



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 November 2025

by K Jones BA (Hons) DipLA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U1105/D/25/3371831

**Moorlands Farm, Lane To Barnes Surges, Mincombe Post, Sidbury, Devon
EX10 0QW**

- 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 James Hortop against the decision of East Devon District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0841/FUL.
 - The development proposed is construction of extension including rooms in the roof for ancillary accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of extension including rooms in the roof for ancillary accommodation at Moorlands Farm, Lane To Barnes Surges, Mincombe Post, Sidbury, Devon EX10 0QW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/0841/FUL, subject to the following 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:
 - Site Location Plan
 - 3821(A)/111 Proposed site plan
 - 3821(A)/103A Elevations
 - 3821(A)/104 Elevations
 - 3821(A)/108A Proposed roof plan
 - 3821(A)/109 Loft rooms over pool/gym area
 - 3821(A)/112 Proposed ground floor plan
 - 3821(A)/113 Complete elevations
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building/dwelling.

Preliminary Matters

2. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the development comprises a two storey extension with first floor balcony, single storey attached garage and single storey garden room link. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so have I. For clarity, I have referred to 'the extension' throughout my decision to encompass all of the elements of the proposal.

3. The Council has confirmed that its draft local plan, the East Devon Local Plan 2020-2042 (the Draft Local Plan), is due to be submitted for examination early next year. Accordingly, while I have had regard to the emerging policies referred to by the parties, the draft plan has not reached a sufficiently advanced stage in its preparation for its policies to attract more than limited weight for the purposes of the determination of this appeal. For these reasons, my determination of this appeal is made against the current development plan policies.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposed development would be appropriate in design terms.

Reasons

5. The existing bungalow is currently undergoing renovation following a grant of planning permission¹ for an extension, new porch and the addition of cladding. This follows two applications² several years ago which granted planning permission for extensions and a garage. The extension and alterations now proposed would represent a significant increase in floor area over both the original bungalow and its extended form.
6. The building plot is remote from neighbouring development, in a context of large, detached properties set within large gardens or considerable land holdings. Architectural styles vary significantly, with a range of bungalows and two-storey dwellings of both traditional and contemporary architecture. The renovated bungalow with a contemporary appearance reflects this character.
7. The proposed extension would maintain this overall appearance through the use of consistent materials, roof pitch, and design elements. It would introduce a significantly extended horizontal form and incorporate a single component with a ridge height approximately 1.5 metres above the existing roofline. Nevertheless, owing to its cohesive design and continuous front boundary treatment, the development would present as a single dwelling, preserving its contemporary bungalow character.
8. Comparing existing and proposed floor area figures, the proposed extension would not be subordinate to the original or the extended bungalow. However, its scale would not harmfully dominate the plot or the existing dwelling, nor compromise design quality. Within a generous plot and in a context of large, detached dwellings, the scale of built form would not be excessive. In this regard, the Council raises no concerns over the impact of the proposal on the character of the area or visual amenity, finding that it would conserve the special qualities of the East Devon National Landscape. I see no reason to disagree.
9. Although the Council considers the existing extensions to represent the maximum acceptable floor area, there is no clear justification to support this threshold. Reference has been made to Emerging Policy HN07 of the Draft Local Plan, which amongst other requirements imposes a 30% limit on increases in habitable floor area through ancillary or incidental annexes, extensions and alterations. However, as I have described above, the Draft Local Plan is at an early stage of preparation,

¹ Application reference 24/0428/FUL

² Application references 87/P0249 & 86/P1367

and I can give only limited weight to this policy. As such, while the proposal would exceed this threshold, this does not provide a clear reason to dismiss the appeal.

10. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would be appropriate in design terms, and would accord with Policy D1 of the East Devon Local Plan (2013-2031). Amongst other matters, this policy requires high quality design that respects the key characteristics and special qualities of the area in which the development is proposed, and ensures that the scale, massing, height, fenestration and materials of buildings relate well to their context. It would also accord with Emerging Policy DS01 of the Draft Local Plan, which contains similar tests in relation to design.
11. Although reference is made to conflict with policies of the Sid Valley Neighbourhood Plan, no specific policy conflict has been identified. Policy 7 of the Neighbourhood Plan requires development to reflect the height, scale, massing, fenestration, and materials of the locality, also stating that building heights should be in keeping with neighbouring properties. For my reasons given above I also find no conflict with this policy.

Conditions

12. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. I have also attached a condition requiring the use of matching materials in the interests of attaining an acceptable appearance.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

K Jones

INSPECTOR