
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2017

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P1133/D/17/3181869

2 Cross View Terrace, Ide, Exeter, EX2 9RZ

- 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 Rick Farrar against the decision of Teignbridge District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01237/FUL, dated 18 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is an extension on the front elevation to form porch and WC.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension on the front elevation to form porch and WC at 2 Cross View Terrace, Ide, Exeter, EX2 9RZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/01237/FUL, dated 18 June 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: C87.1 D1 03 and C87.1 D2 00.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey dwelling in a row of eight properties of the same age and design. They are situated in a discrete location on land set up and behind the main eastern area of this village with service via a relatively narrow driveway and then a pedestrian frontage pathway to these homes only. The dwellings are of simple unadorned design and all have small canopies over the doors on the front elevation. Given the open land to the front and the disposition of properties the scene is a pleasant semi-rural one with established village character. The proposal is as described above and would extend outwards a little less than 2 metres, with a width of just under 3m, and a gable front with a pitched roof over.
 4. The Council is concerned that, particularly with the uniform appearance of the row of dwellings, the scheme would appear overly dominant, be an
-

incongruous addition to the street-scene, and fail to integrate with the existing built environment.

5. Whilst the terrace of properties is presently uniform I have to question whether it must always remain so. I am not persuaded that appropriate change to a dwelling on this row would necessarily have a harmful visual impact. The present scene is a pleasing one but to my mind would not in principle have to be set in aspic to remain agreeable. I note that there is already some variety through frontage landscape treatment and I do not perceive that suitable frontage alterations would unduly catch the eye. I can see that a porch / WC would provide material benefits to residents of this family home. I am also conscious that, as the Parish Council puts it, the property is in a cul-de-sac and is not overlooked by other properties, or, I would add, passers-by, and thus the open public realm is extremely limited. I did also note that the village at this end, outside this cul-de-sac, is characterised by a variety of house types and front elevations.
6. Accepting that the principle of change should not be closed down one turns to the detail of the appeal proposal. The 'porch' would be a relatively large one but nevertheless would be accommodated width-wise between the two existing front ground floor windows and would leave most of the upper elevation unchanged and on a par with neighbouring homes. The front garden area is relatively generous and the degree of projection within this would be correspondingly modest. The pitched roof would not be an unreasonable proposition to my mind and whilst the fenestration proposed would take a different approach from the main dwelling I would not consider this to be aesthetically problematic. I would thus not share the Council's view on the question of harmful incongruity or dominance.
7. Policies S2 and WE8 of the Teignbridge Local Plan 2013-2033, taken together and amongst other matters, call for development to be of good design quality suited to a site and its wider context with a form which has appropriate scale and visual effect. I conclude that the appeal scheme would not run contrary to these policies.

Conditions

8. The Council suggests the standard commencement condition along with a requirement for works to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans. I would agree with this to provide certainty. The Council in its appeal questionnaire does not suggest any other conditions and I shall follow this approach. I do note however that at the time of application determination an officer of the Council requested a planning condition relating to possible contaminated land. From my perspective given the very modest scale of development I would deem such a condition to be unnecessary.

Overall conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property or the locality. Accordingly the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR