



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2022 by R Dickson BSc (hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1110/D/22/3302877

7 Rexona Close, Exeter, Devon EX2 9JT

- 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 Ms Amy Green against the decision of Exeter City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/0320/FUL, dated 7 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on a) the living conditions of the occupiers of No 8 Rexona Close; and b) the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Living Conditions

4. Rexona Close is a quiet cul-de-sac of mostly small-scale semi-detached dwellings sat close to one another. Some have been extended but they remain largely original in terms of their scale and detailing.
5. Despite having a flat roof which would limit its overall height, the extension would be sited very close to the shared boundary with No 8, projecting above the fence and impinging on the outlook from the kitchen window, leading to an oppressive experience for users thereof. The appeal site is positioned to the north-east of 8 Rexona Close, therefore it is unlikely that the proposed extension would result in any further loss of light than is already experienced due to the proximity of the two-storey element of the existing dwelling. This would not however make the unacceptable loss of outlook for occupiers of No 8 acceptable.
6. Accordingly, the proposed development would harm the living conditions of the occupants of 8 Rexona Close, with specific regard to outlook. It would therefore conflict with Policies DG1 and DG4 of the adopted Exeter Local Plan First

Review (2005) (Local Plan) and the Supplementary Planning Document Householders Guide to Extension Design (2008) (SPD) Principles 3 and 5 which collectively seek to ensure residents feel at ease within their homes and gardens.

Character and Appearance

7. As I have alluded to above, buildings on Rexona Close have been extended, including some to the side, but in the main extensions are contextually small and subservient, lending an originality and similarity to the street scene where the host buildings may be modest but visually dominate their plots. This contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The proposed extension to the side and rear would be considerably larger than others. Owing to the angle of the property, the side of the extension would be in public view and would read as a large addition to what is a modest original dwelling. Even if the full extent of the extension could not be seen from a public vantage point, the extension would still dominate the plot size, and would therefore not be subservient to the original dwelling. This would buck the trend of the street scene, eroding its homogeneous qualities.
9. The use of matching materials would not lessen the impact of the scale of the proposed extension. Accordingly, the proposed single storey extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and thus the area. It would therefore conflict with Policies DG1 and DG4 of the Local Plan, and Principles 3 and 5 of the SPD, which require residential extensions to be in keeping with the character and appearance of their surroundings.

Other Matters

10. I have not been provided with the plans or further details of the other examples of developments cited by the appellant and can therefore not be sure of their individual circumstances. I am thus unable to draw sufficient parallels with the appeal scheme to the extent my conclusions would change.
11. I am unconvinced, based on what I have seen, that an extension of the same scale or in the location proposed could be achieved under rights afforded by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (GPDO). It should be noted that the height and roof arrangements quoted in the GPDO should be considered in conjunction with the width and siting of the proposed development, which are both important factors when determining the impact of a development on both living conditions and character and appearance.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith, I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Dickson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR