



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 September 2022

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1110/D/22/3303721

45 Pennsylvania Road, Exeter, EX4 6DB

- 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 S Williams against the decision of Exeter City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/0018/FUL, dated 7 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 3 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of 3 storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. At the time of my visit there was construction activity on the site and a 2 storey rear extension had been built. The extension was not shown on the existing plans submitted with the appeal documents and no evidence was provided to indicate that it has planning permission. To avoid prejudicing the decision of the Council on that development, I will base my decision solely upon the plans that were assessed by the Council as part of the original planning determination.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Longbrook Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site is an end of terrace 3 storey red brick house on the corner of Hoopern Lane, a busy pedestrian route that links to Exeter University. The terrace is identified in the Longbrook Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (2005) (CAAMP) as making a positive contribution to the character of the area. The appeal property frontage comprises a 3 storey gable with a 2 storey front projecting bay which incorporates key characteristics identified in the CAAMP, such as pale brick window surrounds, terracotta tiles and a slate roof. A 3 storey wing projects to the side of it with a chamfered corner and gable end facing Hoopern Lane.
5. At the back of the rear wing there was a 2 storey and a single storey rear extension. These were subservient stepping down below the eaves of the side wing and the main rear projecting gable, creating a rhythm to the rear and side of the property. Although they have plain facades, the side and rear of the

building are prominent because of its corner location and as such contribute to the street scene.

6. The proposal is to replace the single and 2 storey rear extensions with a 3 storey extension. The roof ridge height would be the same as the existing house, but its eaves would be higher. Consequently, it would break up the rhythm described above and dominate the rear of the property. From side views it would form a double gable, attaching to the existing side wing gable but with higher eaves. The difference in eaves height would give an asymmetric and awkward appearance. Consequently, the proposed development would harm the appearance of the side and rear of the host property and thus the CA, when approaching the site along Hoopern Lane. I note that the CAAMP identified the gradual erosion of character by cumulative alterations to unlisted buildings as the main threat to the quality of the CA.
7. Given the small scale of the development within the context of the CA as a whole, it would not harm its character. There would however be harm in terms of its appearance. The harm would be limited and thus less than substantial but would nevertheless be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), Objective 9 and Policy CP17 of the Exeter Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2012), Policy DG1 (b, f, g and h) and C1 of the Exeter Local Plan First Review 1995-2011 (2005), and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document Householder's Guide to Extension Design (2008) which seek a high standard of design that relates well to existing buildings and conserves or enhances the character and appearance of Conservation Areas.
8. Any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset requires justification and, in accordance with paragraph 202 of the Framework, I must weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal. There would be modest benefits arising from short term employment during its construction. However, such benefits would not outweigh the harm to the appearance of the area and consequently the CA.

Other matters

9. I have had regard to the appeal decisions provided by the appellant¹. One appeal related to a site that was not visible from the public realm and the other related to the replacement of a vandalised and unsightly garage fronting on to Hoopern Lane. Neither are directly comparable to the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/Y1110/W/20/3265339 and APP/Y1110/W/15/3134764