
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2017

by Neil Pope BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 12th December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1110/D/17/3180037
77, Thornpark Rise, Exeter, Devon, EX1 3HH.

- 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 Phil Jays against the decision of Exeter City Council (the LPA).
 - The application Ref.17/0193/FUL, dated 2/2/17, was refused by notice dated 13/7/17.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension with raised decking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The above description reflects amended plans that were considered by the LPA. Its processing of the application is not a matter for my consideration.

Reasons

3. The proposed pitched roof extension would be subservient in scale to the host dwelling and would respect the character and appearance of this terraced house. It would be set back 0.4m from the boundaries with the neighbouring dwellings (Nos.75 and 79) and the eaves height would be approximately 0.6m above the top of the fences along the edges of the patios. In an attempt to limit the impact upon neighbouring residents, the proposal would project 4.8m from the rear of No.77 compared to 6m as initially proposed.
4. The extension would be readily apparent from Nos.75 and 79. From the adjacent ground floor windows to habitable rooms in these adjoining properties, as well as from the patio areas the proposal, by virtue of its height, length and close proximity, would appear somewhat overbearing and visually intrusive. Whilst it would not intrude into views along the rear gardens of these adjoining properties, on balance, I concur with the LPA that neighbouring residents would not feel at ease within their homes and the outside amenity areas immediately alongside. For the residents of No.79, the extension would also be likely to reduce the amount of sunlight to their lounge and patio, exacerbating the loss of residential amenity. The proposal would not maintain a good standard of amenity for neighbouring residents and would conflict with the spirit of policy DG4(b) of the adopted Exeter Local Plan First Review.
5. Given all of the above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Neil Pope

Inspector