

**REPORT TO:** PLANNING COMMITTEE  
**Date of Meeting:** 11 February 2019  
**Report of:** City Development Manager  
**Title:** Appeals Report

**Is this a Key Decision?** No

**Is this an Executive or Council Function?** No

**1. What is the report about?**

- 1.1 The report provides Members with information on latest decisions received and new appeals since the last report.

**2. Recommendation:**

- 2.1 Members are asked to note the report.

**3. Summary of Decisions Received**

- 3.1 **18/0774/FUL** - 68 Broadway. The application sought permission to demolish garage and replace with an extended garage.

The main issues were:

- the character and appearance of the area;
- the living conditions of future occupiers with regard to the provision of garden space; and
- the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to outlook.

To take each in turn, the Inspector considered that the proposed garage would be overly large and would harm the character of the host dwelling, its garden and the surrounding area. The disparity between it and the adjoining garage would only emphasise the excessive bulk of the building and unbalanced appearance. While it would not be visible from many public vantage points, it would be clearly visible from a number of neighbouring gardens and properties. It would be larger than any other of the many existing outbuildings in the locality, although the presence of other outbuildings does not justify the harm identified. Even taking into account the proposed render external finish in place of cladding, the garage would still fail to assimilate well with surroundings, mainly due to its overall bulk and massing and it was concluded to cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.

In terms of living conditions, the Inspector identified that the proposal would somewhat compromise the garden space but the remaining space would be of a scale sufficient to serve the host dwelling and concluded that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of current or future occupiers.

In respect of the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, while it would form a new visible and not particularly attractive built feature, the Inspector did not consider the structure to be of a scale or sited in such a way as to result in significant dominating or overbearing effects on the occupiers of adjoining properties.

For these reasons, it was concluded that the appeal should be dismissed. While the Inspector considered there would be sufficient amenity space to serve the property and that the living conditions of neighbours would not be harmed, this does not outweigh the harm identified to the character and appearance of the area which leads the proposal to conflict with the Development Plan as a whole.

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

None.

#### **CITY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER**

##### **Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 (as amended)**

##### **Background papers used in compiling the report:**

Letters, application files and appeal documents referred to in report are available for inspection from: City Development, Civic Centre, Paris Street, Exeter

Contact for enquiries: Democratic Services (Committees) - Room 2.3. Tel: 01392 265275