



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2011

by John Wilde C.Eng M.I.C.E.

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 22 June 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/R3325/A/11/2145230

Land at junction of Foldhill Close and Bearley Road, Martock, Yeovil, Somerset, TA12 6PF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Yarlington Homes against the decision of South Somerset District Council.
 - The application Ref 10/03998/FUL, dated 1 October 2010, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2010.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single two storey three bedroom detached dwelling house, detached carport and associated on site access/boundary provision.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring property, with particular respect to the loss of car parking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is situated at the junction of Foldhill Close and Brearley Road, and is an open surfaced area currently used for car parking, set behind a footway. To the west the site is partitioned from the adjacent property by a mature relatively high hedge. To the south on the other side of Foldhill Close there is a similar surfaced area used for car parking. These two areas are very prominent and give a perspective of openness to the street scene. The proposed development would involve the construction of a two storey dwelling which would face Foldhill Close and have its vehicular access off Brearley Road.
4. The front elevation of the proposed dwelling would be forward of that of the adjacent property 3 Fordhill Close. This arrangement would to an extent form a crescent shape with Nos 1, 2 and 3. However, the proposed dwelling would be out of keeping in terms of its orientation with the majority of dwellings in Brearley Road, with its rear elevation being prominent when viewed from the north. Furthermore, the front and east elevations of the proposed dwelling would be in close proximity to the footway, and the side elevation of the carport would border the rear of the footway. This would place built form far

closer to the rear of the footway than elsewhere in the vicinity of the junction. I am also aware that nearly all of the properties bordering Brearley Road are bungalows, with the hedge to the west of the appeal site forming a natural boundary between the two storey development to the west and the single storey to the east. Consequently, the proposed two storey dwelling would appear out of keeping, particularly from viewpoints to the north and south-west, where it would be seen in conjunction with the bungalows.

5. Overall, notwithstanding the retention of the on site tree, I conclude that the proposed development would be cramped and an overdevelopment of the site, detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. The proposed development would therefore conflict with policies ST6 and ST5 of the South Somerset Local Plan (LP). Both of these policies seek to ensure, amongst other things, that development respects and complements the key characteristics of the locality. The proposed development would also conflict with policy ST1 of the Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan Review. This policy seeks to ensure, amongst other things that development is of high quality, good design and reflects local distinctiveness.

Parking

6. The appeal site currently provides parking for Yarlington Homes, although I have been made aware that other residents in the vicinity have made use of it in the past. At the time of my visit there were no vehicles parked on the site, and none on the large car parking area opposite. There was also parking available on street in Brearley Road. Whilst I have some anecdotal evidence that the site is used to a greater extent at other times, I have no detailed parking survey to back this up. I am also conscious of the large parking area available to the front of Brearley House. In the absence of significant evidence to show that parking in the vicinity is a regular problem, I conclude that the proposed development would not conflict with policies in the development plan designed to promote residential amenity or highway safety.

Conclusion

7. Notwithstanding this however, by virtue of my findings on the issue of character and appearance, which outweigh my findings on parking, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Wilde

Inspector