



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 June 2021 by Max Webb BA (Hons)

### Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 June 2021

---

### Appeal Ref: APP/R3325/D/21/3273115

### Magnolia Cottage, Shells Lane, Shepton Beauchamp, Ilminster TA19 0LX

- 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 Nicholas Urch against the decision of South Somerset District Council.
  - The application Ref 20/03124/HOU, dated 2 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 February 2021.
  - The development proposed is demolish ground floor extension, construction of two storey chalet bungalow type extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is formed of a pair of semi-detached bungalows, located on a slightly elevated site. There is a small converted garage attached to the side of the appeal property. The semi-detached pair has some design differences, however the scale and mass of the two properties is similar. The area has a mix of built design and use of materials.
5. The proposal seeks to demolish the existing converted garage and build a chalet style two-storey extension. The existing converted garage is low and has a flat roof, it is clearly subordinate to the main dwelling. Even though much of the proposal would be over the footprint of this garage, it would appear as a substantially bulkier addition. The slightly lower ridgeline and the very modest step in for the new front wall would not reduce the proposal to a level which would clearly appear as a subservient addition to the original building.
6. The existing dwelling, and it's attached neighbour, have half hipped roofs. The development would result in the loss of this feature from the existing dwelling and it would not be replicated in the extension. Although there are differences between the two properties there is a general conformity in terms of roof line, roof form and scale. The introduction of a full gable, along with the overall scale of development, would result in an imbalance between the semi-detached

pair. The proposal would use similar materials and would have a generally conforming built design to that of the host dwelling, however this would not adequately mitigate the impact of the development. Whilst there are some design differences between the semi-detached pair, the similar scale of these properties ensures they remain coherent; this would be disrupted by the proposal.

7. Though the surrounding properties are a mixture of design and materials, in the immediacy of the appeal site the properties are relatively unmodified on the front elevation and maintain a moderately small scale. The raised siting of the appeal site means it is in a more prominent position than the immediate neighbours and is more visible from the road. Therefore, the effects of the alterations and increase in scale would be more profound, and cause harm to the character of the area.
8. Overall, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028 (adopted March 2015), which seeks to maintain local character, and ensure development respects the local context. It would also go against the aims of the Supplementary Planning Document Extensions and alterations to houses – a design guide (2010), which suggests extensions should be subservient to the existing property.

### **Other Matters**

9. The appellant has suggested that the proposal would allow for the existing oil tank to be replaced by an air-source heat pump. This would provide a cleaner source of energy and help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The provision of more space in the property would also be a benefit for the appellant. Overall, these matters would provide modest benefits and so they would not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Acceptable elements of the proposal, such as works to the rear, would not mitigate or outweigh the harm.
10. The pre-application discussions with a Council Planning Officer have been taken into consideration, however they are recommendations and are not considered a binding agreement. They do not alter the substantive planning considerations for this development.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard for the Development Plan when it is considered as a whole, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

*Max Webb*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

*K Taylor*

INSPECTOR