



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 August 2025

by H Faulkner BSc (Hons) MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K1128/D/25/3364666

Copperfield, 8 Grenville Close, Stokenham, Devon TQ7 2SY

- 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 Mark Baldwin against the decision of South Hams District Council.
 - The application Ref is 4073/24/HHO.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as: “the application proposes extending the house at the front to include an enclosed porch area and extending the roof to provide additional accommodation. Currently, the house has two bedrooms with restricted head height. The proposal aims to improve this by adding two dormers and an additional large flat roof first floor construction over the existing dining area. A small dormer is proposed at the front to increase head height in the study, and a rear dormer to provide more headroom in Bedroom 2. The construction over the dining area will provide additional space for a master bedroom with wardrobe. There are also internal changes at the ground floor level to create a larger entrance area and staircase, though these will not increase the building's footprint. The exterior gardens have become quite overgrown and have not been maintained. The plan includes landscaping both the front and rear of the house. This will involve creating a new driveway and lawn at the front, and a raised patio area that steps down to the lawn at the rear. A few ornamental trees on the site will remain these are indicated on the site plan. The proposed works will also significantly improve the energy efficiency of the existing dwelling. Plans include installing an air source heat pump and upgrading the building fabric with higher performance insulation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description in the heading above is taken directly from the application form, as I have no record of an alternative being agreed between the parties. The decision notice describes the development as front and rear extensions, alterations with associated landscaping and installation of driveway which accurately reflects the development proposed.
3. On 22 November 2023, all designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty in England and Wales became “National Landscapes”. The site is within the South Devon National Landscape (SDNL) which was formerly the South Devon Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (the AONB).

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed two storey rear extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area including the SDNL.

Reasons

5. Grenville Close is a cul de sac consisting of mainly detached bungalows of similar designs with simple pitched roofs and gables. Several of the properties have been altered since their original construction and where flat roof extensions are visible from the street they are only single storey.
6. The proposal seeks to renovate the property with several additions including a two-storey flat roof extension to the rear. The flat roof would extend directly from the ridge and project a significant distance beyond the rear elevation of the property. Flat roof extensions of this type are not characteristic of the property or the surrounding area. Further to this the depth of the extension would increase the overall massing of the building in a manner which would appear unbalanced.
7. Due to the topography, views of the rear extension would be visible from Grenville Close as well as by users of the lane to the side of the property. Furthermore, due to the elevated position the rear of the property is also visible from the lane running alongside the Tradesman's Arms and from the rear of the properties on this road.
8. It is noted that other properties in the area have been altered and extended, in some cases with large extensions with variations in style. However, from what I observed on my site visit the design of these extensions had roof forms consistent with others in the area, rather than having large flat roof elements.
9. The design of the proposed rear extension would follow the theme of the other alterations proposed. However, its design, scale and massing would result in harm to the appearance of the property and the surrounding 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 Policies DEV20 and DEV21 of the Plymouth and South West Joint Local Plan (2014-2034) (JLP).
10. With regard to National Landscapes 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. Further to this Policy DEV25 of the JLP gives the highest degree of protection to the AONB (now the SDNL). The policy requires development proposals to be designed to prevent the addition of incongruous features and to maintain an area's distinctive sense of place. Due to the concerns with regard to the scale and design of the proposal it would result in a harmful visual impact on the area. Whilst this impact would be fairly localised it would still affect the SDNL and be contrary to Policy DEV25 of the JLP.
11. As a result, for the reasons above, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and would not conserve and enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the SDNL. As such, it would not comply with Policies DEV20, DEV21 and DEV25 of the JLP. Those policies seek development within the SDNL to conserve and enhance the landscape and scenic beauty, including the distinctive landscape character.

Other Matters

12. There are several listed buildings near to the appeal site. Mindful of my duty set out in s66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have had special regard to the desirability of preserving their setting. The closest

listed properties are arranged as a terrace which includes the Tradesman's Arms. These properties positively contribute to the character of the area. Their significance stems from the quality of their architectural and artistic features, age, form, historic fabric, and group value. Their special interest/significance is experienced mainly within their immediate contexts, in views along the street. The views of the proposed extension would be seen within the context of the housing development in which they would be sited. Given the location and extent of the proposed development, I consider that it would preserve the settings of these listed buildings and the contributions these make to their significance. I note that the Council has raised no concerns in this regard either.

13. In respect of the Stokenham Conservation Area, which is adjacent to the appeal site, the Council has not identified any harm in this regard. The appellant suggests that the proposals would provide a contemporary contrast which will seek to highlight the historical features of the conservation area. For the reasons given above, I do not find this to be the case.
14. The renovation of the property, excluding the rear extension, will result in some improvements to the appearance of the property along with improved energy efficiency. However, these benefits do not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion

15. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan, when read as a whole, and there are no other material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given the appeal is dismissed.

H Faulkner

INSPECTOR