
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 June 2017

by K Ford BSocSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D0121/D/17/3172974

49 Worlebury Hill Road, Weston-super-Mare BS22 9ST

- 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 and Mrs Taylor against the decision of North Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref 17/P/0005/F, dated 19 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is convert dormer first floor to full height first floor with first floor sitting room and balcony over sunroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The impact on the character and appearance of the area.
 - The impact on living conditions in terms of overlooking and the loss of privacy to Nos 47 and 51 Worlebury Road and 2a St David's Close.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. 49 Worlebury Hill Road is a hipped roof bungalow with single dormers to the front and rear of the property in a road consisting of other bungalows of a similar type and houses. Located on a corner plot towards the top of a hill adjacent to Pimms Road, it is set forward of No 51, the neighbouring house.
4. The proposal is to raise the height of the dwelling to increase the footprint of the accommodation on the first floor. The first floor would be reconfigured to create 2 ensuite bedrooms (one with dressing room), a sitting room and a terrace over the ground floor sun room.
5. The reason for the design of the proposed roof to incorporate a solar panel to the front of the property is understood, however the resultant roof space is out of proportion with the rest of the property and consequently the scale and height of the proposal would add significant bulk to the dwelling. This distinguishes it from other 2 storey properties in the vicinity which have roofs which are not as deep. The corner location of the bungalow on a hill means

that the proposal would create a prominent feature in the street scene, visible from both Worlebury Hill Road and Pimms Lane and would contribute negatively to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS12 of the North Somerset Council Core Strategy which requires development to demonstrate sensitivity to the existing local character of an area and policies DM32 and DM38 of the Development Management Policies Sites and Policies Plan (Part 1) (Sites and Policies Plan) which requires the scale, height and proportions of development to respect the character of the existing property and surroundings.

Living Conditions

6. The proposed elevated terrace at the rear of the property would provide direct views into the garden and side first floor bay window of 51 Worlebury Hill Road and the conservatory and rear garden of 47 Worlebury Hill Road. Whilst there would be no harm in terms of views into the habitable rooms of 2a St David's Close because of the distance between this property and No 49, there would however be views into the rear garden of the property because of the vantage point provided by the height of the terrace. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies DM32 and DM38 of the Sites and Policies Plan which states the design and layout of development should not prejudice the living conditions of adjoining occupiers and ensure the retention of adequate private amenity space. It also conflicts with the overlooking tests contained within the Residential Design Guide – section 1.

Other Matters

7. I note the appellants reference to other examples however each case is determined on its own merits and I have based my decision on the information before me. Similarly, I note the willingness of the appellant to make amendments to the design of the proposal. However, I am only able to assess the scheme that is before me.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons outlined above and taking into account all other matters, the appeal is dismissed.

K Ford

INSPECTOR