



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 April 2023

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/U1105/D/23/3316821

37 Hill Crescent, Honiton, EX14 2HY

- 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 A Carpenter against the decision of East Devon District Council.
 - The application Ref. 22/1854/FUL, dated 17 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 December 2022.
 - The development is construction of attached garage to front and side elevation.
-

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 host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on Hill Crescent and comprises a single storey detached bungalow with accommodation in the roof. The host property is set back from the road with an open frontage that includes parking and an area of lawn. The front elevation to the host includes a garage door which extends marginally in front of the main wall. On the existing plan the area behind this door is shown as a store. This plan also shows a pitched roof above the garage door, whereas, as I observed on site, it has a mono pitch roof that links into the main pitched roof. A porch is also shown on the plan, albeit, at the time of my visit, this had largely been demolished.
4. The appeal site forms part of an estate of similar style single storey bungalows with the exception being a two storey property to the south east of the appeal site (No.32 Hill Crescent (No.32)) and some chalet bungalows further to the west. Due to its corner position, the slight rise in the road and open frontage, the host property is prominent and highly visible.
5. Whilst I accept that a number of properties in Hill Crescent have been altered and extended, the scale of change that has occurred is modest. Most of the frontages to the properties within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site retain a consistent and simple appearance through the retention of most of their original design features, which combined with, in some cases, open frontages or gardens enclosed by low level walls and hedging are a positive characteristic of this part of the estate. The latter is enhanced by the gaps

- between the properties and the fact that there are largely no extensions or outbuildings beyond the original small garage extensions to these properties. All of these factors combine to give a feeling of spaciousness to the estate.
6. The appeal proposal involves extending the existing store to the front and side to create a large single storey garage with a pitched gable ended roof.
 7. Within the above context, I consider that the scale, mass, extent and footprint of the proposed garage would be excessive. The proposed extensions would not be sympathetic to or in proportion to the host property or to adjacent properties. As I observed on site, there are no properties in this part of the streetscene where existing garages have been extended on such a scale as proposed, and it would introduce, therefore, a prominent feature that would appear out of keeping with the host property and surrounding area.
 8. The proposal would reduce the gap between the host and No.39 Hill Crescent and extend well beyond the established building line, harming those features that make a contribution to the character of the area. Overall, the proposal would visually dominate the streetscene and result in a development that fails to integrate with or relate well to the existing rhythm of built development on this part of the road and would thus not sit comfortably on the appeal site.
 9. The Appellant has referred to the fact that there have been no objections from interested parties, but that does not imply that the proposal is acceptable or take away the need for it to be properly assessed in terms of its impact on the host property and surrounding area. The Appellant has also referred in their Grounds of Appeal to examples of other extensions, including extensions to No. 1 Hill Crescent (No.1) and an extension to create a two storey house at No.32. Even so, I have not been provided with any planning background to these examples or any details of the considerations that may have led to their approval. As such, it is not possible for me to assess whether they are in any way comparable to the appeal proposal. However, in relation to the extensions at No.1, I do not regard these as an example of good design that should be replicated on the estate and this site does not form part of the immediate context to the appeal site. Also, the extension to No.32 does not appear to have encroached over the established building line or onto its open frontage. Consequently, none of these examples affect my overall findings.
 10. Accordingly, I find that the appeal proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area and would thus fail to comply with policy D1 of the East Devon Local Plan 2013-2031 (January 2016). This policy seeks, amongst other requirements, to ensure that that new development respects the key characteristics of an area and that its scale, mass and height relates well to its context.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons given above and having taken all the matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Roberts

INSPECTOR