



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2013

by T M Smith BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 July 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/R3325/D/12/2198623

1 Bearley Cottages, Bearley Lane, Tintinhull, Yeovil, Somerset, BA22 8PE

- 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 Mrs S Knight against the decision of South Somerset District Council.
 - The application Ref 12/04899/FUL, dated 13 December 2012, was refused by notice dated 28 February 2013.
 - The development proposed is a 2-storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing property, 1 Bearley Cottages, and on the pair of semi-detached dwellings, of which it is a part.

Reasons

3. 1 Bearley Cottages comprises a two storey semi-detached property that is located at the end of Bearley Lane and occupies an elevated position set back from the road. It has a conservatory on its front elevation, and similar to the adjoining property, it features a two storey hipped roof projection to the side elevation as well as a two storey flat roof extension to the rear. The appeal property is situated within a generous plot and contains a single storey detached garage that is off-set from the front elevation.
4. The proposal would extend the existing property to the side and would also replace the roof of the existing hipped and flat roofs to provide a uniform ridge height. However, the extension would be some 8 metres in width, equal to the total width of the existing property which would double its footprint. Furthermore, although set further back into the plot, the ridge height of the extension and replacement roof would be some 200mm above the ridge height of the existing property.
5. From Bearley Lane opposite the appeal site, Nos 1 and 2 currently appear to be balanced in terms of their overall scale, massing and design. I accept that the existing flat roof extensions are not positive features of the property. However, these extensions, as well as the conservatory, are subservient additions and are positioned so that they do not detract from the overall balanced scale, bulk and appearance of the pair of dwellings.

6. Although the proposed extension would be constructed of matching materials and could be easily accommodated within the appeal site, due to its width, height and scale it would both dominate and be disproportionate to the existing property. Consequently, it would cause unacceptable harm to its character and appearance. Furthermore, the proposed extension would greatly unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings to the detriment of their character and appearance.
7. In conclusion, the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the existing property, 1 Bearley Cottages and the pair of semi-detached dwellings, of which it is part. I reach this conclusion notwithstanding the fact that Bearley Lane is lightly trafficked. Consequently, it would conflict with policies ST5 and ST6 of the *South Somerset Local Plan* as well as policy STR1 of the *Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan*, which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development should be of high quality, good design and reflect local distinctiveness; and that the scale, mass and height respects the form, character of their surroundings.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has pointed to a need to extend the existing four bedroom house to provide additional accommodation for her family and to the lack of large properties in the area. These personal reasons to provide accommodation for a growing family are appreciated, but this has to be balanced against the harm that would arise from the proposed extension, which would continue to exist long after the personal needs have ceased. The personal needs in this case do not outweigh the concerns in respect of the harm that would arise to the character and appearance of the existing property and the pair of semi-detached properties as a whole.

Conclusions

9. For these reasons above, and having regard to all other matters raised, including the Parish Council's support for the scheme, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

TM Smith

INSPECTOR