



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 July 2025 by R Dickson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X1165/D/25/3368077

6 Cranford Road, Preston, Paignton, Torbay TQ3 1DA

- 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 & Mrs Taylor against the decision of Torbay Council.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/0775.
 - The development proposed is the formation of balcony on existing flat roof to conservatory, including installation of doors in former to access balcony. New windows to existing conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Cranford Road is a residential street that descends down a hill, with bungalows arranged in a stepped formation responding to the natural topography. The character of the area is defined by a largely cohesive and traditional material palette, with many properties retaining original finishes. There is a noticeable presence of alterations, including dormer windows to the front and side elevations, weatherboarding, and the use of glass and metal detailing. Front elevations vary in design, incorporating both gable and hipped forms, with the even-numbered dwellings having greater variation than the odd-numbered dwellings opposite. Despite the alterations, the area has maintained visual consistence in terms of its general scale and form.
5. The appeal site is a bungalow with a dormer window to the front elevation providing additional accommodation within the roof space. Owing to the dormer being stepped in from the front elevation, the dwelling still appears as a bungalow within the street scene. At ground floor level, there are large windows which span most of the width of the front elevation. Due to the change in ground level, the property also has a lower ground floor element, with French doors on the front elevation. The

front elevation of No 6 is set broadly in line with the other dwellings below it, however it does project further than No 8, which is positioned at a higher level.

6. The proposal seeks to alter the front elevation through the introduction of floor to ceiling glazing at ground floor level, the replacement of the window in the dormer with a larger glazed area including doors, and the introduction of a balcony with a glass and metal balustrade surrounding it. The alterations to the ground floor have been agreed between the parties as being able to be achieved through The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO).
7. The proposed balcony, which would be bound by a glass and metal balustrade, would utilise the existing space above the ground floor. The addition of the balustrade would visually alter the massing of the roof area, resulting in the roof area being brought out to the same projection as the ground and lower ground floor. The overall effect would increase the height of the front elevation, highlighting the dwelling as being a tall structure amongst other bungalows. Given that most of the dwellings on Cranford Road are stepped to follow the natural topography of the area, the introduction of the balcony at roof level would dominate the street scene and would harmfully increase the height of the front elevation. As such, the addition of the balcony element would harm the character and appearance of the area.
8. The balcony would be accessed from the dormer, with more glazing, including a glazed door, to the front elevation of the dormer. The symmetry of the dormer, windows below it and French doors would be maintained through the increased glazing. An increased amount of glazing, rather than a smaller window and horizontal cladding, would not impact on the street scene. It would not increase the bulk of the dormer, nor give it undue visual prominence, and as such, would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area. During my site visit, it was evident that many dwellings surrounding the appeal site have large amounts of glazing to their front elevations. Given the topography of the site and outlook of most of the dwellings in the area, large windows are a character of the area. As such, an increase in the amount of glazing to the dormer would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.
9. The windows on the ground floor would be marginally increased in size as part of the proposal to create floor to ceiling glazing. Given the size of the existing windows, the increase in size would not harm the character and appearance of the area. There is agreement between the main parties that the increased glazing to the ground floor would be permitted under the GPDO. As such, I find that this fallback has a real prospect of being implemented.
10. The Appellant sets out that there is an additional fallback whereby a similar level of glazing on the dormer could be achieved through an alternative scheme. The alternative would provide either larger windows, or a door and Juliette balcony. I agree that the fallback has a real prospect of being implemented if this appeal is dismissed. While the fallback is a different scheme to that before me, it would be less harmful than the appeal proposal, in so far as it would omit the larger balcony, which I have found would harm the character and appearance of the area. I therefore give this limited weight.
11. The proposal taken as a whole would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to Policies DE1 and DE5 of the Torbay Local

Plan 2012 – 2030 and Policy PNP1(c) of the Paignton Neighbourhood Plan 2012 – 2030 (2019). These policies require, amongst other things, that development is well designed, be of an appropriate scale and size, and that residential extensions do not have adverse effects on the character or appearance of the original property or on the street scene in general.

12. The development would also be contrary to the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework) in terms of ensuring developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

13. The Appellant has provided an example of other balconies, including one at the neighbouring property, No 8, and another at 18 Greenfield Road. The balcony at the neighbouring bungalow is positioned differently to the proposed balcony at the appeal site. The dwelling is not as tall and is set further back in its plot, which lessens the impact of the balcony on the character of the area. Importantly, the balcony has not altered the roof structure or massing of the roof of No 8. Similarly, the balcony at 18 Greenfield Road is set below the eaves and is accessed from the ground floor level. As such, neither of the examples given are directly comparable to the appeal before me. In any case, each appeal is determined on its own merits. I therefore give them limited weight, and they do not lead me to conclude in favour of the appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Dickson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR