



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 July 2011

by Mike Robins MSc BSc(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20 July 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/R3325/D/11/2154255

29 St Marys Park, Huish Episcopi, Langport, Somerset TA10 9HD

- 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 Mr C Jones against the decision of South Somerset District Council.
 - The application Ref 11/00316/FUL, dated 16 January 2011, was refused by notice dated 14 March 2011.
 - The development proposed is two extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. This appeal relates to extensions to the front and rear of a small bungalow on a relatively modern housing estate. The estate offers a variety of bungalows and two-storey houses, with most properties having generous plots. The open and spacious character is reinforced by well established hedges and shrub boundaries. The two-storey properties tend to have greater articulation with most showing some form of gable element to the front, for example those opposite the site, or the properties further along St Marys Park to the west and into The Firs.
4. The bungalows on the estate, however, tend to have a very simple, symmetrical and consistent form, and this is clearly evident along this side of St Marys Park between Nos 24 and 31.
5. The proposal would introduce an extension of approximately 4m to the rear. Although there is a public footpath to one side and a rear access road serving detached garages, this rear garden area is relatively well screened, and an electricity substation separates it from the road. I concur with the Council that this part of the scheme would present no significant harm to the overall character of the estate.
6. To the front, an extension of approximately 5m is proposed. This would be slightly offset to allow access through to the original hall and retention of a window to the front of the existing bedroom. This would, however, be a large extension in relation to the modest scale of the bungalow. Its length would

exceed any retained width to the front of the original property, and it would appear as a prominent and disproportionate addition, significantly altering the form of the dwelling.

7. Estates of this type often lack some of the traditional architectural features that establish character, and instead derive it from their consistent forms and spacing. I note the set back of this property from No 30 and the presence of a modest front gable feature to the bungalow opposite, No 36, as well as those in Parsonage Close, which integrate reasonably successfully into the streetscene. While this would suggest that a modest front extension may be acceptable here, the one that is proposed would be too large and would establish an incongruous form within the estate that would detract from its character.
8. The proposal overall would, therefore, conflict with the South Somerset Local Plan, adopted 2006, and Policies ST5 and ST6. These policies state that the scale and proportion of new development should relate to the character of the area, and respect the form, character and setting of the locality.
9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mike Robins

INSPECTOR