



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2020

by C J Ford BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

a person appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W3330/D/20/3252865

31 Church Road, Trull, Taunton, Somerset TA3 7LG

- 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 A Power against the decision of Somerset West and Taunton Council.
 - The application Ref 42/20/0016, dated 25 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is replace 3 windows and back door in extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area which is within the Trull Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within the Trull Conservation Area (CA), a designated heritage asset where special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. The site also forms part of the setting of three listed buildings; All Saints Church (Grade I), Tomb of Edward Berrie (Grade II) and Trull War Memorial (Grade II). These are similarly designated heritage assets and special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving the setting of these buildings.
4. The CA covers the historic central part of Trull and the character of this part of the CA is primarily derived from the dominance of the church. The appeal property forms part of a small group of dwellings to the south east of the church and is a two storey semi-detached cottage of traditional design. It has a single storey rear extension which is a lean-to form with a deeper gable ended mid-section.
5. The main two storey part of the house and the gable ended section of the extension are finished in stone while the lean-to parts of the extension are painted brick. Excluding two rooflights, the whole property has timber windows and doors in a matching colour. The consistency in the materials and colour of the windows and doors results in the property having a visually pleasing coherent appearance.
6. Within the small group of dwellings there are examples of timber, Upvc and metal frame windows. However, it is those of timber construction, as found at

- the appeal property, that harmonise with the traditional character of the dwellings and thereby make a positive contribution to the locality. Although the neighbouring dwellings to the south east use Upvc extensively, they are located outside of the CA.
7. The proposal is to replace the 3 timber windows and the timber door in the rear extension with 3 white Upvc windows and a golden oak effect composite door. The Upvc window frames would have a bulkier profile than timber. They would also have a more modern shiny and reflective appearance. As a result, they would fail to harmonise with the traditional character of the dwelling. The variance in materials and colour between the proposed door and the windows would also eliminate the existing consistency in the rear elevation. Consequently, there would be significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling.
 8. It is acknowledged that only the window closest to the road is currently visible in public views. The window alongside 29 Church Road is hidden by the deeper mid-section of the extension while the rear door and its neighbouring window are screened by planting and timber outbuildings. However, as these latter features lack permanence, the harm derived from the rear door and the neighbouring window may be revealed over time. It is therefore considered the inappropriate relationship with the traditional character of the house would be evident and the positive contribution made to the locality would be undermined.
 9. Given the above, it is concluded the proposed development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. It would detract from views of the listed buildings and thereby fail to preserve their setting. The development would conflict with Policies DM 1 and CP 8 of the Council's Adopted Core Strategy 2011-2028 and Policy H2 of the made Trull Neighbourhood Plan to 2028. Amongst other things, the policies seek to ensure development does not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of an area and the historic environment.
 10. The National Planning Policy Framework specifies that where a development would lead to less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, as would be applicable in this case, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits. It is noted the appellant intends to replace the timber frame windows in the main part of the house with Upvc. Unlike the windows and door in the extension, these are not controlled by a planning condition which requires them to be maintained as timber. While the appellant therefore considers the proposal would ensure the windows and door in the extension would match the main part of the house, the appeal can only be assessed against the property as it currently stands. Accordingly, no public benefits may be derived from the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

C J Ford

APPOINTED PERSON