
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2021

by John Wilde CEng MICE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1110/D/21/3277271
17 Norwich Road, Exeter EX4 2DN

- 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 and Mrs Wills against the decision of Exeter City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/0393/FUL, dated 6 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is the forming of a two storey side extension.
-

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. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling constructed in brick and hanging tiles under a tiled roof. There was a garage to the east of the property, connected to the garage of the neighbouring property, No 15, but separated from the appeal property by a pedestrian entrance. At the time of my visit this garage had been removed.
4. The properties in Norwich Road are generally semi-detached with single storey garages and pedestrian entrances in between each block of semis. This arrangement creates space between the properties at first floor level, resulting in a more open spatial distribution of built form.
5. A number of properties in Norwich Road have benefited from side extensions, particularly on the opposite side of the road to No 17. In general however these extensions have incrementally harmed the rhythm and openness of the street scene, creating a terraced effect, particularly where two adjacent properties have received extensions.
6. No 15, which lies adjacent to the appeal property, has already received a flat roofed extension over the existing garage, and the proposed extension would effectively close the gap between the properties that exists at present. This would add to the change in character of the street scene that I have already described as being harmful.

7. My attention has been drawn to the Exeter City Council Supplementary Planning Document entitled *Householder's Guide to Extension Design* (SPD). This makes clear in its Principle 2 that extensions should respect existing building lines, the pattern of buildings in the street and *the spaces between them* (my highlighting).
8. This would not be the case with the proposed extension and therefore, notwithstanding the setback and lower ridge line, conflict would exist with the SPD and with policy CP17 of the Exeter City Council Core Strategy which requires, amongst other things, that development complements or enhances Exeter's character and local identity. There would also be conflict with policy DG1 of the Exeter Local Plan First Review which requires, amongst other things, that development is of a height appropriate to the surrounding townscape and that the massing of structures relates well to the character and appearance of adjoining buildings.
9. I note the appellants' comments regarding inconsistency in the Council's decision making process and the fact that there are other extensions in existence within Norwich Road. The Council have however pointed out that some of these do not have planning permission and others were permitted prior to the existence of the SPD. To my mind the existence of these extensions does not justify the occurrence of further harm to the street scene.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, and having taken into account all other matters raised, the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Wilde

INSPECTOR