



## **PLANNING – UPDATE SHEET**

Date: Wednesday 29 May 2024

Time: 5.30 pm

Venue: Rennes Room, Civic Centre, Paris Street, Exeter

Members are invited to attend the above meeting to consider the items of business.

If you have an enquiry regarding any items on this agenda, please contact Pierre Doutreligne, Democratic Services Officer (Committees) on 01392 265486.

Entry to the Civic Centre can be gained through the rear entrance, located at the back of the Customer Service Centre, Paris Street.

### *Membership -*

Councillors Knott (Chair), Patrick (Deputy Chair), Asvachin, Atkinson, Banyard, Bennett, Hughes, Hussain, Jobson, Ketchin, Miller, Mitchell, M, Pole and Rolstone

## **Supplementary Agenda**

### **Part I: Items suggested for discussion with the press and public present**

#### **7 Appeals Report**

To consider the report of the City Development Manager.

(Pages 3 -  
6)

**Individual reports on this agenda can be produced in large print on request to Democratic Services (Committees) on 01392 265107.**

This page is intentionally left blank

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

29<sup>th</sup> May 2024

### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Correspondence received and matters arising following preparation of the Agenda

#### Item 7: Appeals Report

#### 3. Appeal Decisions

- 3.11 [23/0185/FUL](#) Carmel, Beech Avenue, Pennsylvania. *Demolition of bungalow and construction of new dwelling.*

**Planning Inspectorate decision issued:** 9<sup>th</sup> May, 2024.

#### **Appeals Dismissed.**

An application for the demolition of bungalow and construction of new dwelling, at Carmel, Beech Avenue, has been dismissed.

The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the locality, and living conditions for neighbours.

The appeal property is a 1970's detached bungalow in a rectangular plot, partly set into a hill. The wider area is of a spacious nature of established residential character with a range of dwellings that along with gardens, open space areas and topography create a locality of very pleasing appearance. The proposal is for a substantial two-storey dwelling, in classical style, with a front gable and hipped roof. External materials would include rendered walls, with block plinth and brick/stone detailing and a slate roof along with tall windows with glazing bars. The site lies within the Pennsylvania Conservation Area

The Inspector said, the change from the low-key bungalow to the proposal would be very marked; regrettably too much so given the constraints of the site and the immediate and wider context. This overly bold planned dwelling would be of excessive bulk, too close to boundaries, incorporate a number of out-of-place design features including front and rear fenestration and overall roof form and use of materials as well as, importantly, not respecting or adapting to the topography of the site. It would appear as over-development and incongruous alongside the neighbour Seven Gables and would draw few design cues from surrounding development or landscape. The planned property would neither be modern nor robustly traditional. In this context I find that the over-sized proposal would be jarring on the eye, appear awkward, dominant in the landscape and incompatible with the locality; it would diminish the character and visual qualities area. It would also not preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal would

conflict with S72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Local Plan Policy C1, DG1 and Core Strategy Policy CP17, as well as the Residential Design SPD.

With regard to the impact on neighbours, the Inspector said the planned large bulky property in such close proximity to Seven Gables would have an undue overbearing effect. The residents within that dwelling would understandably expect to have a continued sense of space in a good quality residential environment such as this locality. There would also be scope for additional, and unfortunate, over-looking which would add to the uncomfortable arrangement for neighbours. Residents of a number of more distant properties would notice some reduction in outlook, and possibly perceived over-looking, and whilst that would not in my opinion reach the scale of an undue loss of residential amenity it does demonstrate that the scheme is not well-designed given the nature of the site and its context. The proposal would conflict with Local Plan Policy DG4.

For the Decision Notice, see:

**Reference:** [APP/Y1110/W/23/3333754 \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](https://www.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/app/y1110/w/23/3333754)

3.12 **23/1550/FUL 8 Edinburgh Drive, Exwick.** 2 storey side extension, rear dormer and minor external/internal works.

**Planning Inspectorate decision issued:** 20<sup>th</sup> May, 2024.

#### **Appeals Dismissed.**

The appeal property is a semi-detached property on the eastern side and towards the northern end of the cul-de-sac of houses along Edinburgh Drive. It has a side garden to the north with a row of three garages beyond this. The surrounding area is predominantly residential.

The proposal was for a two-storey side extension on the area of garden to the south of the property, 3.9 metres in width, with the roof and ridge set down from the main ridge and the front elevation set back. The application also included a roof extension with a rear facing dormer window, which falls within permitted development criteria.

The application was refused on the grounds that :

- the proposed extension would have a negative impact on the character, and appearance of the street scene, and
- it would have an overbearing impact on and adversely affect the natural light and outlook enjoyed by the neighbouring properties at 6 and 8 Lincoln Road and would not allow existing or future occupiers to feel at ease in their homes or gardens

The Inspector highlighted the main issues to be

a) The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing property and on the street scene, and

b) The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers to the rear of the appeal property in Lincoln Road, with particular regard to outlook, light and overshadowing and overlooking.

The Inspector concluded that the proposal would respect the character and appearance of both the existing house and the street scene as it would continue the pattern of built development with open gaps, particularly above garages between the dwellings..

However, he did consider that, given the relationship between the appeal property and the properties to the rear in Lincoln Road, and taking into account orientation, and change in levels, that the proposed development would lead to some loss of light and increased overshadowing at certain times of the day. This would add to the harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the properties to the rear. This would conflict with Policy CP17 of the Core Strategy and Policies DG1 and DG4 of the LP First Review

He did not consider that the family related reasons for the extension outweighed the harm that would accrue to the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings

For the Decision Notice, see:

**[Reference: APP/Y1110/D/24/3341324 \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#)**

#### **4. New Appeals**

4.10 **[23/1206/FUL](#) 41 Park Lane, Pinhoe. *RETROSPECTIVE. Flat roof garage with English Cedar cladding* **Start Date:** 15<sup>th</sup> May, 2024.**

For case details, see:

**[Reference: APP/Y1110/D/24/3340186 \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#)**

4.11 **[24/0248/FUL](#) 11 Woodland Road, Pinhoe. New roof to garage with increase in ridge height and pitch. **Start Date:** 23<sup>rd</sup> May, 2024.**

For case details, see:

**[Reference: APP/Y1110/D/24/3343761 \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#)**

This page is intentionally left blank