



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2020

by John Wilde CEng MICE

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

Decision date: 23 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V3310/D/20/3258067

8 Walnut Drive, Bridgwater TA6 5DD

- 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 Elliott against the decision of Sedgemoor District Council.
 - The application Ref 08/20/00084, dated 14 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is a dormer extension to west elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of neighbours with respect to outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached three bedroom bungalow. All of the properties within this row have their frontages facing a footpath, with vehicular access to the rear, from Walnut Drive. The area contains a mixture of bungalows and two storey dwellings, finished in brick and render and generally with simple pitched roofs.

Character and appearance

4. The proposed dormer would be constructed on the west facing pitch of the roof. It would extend nearly the entire width of the existing roof in a horizontal direction and from a short distance above the eaves to over 0.4m above the existing ridge line in a vertical direction. This would result in an overpowering addition that would completely subjugate the existing simple pitched roof form. It would appear as an alien feature and look out of place within the existing townscape.
5. My attention has been drawn to a number of dormers on the wider estate. However, I have not been provided with the planning details of these and from my observations none of them extend beyond the ridge line of their host properties or are as large and obtrusive as that proposed.

6. I therefore consider that the proposed development would conflict with policy D2 of the Sedgemoor Local Plan 2011-2032 – Adoption Version (LP). This requires that development is responsive to and reinforces local context and character.

Living conditions

7. The neighbouring bungalow, No 6, is set back from the appeal property, with its front garden area adjacent to the west elevation of the latter. No 6 has an access path along the east side of the garden area with the west elevation of the appeal property only about 1m away. The bulk of the appeal property is currently reduced in relation to this path and garden area by virtue of its pitched roof.
8. The addition of the proposed dormer would result in a vertical face, higher than the current ridge line, only a short distance from the path and garden. To my mind this would appear as an overbearing and visually dominant addition when viewed from the garden, the path and from the windows to the front of No 6.
9. Conflict would therefore exist with policy D15 of the LP. This seeks to prevent unacceptable impacts relating to, amongst other things, visual dominance.

Conclusion

10. In light of my above findings, and having regard to all other matters raised, including the lack of public objections to the scheme and the appellants' need for more space, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Wilde

INSPECTOR