INSPECTOR