

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 May 2017

by David Walker MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1110/D/17/3174137

32 Liberty Way, Exeter EX2 7AS

- 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 David Baitup against the decision of Exeter City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/1633/03, dated 13 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is construction of new dormer windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located mid-way in a run of dwellings of similar design and with a uniform plot arrangement. These face onto the highway and a linear open space over a short frontage. They are clearly seen as unified collection of houses in views along Liberty Way in both directions.
 4. While there are other examples of dormer windows across the wider housing development the proposal would introduce the first dormers at this part of Liberty Way. Although of sympathetic design in relation to the appeal property, they would disrupt the uniformity of house design along the street with prominent additions.
 5. I acknowledge that the altered house would add some variation to the row, but in this context it would appear isolated and out of character with its neighbours. In contrast, other dormer windows of the area appear to be positioned to highlight different dwelling types or at focal positions within the street layout to add interest. In the case of the appeal property the addition of isolated dormer windows would be harmful to the character and appearance of the local area.
 6. There would be less of an adverse effect when viewed from the rear along Carnegie Walk due to the variety of house designs that are evident. However, it is uncertain whether the rear dormers could be functionally separated from the front dormers. A split decision allowing only the rear dormers is not therefore possible.
-

7. The harm to the character and appearance of the area would conflict with Policy CP17 of the Exeter Core Strategy 2012 and saved Policy DG1 of the Exeter Local Plan First Review 2005, and associated guidance. Specifically, these seek to achieve a high standard of design to complement Exeter's character and local identity, and to ensure the shape of structures relates well to adjoining buildings and surrounding townscape, amongst other matters.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Walker

INSPECTOR