
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 September 2016

by Paul Griffiths BSc(Hons) BArch IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 29 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/U1105/D/16/3152862

1 Raddenstile Lane, Exmouth EX8 2JH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Saul Tyler against the decision of East Devon District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/0589/FUL, dated 18 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion incorporating front dormer window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, and the wider area.

Reasons

3. No.1 is a detached house with a pleasingly proportioned frontage that sits under a relatively steeply pitched roof. Notwithstanding the matching roof pitch and materials proposed, it is my view that the front dormer would have an ill-proportioned bulk and projection that would appear excessive in size, overwhelming the front roof slope. Moreover, the fenestration, with large expanses of glazing, would not relate to the existing windows in the rest of the house. As a consequence, the front dormer would appear as an alien addition that would have a significantly harmful impact on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, and the wider area.
4. Consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, Strategy 48 of the East Devon Local Plan 2013 to 2031 encourages good design. Policy D1 does likewise seeking contextually appropriate design that reinforces local distinctiveness. The proposal fails to accord with Strategy 48 or Policy D1.
5. I can understand why the appellant wants to realise the potential of the loft space to give views of the sea but do not consider a dormer of the design, size and proportions proposed is necessary to achieve that aim.
6. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Griffiths

INSPECTOR