



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2025

By G Powys Jones FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1110/D/25/3365842

65 Parkway, Exeter, EX2 9NB

- 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 Mr James Ayre against the decision of Exeter City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0147/FUL.
 - The development is the erection of a two storey extension replacing detached double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a two storey extension replacing detached double garage at 65 Parkway, Exeter, EX2 9NB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/0147/FUL, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the development on: (a) the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings, and (b) the living conditions of neighbouring residents at 2 Orchard Hill, having regard to visual impact.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property, a semi-detached dwelling, stands at the junction of Parkway and Orchard Hill in a predominantly residential area. In terms of their appearance, form and openings it and its attached neighbour convey distinct echoes of Art Deco design. Another pair on the other side of the junction displays similar characteristics.
4. The appellant proposes extending to the side. The ground floor extension would largely follow the footprint of the garage standing alongside which would be demolished, whilst the flat-roofed first floor extension, matching the main property's height, would be narrower and set in from the ground floor below.
5. The Council regard the two pairs of dwellings on either side of the junction as acting as a distinctive visual 'gateway' to Orchard Hill and have several criticisms of the design. These relate principally to the alleged loss of symmetry, what is described as an awkward arrangement of setbacks, lack of subservience, excessive width on the ground floor, and lack or absence of appropriate detailing.

6. It strikes me that in its assessment the Council has given insufficient weight to the presence of the appeal property's large garage and its visual effects. Built later than the original dwelling, it is very close to it, separated from it only by a short and narrow flight of steps, so that it is perceived virtually as a ground floor extension. It is of a utilitarian appearance, and I consider its replacement by the proposed ground floor extension would prove visually beneficial. The first floor extension would be modest in scale.
7. I consider the overall design, including openings, roofs, junctions and corners, to appropriately reflect that of the host property and its attached partner, as would the external materials. Considering the volume lost by the demolition of the garage, the extension would appear subservient to the host property. There would be some loss of symmetry, but that is unavoidable on most extensions, and I note that the Council in post-decision correspondence with the appellant does not oppose an extension in principle.
8. I conclude that the proposed development would sit acceptably in its visual context without harming the character and appearance of the host property or its surroundings. Accordingly, I find no conflict with those provisions of policy CP17 of the Exeter Core Strategy promoting a high standard of design in new development complementing and enhancing the City's character and local identity.

Living conditions

9. No 2 Orchard Hill is an immediately neighbouring dwelling, sited at a higher level than the appeal property. It originally had two areas of open external space, but one, immediately behind the house, is now largely occupied by a conservatory. The officer report is not entirely clear as to which area it considers would be affected, but I assessed both.
10. The Council says that there would be a '*potential*' overbearing effect were the appellant's proposal to proceed. It strikes me that a development proposal would either be overbearing or not, a judgment is required. In my view, the proposal is modest in scale and sited a sufficient distance away from No 2 so as not to prove problematical in this regard. The extension would undoubtedly be seen from No 2's curtilage, but its impact would not prove harmful. Although not decisive in my considerations, I note that the residents of No 2 have not objected following consultation.
11. I therefore conclude that the extension, if built, would not cause unacceptable visual impact to the closest residents. Accordingly, there is no conflict with those provisions of policy DG4 of the Exeter Local Plan First Review designed to ensure that residential development is provided with a quality of amenity which allows residents to feel at ease within their homes and gardens.

Conditions

12. In the interests of certainty, it is important that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, and a condition to this effect is imposed. The Council's suggested standard condition on materials is also imposed.
13. The Council has suggested other conditions. The first requires details to be submitted in respect of the proposed cycle and bins stores, whilst the second

requires details of surface water disposal. Both are imposed, albeit in a modified format, in the interests of visual amenity and sustainability respectively.

Other matters

14. Reference has prior to their construction or installation been made to other development plan policies but those to which I have referred are considered the most relevant in the particular context of this case.
15. All other matters raised in the representations have been considered, including the Council's various references to its Supplementary Planning Document on Design of Extensions and Alterations, but none is of such strength or significance as to outweigh the considerations leading to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF 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: Drawings Ref. P1.1 Rev B; P2.0 Rev A; P2.1 Rev B; P3.0 Rev B & P3.1 Rev B.
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing property.
- 4) Prior to their construction or installation details of the following matters shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval: (i) the proposed bin and cycle stores; (b) the means of surface water disposal. The bin and cycle stores and means of surface water disposal shall be constructed or installed in accordance with the approved details prior to the extension hereby permitted being beneficially occupied.