



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2018

by Stephen Hawkins MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 January 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/D0121/D/17/3181940

67 Church Street, Abbots Leigh BS8 3QU

- 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 S Jones against the decision of North Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref 17/P/0607/F, dated 1 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 9 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property consists of a substantial former barn occupying generous grounds in a secluded location on the outskirts of the village. The dwelling has retained a linear plan form reflecting its agricultural origins and it is constructed of natural stone. Consequently, although there are a considerable number of openings in its walls and roof the dwelling largely retains a traditional rural character and appearance. This is reinforced by its countryside setting.
4. The proposed extension would be positioned towards the middle of the front elevation. This would be entirely at odds with linear plan form of the dwelling. Moreover, the extension would have a width and length not dissimilar to the overall width of the dwelling and would project outwards around 5 metres from the front elevation. Therefore, the extension would be of a substantial size relative to that of the dwelling. Whilst the elevations of the extension would be largely glazed and it would have a flat roof, these factors would not significantly reduce its apparent size and bulk. Consequently, the extension would be viewed as an obvious addition of considerable scale at the front of the dwelling.
5. The flat roof of the extension would incorporate a substantial raised lantern. The roof treatment would therefore pay little regard to the simple pitched roof

form of the dwelling and it would give the extension a rather squat and box-like profile. Further, the largely glazed elevations of the extension would be entirely at odds with the sense of robustness created by the stone walls of the dwelling.

6. Due to all of the above factors, the extension would not integrate successfully with the dwelling. Consequently, the extension would be viewed as an incongruous and visually disruptive addition to the dwelling, unacceptably harming its character and appearance and that of the rural surroundings. I appreciate that the front elevation might practically be the only available side on which the dwelling could be extended. However, that does not weigh in favour of the proposal.
7. Therefore, the proposal would not accord with Policy CS12 of the adopted North Somerset Core Strategy, as it would not achieve high quality design and place-making which demonstrates sensitivity to the established local character. The proposal would also not accord with Policy DM32 of the adopted Development Management Policies: Sites and Policies Plan Part 1 (DMP), as it would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. Further, the proposal would not accord with DMP Policy DM45 as it would be out of proportion to the original building and would not respect its scale, character and setting.

Other Matters

8. The Council considered that the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and I have not found any reason to disagree with that assessment. The proposal would not harm the living conditions of occupiers of adjacent properties. However, these matters do not materially affect my findings in respect of the main issue.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stephen Hawkins

INSPECTOR