



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2024

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16.05.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1110/D/24/3340669

11 Rews Park Drive, Exeter EX1 3QL

- 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 Ian Coles against the decision of Exeter City Council.
 - The application Ref: 23/1396/FUL dated 14 November 2023, was refused by notice dated 11 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is construction of a two storey side extension with an integral garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing property and on the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modern two storey detached dwelling at the cul de sac end of a development of mainly detached houses, of similar scale and external materials but with some detailed design differences.
4. The proposal would seek to construct a wide two storey extension with accommodation over two floors and an integral garage. The extension over two storeys would project forward of the main house and in line with the forward projection of the existing garage. It would continue the main roof ridge across the extended property.
5. The width of the two-storey extension, including the width of the front gable would overwhelm the scale and proportions of the existing property. The over dominance of the proposed extension in relation to the existing property would be exacerbated by the forward projection of the two-storey extension in relation to the existing property. The property as extended would appear unbalanced in terms of its overall scale and proportions and this would harm the character and appearance of the existing property.
6. Although set to one side at the cul de sac end of Rews Park Drive the property as extended would appear overly large in relation to the scale and proportions of the surrounding properties. I have taken into account the large development that is being undertaken to the immediate east of the appeal property, but the

appeal property is and would remain to be seen in the context of the Rews Park Drive development. The proposed extension would result in the appeal property becoming visually over dominant in terms of its scale and massing and this would be harmful to the street scene.

7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area. This would conflict with Policy CP17 of the Exeter Local Development Framework Core Strategy, Policy DG1 of the Exeter Local Plan First Review and the Exeter City Council Supplementary Planning Document 'Householder's Guide to Extension Design' (SPD) and the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular Section 12, all of which, amongst other matters, seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.

Other Considerations

8. I have noted that there have been no neighbour objections to the proposed extension, but this does not, on its own, overcome the harm I have concluded. There would be no harm to the living conditions of any of the adjacent neighbours and the Council also raised no objection in this regard.
9. The Appellant has drawn my attention to a number of other extensions that have been permitted, both in Rews Park Drive and elsewhere, which have been permitted although not in full accordance with the Council's SPD. Each proposal must be assessed on its individual merits but in so far as the information has been made available to me, I have taken them into account. However, none of these other proposals compare directly with the proposed extension before me and do not therefore persuade me to a different conclusion.
10. Concerns have been raised by the Appellant regarding the development being undertaken at Pin Brook Park but these matters in relation to the permissions granted and procedures followed are not within my remit and should be redirected to the Council.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no other material considerations to override this finding. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR