



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2025

**by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 17<sup>th</sup> February 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y1110/D/24/3350975**

**54 Hurst Avenue, Exeter EX2 5LF**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Miss Philippa Matthew against the decision of Exeter City Council.
  - The application Ref. is 24/0466/FUL.
  - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Hurst Avenue, and (ii) the effect on the living conditions as regards outlook and light for the occupiers of No. 52 Hurst Avenue.

### Reasons

3. On the first issue, I saw on my visit that the appeal property is one half of a semi-detached pair with No. 56 and with the pair being the middle building in a row of three of the same design. The symmetry of the largely unaltered front elevations of each pair and the resultant rhythm of the row is a particularly pleasing feature of the street scene.
4. Although the proposed full length side extension would have a slight set back from the front wall and set down from the roof ridge to comply with the Council's design guidance, it would extend to within a short distance to the property's boundary with No. 52. The effect of this would be to harmfully affect both the symmetry of the pair and the rhythm of the row.
5. In order to avoid this harm and having particular regard to the site-specific circumstances of this application, the side extension would have had to be significantly recessed from the front elevation instead of the slight set back currently proposed (albeit in line with the Council's design guidance), together with the extension also having a slightly narrower width.
6. However, with the scheme as presented in the appeal application I agree with the Council's view that the proposal would have a terracing effect, even recognising that a two-storey side extension to No. 52 would not appear feasible. Moreover, the relocation of the dwelling's entrance to the front would

further affect the symmetry of the pair with No. 56, although this feature on its own would not warrant refusal of the application.

7. On the second issue, the two-storey extension in its position close to the boundary with No. 52 would inevitably result in a significant degree of enclosure to the windows and entrance door of this property and thereby have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions for existing and future occupiers of that property as regards light and outlook.
8. I have carefully considered the submissions of the appellant, both in the written appeal statement and her letter dated 13 June 2024. In both documents my attention has been drawn to other examples of side extensions in the locality. However, none of these sufficiently replicate the setting, siting and resultant combination of symmetry and rhythm in this case that would justify my overturning the Council's decision to refuse permission on the main issues of the development's harmful effect the character and appearance of the area and the neighbour's living conditions.
9. Accordingly, I find that there would be an unacceptably harmful conflict with Policy CP17 of the Exeter City Council LDF Core Strategy 2012; Saved Policy DG1 of the Exeter Local Plan First Review 1996-2011 and with Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework, revised December 2024.
10. For these reasons and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal fails.

*Martin Andrews*

INSPECTOR