



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2023

by C Rose BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1110/D/23/3314369

14 Farm Close, Exeter, Devon EX2 5PJ

- 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 P Belworthy against the decision of Exeter City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/1205/FUL, dated 1 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey extension at 14 Farm Close, Exeter, Devon EX2 5PJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/1205/FUL, dated 1 September 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - 22013_E106 Existing Site Plan; 21009_P01A Proposed Ground Floor Plan; 21009_P02A Proposed First Floor Plan; 21009_P03A Proposed Roof Plan; 21009_P04A Proposed Site Plan; 21009_P05A Proposed Elevations; and 21009_P09 Section.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on drawing number 21009_P05A Proposed Elevations.

Preliminary Matter

2. During the appeal both parties confirmed that due to an oversight, Drawing Number 21009_P05A Proposed Elevations had not been submitted to the Council or considered by them at the time of their decision. Both parties have stated that they are content for this plan to be considered as part of the appeal in place of Drawing Number 21009_P05. The amended plan details a smaller dormer window which was referenced in other documents considered by the Council and to which no third-party comments have been received. In view of this, consultation on the plan is not required and I have considered it as part of the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is in the corner of Farm Close, a small cul-de-sac of semi-detached properties constructed in brick and render with tiled roofs. Several properties in the close have been extended to the side with two-storey extensions comprising a variety of designs.
5. The proposed development would be constructed in similar materials to the host dwelling. It is proposed in a narrow gap between No's 14 and 16 Farm Close, set back from the front of the existing dwelling, set in from the boundary and with a lower ridge height.
6. The setting back of the frontage, its setting in from the side boundary and lower ridge height would ensure that the extension would respect the building line, spaces between buildings and pattern of development within the cul-de-sac. It would not create a terracing effect and would be subservient to the original house in terms of its size and proportion when viewed from Farm Close. As a result, the proposal would comply with The Householder's Guide to Extension Design (September 2008) (HG) in relation to the General Principles related to Street Scene and Scale and Massing.
7. The side wall of the proposed extension would not be parallel to the original house contrary to the guidance in Chapter 3.2 of the HG. However, the HG states that this is required to maintain the established character of the street. Although the angled nature of the extension and resulting first floor roof would result in an unusual built form, due to its position set back in the corner of the cul-de-sac in a narrow gap between No's 14 and 16 Farm Close with matching roofing materials, it would not be prominent within, or harmful to, the character of the street or original house.
8. Moreover, although the HG states that existing extensions should not be taken as precedents, and the HG may have been introduced to prevent similar extensions to those already in the cul-de-sac, the number and differing styles and shapes of two-storey side extensions form part of the character of the cul-de-sac. The proposal would be of a different design again, but in light of the variation of two-storey side extensions in the cul-de-sac, the proposal would not undermine the established character or appearance of the area.
9. The reduced size of the rear dormer as shown on Drawing Number 21009-P05A is very similar in design and size to existing rear dormers to No's 14 and 16 Farm Close. As a result, the reduced size would not be overly bulky and would appear as part of an 'integrated design' to the main dwelling as required by the HG.
10. Overall, for the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposal would accord with the character and appearance of the area.
11. The appeal scheme would therefore meet the aims of Policies CP17 of the Exeter City Council Core Strategy (2012) and Policy DG1 of the Exeter Local Plan First Review (2005). Amongst other things, these seek to ensure a high standard of design, promote good design at a height, volume and shape that relates well to the character and appearance of adjoining buildings and surrounding townscape.

Conditions

12. I have considered Paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance in relation to conditions. In addition to the standard time condition, it is necessary for a condition to confirm the approved plans in the interests of certainty. A condition is also necessary to ensure that external materials for the extension match those of the existing dwelling as shown on the plans in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Rose

INSPECTOR