



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2022

by Matthew Jones BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1110/D/21/3286113

8 Lower King's Avenue, Exeter EX4 6JT

- 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 Katy Lee against the decision of Exeter City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/0209/FUL, dated 4 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is construction of porch extension and widening of drive.
-

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. Lower King's Avenue predominantly contains semidetached dwellings. Most exhibit high degrees of symmetry, which combines with the general absence of unsympathetic alterations to create a well-ordered and well-maintained street scene. No 8 is one of a pair which share a near symmetrical facade, with the entrances set centrally between projecting bays which bookend the building.
4. Given its length, width and placement to one side, the porch would disrupt the symmetrical composition of the building to its detriment and that of the street scene. As these are matters of massing and location, they would not be resolved by matching the materials with the existing dwelling. The appellant makes a fair point about the potential construction of a porch under Permitted Development Rights, and the possible design of such. However, it seems to me that any such porch would be clearly smaller, and therefore less detrimental.
5. As such, the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy CP17 of the Core Strategy (adopted 2015), saved Policy DG1 of the Exeter Local Plan First Review 1995-2011, the Householder's Guide to Extension Design Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2008) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

6. I recognise that the appellant undertook consultation with neighbouring residents, none of whom have objected. I also acknowledge that the proposal would help to future proof the standard of accommodation within the house. However, these matters do not serve to overcome the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

7. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole and there are no other considerations which outweigh this conflict. For these reasons, and taking all other matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Matthew Jones
INSPECTOR