



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2020

by C J Ford BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

a person appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1110/D/19/3242304

6 Elliott Close, Exeter EX4 5ED

- 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 Ryan Bennett against the decision of Exeter City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/1169/FUL, dated 22 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'single storey front extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposed development in the main header above is taken from the original planning application form. In dealing with the application, the Council described the proposal as 'single storey front extension and extension to bay window'.

Main Issue

3. As the Council does not object to the proposed bay window extension and there is no reason to disagree with that view, the main issue is the effect of the proposed single storey front extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey end of terrace house which is situated in a planned estate containing a mix of house types. The house types with two and three storey front elevations in Elliott Close generally have simple flat fronted façades. In most cases these are punctuated by a modest projecting front door canopy or porch and/or a first-floor bay window feature. The appeal property has both a canopy and a bay window. Substantive forward projections from the main front walls are not a characteristic of these house types.
5. The houses are also set back from the highway which, in combination with the front elevation treatment described above, ensures the street has a degree of spaciousness. This spaciousness is an important positive characteristic of the locality.
6. Owing largely to its corner plot position, the appeal property has more amenity space to the side and front than most houses in the street and the area to the

side accommodates a detached garage alongside a protected oak tree. However, the position also means the flank and front of the property are particularly prominent when viewed from the two respective cul-de-sac spurs to the street.

7. The proposed single storey front extension would be approximately 2.8m deep and 4m wide with a mono pitch lean to roof. In contrast to the typical modest porch projections, it would appear as a very bulky and incongruous addition that would detract from the simple character of the appeal property and the terrace. Whilst the space available at the front of the property would enable the extension to be physically accommodated to a more comfortable degree than many others in the street, the prominent corner plot position would nevertheless emphasise its appearance as an incongruous feature and it would harmfully erode the important spaciousness of the locality.
8. It is recognised that a further house type exists in the street which the appellant describes as bungalows with front gable projections. However, their presence does not justify the harm identified above to what is a more vertical house form in the street scene. Moreover, the benefits of the proposed additional and reconfigured living accommodation are acknowledged but does not outweigh the identified harm. Whilst the Council has expressed an opinion that it would find an extension with a reduced depth of 1.5m to be acceptable, the appeal proposal has been determined on its own merits.
9. Accordingly, owing to its design, in particular its size, massing and position, it is concluded the proposed single storey front extension would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area. It would therefore conflict with Objective 9 and Policy CP17 of the Council's Core Strategy (2012) and Policy DG1 of its Local Plan First Review (2005). These seek to ensure that development proposals promote local character and distinctiveness, an aim that is similarly reflected in paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework. It would also conflict with the Council's 'Householder's guide to extension design' Supplementary Planning Document (2008). Principle 2 of the guide specifies that extensions should not project forward of the front main building line and should respect the pattern of buildings in the street and the spaces between them.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

C J Ford

APPOINTED PERSON