



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2022

by **Matthew Jones BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1110/D/21/3283056

66 Tollards Road, Exeter EX22 6JH

- 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 Jack Butt against the decision of Exeter City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/0941/FUL, dated 6 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as *'To demolish the existing garage in rear garden and to construct a new garage to the side of the property with a bedroom and en suite above. The property currently has three bedrooms one of which is a box room which can only be used as a small home office or wardrobe. The extension to the side will be set back from the front line of the existing property, the ridge will be significantly lower than the existing and the extension will maintain a 1m distance to the boundary to the side all of which complies with householders guide to extensions provided by the council and ensures the extension remains subservient. The gap maintained between the property boundary and between the two houses at first floor level ensures that the view between the properties remains and the feeling of openness and balance is maintained. The materials used to the front of the property and side extension will be reflective of the materials used throughout the original house and surrounding area and will ensure the character of the original house and street scene is maintained. To construct a single storey rear extension consisting of a day room, utility and WC and to create a more open plan living area. The extension will remain single storey with a flat roof which will ensure there is no effect on the light, overshadowing or privacy to either neighbours. The recess at the back of the new garage and to the side of the WC will ensure that access to the existing manhole remains for maintenance and will also provide an area for bins/recycling and bike storage. The extension design will also ensure that a large rear garden is maintained as required in householder planning guides. South West Water have already granted build over permission with regard to the drainage that runs through the rear garden and driveway, the decision can be found in the supporting documents section. To construct a small porch to the front the house with a mono pitch roof and materials used will be reflective and similar to that of the original house and surrounding area. The construction will specifically focus on incorporating materials that will significantly reduce the property's heat loss and thereby improving the overall efficiency of the property to a maximum to reduce running costs and CO2 emissions. All aspects of the proposed construction have been carefully designed in accordance with the guidance provided on the planning portal and by Exeter City's Council's householder extensions guide. This ensures that all aspects of the proposed works remain subservient to the original house whilst maintaining the original street scene, character and feeling of openness.'*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. 66 Tollards Road is in an area formed of groups of uniform rows of largely symmetrical semidetached houses set beyond open plan gardens with fairly generous spaces between buildings. No 66 is one of a group with dormers at first floor level set in steeply pitched roofs with sharp ridge lines, which cut assured side profiles against the sky. Whilst many have garages to their sides (or could do), they are low profile and do not prejudice the harmonious, spacious suburban scene that the design and pattern of the buildings has created.
4. The side extension would be subservient to No 66 given its width, set back position and height below the ridge. However, the subservience in height would be achieved with a contrived roof form, slackening at its apex to become almost flat, inconsistent to the acute profile of the flank wall from which it would extend. The set back would be modest to the extent that the extension would be assertive. Its fenestration would disturb the symmetry of the first floor of the building and would be incongruous, with the dormer sill meeting high eaves above an odd expanse of wall between it and the garage opening.
5. The space between No 66 and its neighbour No 64 to the south is relatively wide, and there is a fair drop in height between the two dwellings. Nonetheless, the around 1m gap between the first floor of the extension and the common boundary would be appreciably closer than other such relationships around the site. Moreover, the side extension would appear to step down towards No 64, bridging the visual break between them and leading to a terracing effect.
6. I appreciate that the appellant has sought to conform to elements of the Householder's Guide to Extension Design Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2008) (the SPD). However, I have found that the scheme would conflict with Principle 2 of the SPD, insofar as it would not respect the pattern of buildings in the street and the spaces between them, a matter that would not be resolved by any particular choice of finish materials.
7. The extensions permitted within the gap between nearby 39 and 41 Wendover Way are together at odds with the spacious disposition of houses here and are not therefore a positive design precedent. Permission for the extension at No 41 was granted in a materially different policy context, prior to the adoption of the Core Strategy (CS) and the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in 2012. The subsequent permission at No 39 was likely within a situation where the space between the houses had already been compromised. As such, these decisions are of little influence in my assessment.
8. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with the design aims of Policy CP17 of the CS, saved Policy DG1 of the Exeter Local Plan First Review 1995- 2011 (adopted 2005) and the Framework.

Conclusion

9. The proposal would conflict with the development plan read as a whole and there are no other considerations which outweigh this conflict. As such, and taking all other matters raised into account, I shall dismiss the appeal.

Matthew Jones
INSPECTOR