



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2025 by R Dickson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Tamsin Law BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1153/D/25/3365408

27 Pounds Park Road, Bere Alston, Yelverton, Devon PL20 7AY

- 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 and Mrs Giles against the decision of West Devon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 4135/23/HHO.
 - The development proposed is for a two storey side extension to dwelling.
-

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. Pounds Park Road is characterised by semi-detached houses of similar age and design, which are generally in line with one another with uniform spacing between pairs. Despite this consistency, there are variations including rendered porches, differing materials, and a single-storey extension at No 1. The street slopes gently upwards from Lockeridge Road, curving at the top to meet Station Road.
5. Located at the top of the slope where the road bends, No 27 is also a semi-detached dwelling, however it diverges from the prevailing rhythm of the street. It is angled relative to the other dwellings and appears to be narrower. As the host sits in a corner position, there is a notably wider gap between it and No 29 compared to other pairs along the road. No 29 sits next to the appeal site and is a detached dwelling. As such, the appeal site is the last dwelling on the row of a similar age and style.
6. The Joint Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document (2020) (SPD) provides guidance on the design of side extensions to avoid over-dominating the existing house or street-scene in paragraphs 13.37 to 13.39. The front of the extension would be set behind the existing front elevation, and the ridge height would be lower than the existing ridge height. Therefore, in this regard the proposal would be subordinate to the host and would accord with the guidance set out in the SPD.

7. The proposal would significantly increase the gross internal area of the dwelling. Despite the increase in area, the width of the extension would be less than the width of the host. This coupled with its set back from the front elevation and lower ridge height would contribute towards the extension appearing less important than the original dwelling.
8. The character of Pounds Park Road is the semi-detached houses of a similar design and scale with regular spacing. Although there are examples of side extensions, namely at 1 Pounds Park Road and 38 Lockeridge Road, they do not form part of the prevailing character of Pounds Park Road. No 27 is unique in that it is positioned on the bend in the road. Its position relative to No 29 creates a large gap between the houses which is not a common feature of the street scene. Although the proposed extension would decrease the gap, a gap would still be retained between the host at No 29, which would be similar to uniform spacing on the rest of the road.
9. When approaching No 27 from the bottom of the slope, the proposed extension would be largely hidden from view behind the original dwelling, owing to its set back and lower ridge height. When approaching the site from the other direction, it is likely that the extension would not be immediately noticeable given the relative set back of the host compared to No 29. As such, the extension would not harm the character or appearance of the area.
10. The materials have not been specified on the plans before me; however, the host is clad in reconstituted stone blockwork, with a grey rendered porch and slate roof. Although most properties are clad in reconstituted stone brickwork, more recent porch additions are finished in render, and some dwellings have a different material on their side elevation. Therefore, I have recommended a condition to secure the use of materials that match those used on the existing building, allowing the extension to assimilate with the street scene.
11. Accordingly, given the unique position of the appeal site, the two-storey extension would not have a harmful impact on the character or appearance of the street scene and surrounding area. As such the proposal would accord with policy DEV20 of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan (2014 – 2030), together with paragraphs 13.37 – 13.38 of the SPD which collectively seek to ensure that developments have regard to the pattern of development and wider context. The proposal would therefore also accord with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (the Framework).

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should allowed.

R Dickson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. Paragraph 187 of the Framework refers to amongst other things, protecting and enhancing sites of biodiversity, and minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity. Paragraph 193 indicates that if significant harm to biodiversity

- resulting from a development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated or as a last resort, compensated for, planning permission should be refused.
14. The Planning Practice Guidance states that an ecological survey will be necessary in advance of the planning application if the type and location of development could have a significant impact on biodiversity and existing information is lacking or inadequate.
 15. The appeal is supported by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) undertaken by Green Lane Ecology, dated February 2024. The PEA states that the report is only valid for a 12-month period, after which it may need updating. An up-to-date survey has not been undertaken for the proposed development. Furthermore, the PEA notes the presence of bat droppings in the roof void and states that further bat surveys are required in order to classify the roost and inform any mitigation and compensation. No bat surveys have been submitted with the appeal.
 16. The information provided does not provide the necessary certainty that roosting has not occurred nor that the proposed development could provide adequate mitigation for bats. Accordingly, I conclude that it has not been demonstrated satisfactorily whether any bats which may be present would be adequately protected and the extent to which they may be affected by the proposed development.
 17. Circular 06/2005¹ states that it is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by development, is established before planning permission is granted. On the basis of the evidence before me, I do not consider that it would be appropriate to condition the undertaking of further survey work.
 18. For the reasons outlined above I conclude that it has not been demonstrated that the scheme would avoid or adequately mitigate unacceptable harm to bats, which are a protected species. The proposal would conflict with paragraphs 187 and 193 the Framework that seeks to protect and enhance sites of biodiversity value.
 19. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and, notwithstanding my representative's findings on the main issue with which I agree, I have found harm in relation to protected species. I am therefore unable to allow the appeal, and it is therefore dismissed.

Tamsin Law

INSPECTOR

¹ Biodiversity and geological conservation: circular 06/2005