



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2025

by **D R Kay BA Dip.Arch RIBA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1110/D/25/3365328

24 Carlton Road, Exeter, Devon EX2 5NS

- 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 & Mrs Lewis against the decision of Exeter City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0319/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension including garage conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension including garage conversion at 24 Carlton Road, Exeter, Devon EX2 5NS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/0319/FUL, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one of a pair of two-storey, semi-detached. The property has a gabled, pitched roof finished in concrete tiles. Pairs of semi-detached properties within the street are typically joined together by single storey flat-roofed garages. The appeal property is typical of other properties in the area, though a number have been the subject of extension and alteration. The character of the area is that of an established sub-urban residential neighbourhood.
4. The proposal would introduce a two-storey extension to the side gable, above and in front of the existing garage. The garage would be incorporated into the extended dwelling for use as accommodation and as a storage facility, a garage door being retained to provide access. The principal elevation of the extension would be set back from the main elevation, albeit by only a short distance. The roof of the extension would follow the same pitch as the main roof, but would sit below its eaves and ridge lines, remaining subservient to the host dwelling. The extension would be finished in buff brick and with roof tiles matching the host dwelling.
5. The Council have stated that the proposal would not follow the adopted Householder's Guide: Design of Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), particularly with reference to the set back of the front elevation. They also state that the proposal would imbalance the pair of semi-detached properties at 22 and 24 Carlton Road, reducing the visual gap in

development between 24 and 26 Carlton Road. This is alleged to harm the character of the street scene.

6. The Council refer to other examples of similar development on Carlton Road, noting that the extension at 4 Carlton Road, whilst being like the appeal proposal, was executed in 1992 under different governing policy. They also refer to the extension at 18 Carlton Road, noting that the extension at that property is set back from the principal elevation, and so obeys the SPD guidelines.
7. However, my attention has also been drawn to other developments within the immediate area, including at both Carlton Road and Whitchurch Avenue. The development at 27 Carlton Road (No 27), in particular, was approved in July 2023¹ after the adoption of the SPD.
8. During my visit, I observed that there are several examples of two-storey side extensions within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. Those two-storey developments, irrespective of their planning history, form part of the character of the area and have resulted in the reduction of gaps between some properties. Many of these additions are not set back from the principal elevation in accordance with the recommendation of the SPD. The presence of single storey porches, of different sizes, design and materials, the majority of which sit in front of the principal elevation, has also impacted the balance of pairs of semi-detached properties.
9. The proposed extension would be less than half the width of the existing house, and its ridge line and roof slopes would be set down below that of the host dwelling. In these regards, the proposal would broadly accord with these requirements of the SPD and would therefore appear as a sub-servient addition to the host dwelling. Whilst the principal elevation of the extension would only be set back by a small distance from that of the host dwelling, this is similar to the existing pattern of development within the surrounding area, particularly as evidenced at No 27, opposite the appeal site.
10. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host building or the surrounding area. It therefore follows that I do not find the proposal to conflict with Core Policy 17 of the Exeter Core Strategy or saved policy DG1 of the Exeter Local Plan, which require, among other things, development to have a high standard of design which reflects the character, scale and pattern of development of the surrounding area.

Other Matters

11. The appellant's have stated the reason for pursuing the application is to support their children who have certain neurodivergent disabilities, noting that the additional space would allow them to meet their children's developing needs as they age. I have therefore given due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty for persons with protected characteristics under s149 of the Equality Act 2010. Whilst it would be inappropriate to detail these individual disabilities further, evidence has been put before me which allows me to assess that the proposal would provide additional, individual accommodation which would assist the appellants in meeting the long-term needs of their children. On that basis, I attribute moderate weight to this

¹ 23/0737/FUL

matter and am satisfied that allowing the appeal would be a proportionate response.

12. The appeal site is located within the '10km Zone of Influence' for the Exe Estuary SPA and The East Devon Pebbled Heaths SPA & SAC. As the proposal is for an extension of limited size to an existing dwelling, it would not result in any additional residential units. It would, therefore, be unlikely to result in increased visitor pressure on the above sites, or, in combination with other developments, give rise to any significant adverse effects.
13. I acknowledge the comments raised by neighbours, including in respect of party wall matters and damage during construction. However, these are private issues, and they have not led me to an alternative conclusion on the main issue. Noise and working hours concerns would be matters addressed by existing environmental health controls.

Conditions

14. In addition to the standard time limit for implementation, in the interests of certainty, I have attached a condition specifying the approved plans.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal proposals would not be contrary to the development plan read as a whole, and that there are no material considerations, including policies in the Framework, that would justify determining other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is allowed.

D R Kay

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: 2501-RAD-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-1000 Rev P01 - Site Location and Proposed Block Plan, 2501-RAD-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2000 Rev P01 – Existing Plans and Elevations, 2501-RAD-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2001 Rev P01 - Proposed Plans and Elevations.

***** End of Schedule*****