



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2025

by **B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P1133/Y/25/3361223

Tudor Cottage, Exeter Road, Dawlish, Devon EX7 9JD

- 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 Ms Jane Westwood against the decision of Teignbridge District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01889/LBC.
 - The works proposed are replacement windows and a door at the rear of the property, 1 replacement window to the side of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal site forms part of the Grade II listed building known as 1-7 Exeter Road, which, as an entity, is comprised of a terrace of four dwellings within the Dawlish Conservation Area. In reaching my decisions, I have considered the statutory duties under sections 16(2) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 (the Act).
3. The Teignbridge Local Plan 2020-2040 was published on 14 March 2024 and has been submitted for public examination. Whilst the draft policies referred to in the delegated report reflect the existing policies referred to in the decision notice, the evidence before me indicates that the emerging Local Plan has not reached a sufficiently advanced stage in its preparation for it to attract weight for the purposes of the determination of this appeal.
4. The appellant's Heritage Design and Access Statement refers to the inclusion of trickle vents. However, the position and form of this element is not clearly shown on the submitted plans, and I have based my decision the plans before me.

Main Issues

5. The main issues in this case are whether the proposed works would preserve the listed building, or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses and preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Dawlish Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

6. The appeal property consists of the end dwelling of a Grade II listed later medieval terrace sat on Exeter Road. The terrace, No 1-7 Exeter Road¹, was first listed in

¹ List Entry Number: 1096648

1951 and comprises of a two storey cob walled former Devon longhouse with a thatched roof, and a rounded projection on its frontage. The building has a low height and includes deep set windows and doors. A date tablet located on the projection indicates a date of 1539. The listing description refers to the cob walls being supported by buttresses, and modern leaded casement windows, and they are arranged in a relatively informal manner. Nearby signage sets out that the terrace is believed to be the oldest remaining houses within the CA.

7. The appeal property has a 1950's single storey rear extension to the rear, which contains the kitchen of the property. As such, the original form of the building has been compromised. Nevertheless, I observed that the extension is modest in scale and its simple lean-to form and use of traditional materials, such as timber single glazed windows and a slate roof, are largely sensitive to the building's historic aesthetics. This means that the original architectural form of the dwelling remains legible.
8. Whilst the rear extension and its fenestration are not referenced in the list description, listings are primarily for identification purposes and do not provide an exhaustive or complete description of the building's special interest and significance.
9. Tudor Cottage, as the corner property, has a prominence from the road. The retained detailing on this property makes a valuable contribution to the architectural consistency of the rest of the listed terrace. It is integral to the special architectural and historic interest, and group value, of Nos 1-7 as an entity.
10. 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 fine illustration of a later medieval Devon longhouse. Important contributors in these regards which are pertinent to the appeal are its architectural detailing, consistency and surviving original vernacular architectural style. The extension incorporating its fenestration and door make a neutral contribution to the listed building's special interest and significance.
11. The significance of the CA as a whole, in part lies in its origin as a small farming and fishing settlement that was transformed in the 19th century into a substantial seaside resort. This results in a predominance of elegant classical 19th Century architecture, with a limited, but notable number of earlier buildings such as the appeal site.
12. The Dawlish CA Character Appraisal (2008) states that the old town of Dawlish probably occupies the area of the medieval settlement, and identifies the terrace as an outstanding highlight of the CA. Despite modern additions to the rear therefore, the appeal property and terrace, as part of this historic coherent building, contributes positively to the character and appearance of the surroundings and CA as a whole.
13. The proposed works would replace the existing fenestration within the rear extension with double glazed aluminium windows. While the existing windows and extension are not historic and have limited heritage value, they are sympathetic to the historic fabric of the main building in their traditional appearance, incorporating timber and single glazing. The replacement double glazed units would have thicker frames and, from what I observed, a deeper profile. Along with the use of aluminium, this would result in strikingly contemporary windows that, whilst having

the same opening design and located in the existing openings, would appear incongruous in the context of the historic building. They would give the extension a greater prominence and disrupt the hierarchy of the primary historic core and secondary extension.

14. The replacement of the existing simple timber back door with an aluminium door would similarly appear incongruous in the context of the surrounding traditional materials and simple form of the extension. The works would result in the extension having a harmful effect on the asset's historic and architectural interests and therefore significance.
15. Given the surrounding boundary walls, I observed that the proposal would not be particularly conspicuous when viewed from adjacent properties or the public highway. However, listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest irrespective of whether changes to them are apparent from public vantage points.
16. Whilst I was not able to see the details of the fenestration, I observed that the adjacent neighbour, Tudor Rose also has a single storey rear extension². Limited details are provided of this development including the circumstances and policy context of the planning decision, which prevents direct comparison. However, even if this extension has triple glazed windows, this is not a sufficient justification for the further weakening of the architectural and historic interest of the listed building.
17. I conclude that the proposed works would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building, Nos 1-7 Exeter Road and would harm its significance as a designated heritage asset.
18. This harm to significance would result in some residual harmful effect to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole. Indeed, the CA Management Plan specifically identifies the insensitive treatment of existing, historic buildings as a threat to the CA. The proposal would not therefore preserve the character and appearance of the CA as a whole and would harm its significance as a designated heritage asset.
19. Given the siting of the proposal within an existing extension and the fairly localised nature of the 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 minor level of 'less than substantial'.
20. There are aspects of the scheme that would be of public benefit. There would be some economic benefits brought about through the investment into the property and the construction phase. Also, social benefits would be gained through improvements to the local housing stock.
21. Given the scale of the works, any benefits from thermal or draught proofing performance, sound insulation, security and from improved maintenance are each likely to be small.
22. 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

² Application references 23/00079/LBC and 23/00078/HOU

significance. As such, harm carries considerable importance and weight. Consequently, the weight of public benefits associated with the works is small and does not outweigh the less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets that I have identified.

23. I have found that the proposal would be harmful to the designated heritage assets. There is no substantive evidence before me to indicate that in dismissing the appeal, this would prevent the use or enjoyment of the existing dwelling. Dismissing this appeal would not be a disproportionate interference with that right. I do not consider that dismissing the appeal would discriminate in any way against the appellant or their family. On this basis I do not consider that my decision would represent an interference with the Human rights of the appellant.
24. Consequently, the harm identified to the significance of the designated heritage assets has not been supported by clear and convincing justification. The works therefore would conflict with the statutory presumptions set out in sections 16(2) and 72(1) of the Act and fail to satisfy the historic environment conservation and enhancement policies of the Framework. There is also conflict with Policies EN5 and S2 of the Teignbridge Local Plan 2013-2033 (2014) 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.

Conclusion

25. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Phillips

INSPECTOR