
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2019

by L McKay MA MRTPI

Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th October 2019.

Appeal Ref: APP/U1105/D/19/3230848

59 Mount Pleasant Avenue, Exmouth EX8 4QR

- 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 Mark Philp against the decision of East Devon District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/0646/FUL, dated 26 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a front and rear hip to gable roof extension with side dormer to form new first floor accommodation and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Mount Pleasant Avenue is a residential street of mainly detached bungalows interspersed with some pairs. There is some variation in design but roofs are predominantly hipped and of similar pitch and height. 59 Mount Pleasant Avenue is a modest property with a simple hipped roof. The appeal proposal would substantially enlarge the roof, making it a prominent feature within the street scene.
4. While the proposed dormer would be set in somewhat from the ridge, proposed gable ends and eaves, it would occupy nearly all of the enlarged side roof slope. Although the materials used would be appropriate in this context, the dormer would be unduly dominant and overscaled in relation to the host property. It would be highly visible from the road due to its size, position and the rising land levels and would harm the contribution of the host property to the street scene.
5. The proposals include alterations to doors and windows associated with internal rearrangements to access the proposed first floor accommodation. Their design would relate well to the host property and would have a neutral impact on the character and appearance of the area.
6. The proposed enlarged roof and dormer would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. They would conflict with policy D1 of the East Devon Local Plan 2013-2031 (2016) which, amongst other things, requires

development to be of high quality design, respect the key characteristics of the area and ensure that the scale of proposals relates well to their context.

Other matters

7. My attention has been drawn to a number of other properties in the area which have dormers or a gable end and balcony. I do not have details of the particular circumstances which led to those examples being built. Of those that have been constructed, 2 of the properties are in Mount Pleasant Avenue; these have front dormers which are substantially smaller than the appeal proposal and are well contained within their roof slopes. Another 4 of the properties are in nearby streets; these have dormers which are either significantly smaller than the proposal before me or, in the case of 25 Hill Drive, are sizeable but located at the end of a cul-de-sac where public views of it are limited. The gable and balcony are located in a mixed street scene and set back from the road, so are not prominent. Consequently, none are comparable in scale and prominence to the appeal proposal, which I have considered on its own merits. Therefore, while there are various other dormers in the local area, they have not altered the character of the area to such an extent that the appeal proposal would appear any less incongruous.
8. I recognise that the proposal would create additional space to meet the family's needs without compromising the outdoor space. I have carefully considered the appellant's circumstances however this would be a private benefit and does not justify the significant harm identified. Nor does the fact that the appeal site is not within a Conservation Area or near protected trees.

Conclusion

9. While I have found that the proposed changes to doors and windows would be of neutral effect, the enlargement of the roof would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. The door and window changes are part and parcel of the proposal to provide roof accommodation and as such I cannot separate them. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR