



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 January 2021

by C J Ford BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

a person appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W3330/D/20/3261888

Fairmead, Stathe Road, Stathe, Bridgwater TA7 0JJ

- 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 Ian Webb against the decision of Somerset West and Taunton Council.
 - The application Ref 51/20/0007, dated 23 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2020.
 - The development is extend work started for a single storey extension commenced under approved application (51/19/0018) to create a two storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey extension at Fairmead, Stathe Road, Stathe, Bridgwater TA7 0JJ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 51/20/0007, dated 23 July 2020 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans; Location Plan, Site Plan Existing, Site Plan Proposed and Drawing Nos 005 Rev A, 006 Rev B, 007 Rev B, 008 Rev A and 009 Rev B.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with those specified in the application form.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of the site visit the blockwork of the proposed development had been erected up to roof level. However, the ground floor works are part of a previously permitted scheme in relation to a single storey rear extension, (Council Ref: 51/19/0018). Also, I have used a simplified version of the description of the development in the decision above for the sake of conciseness.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a traditional brick built two storey cottage. Although its front elevation is fairly wide, the gable ended flanks reveal it is particularly shallow. It has previously been enlarged through a rendered two storey front extension and a timber clad single storey side extension. There is also a rendered single storey lean-to element running along the front of the house which links the two extensions.
5. The dwelling is sited within a large plot which is generally secluded in relation to neighbours and the wider countryside. Public views are limited to those available from an unsurfaced footpath to the north of the site boundary.
6. The appeal proposal involves a two storey rear extension that would be rendered. It spans the full width and is deeper than the original brick built part of the house. The tiled roof would have a twin hipped form that would connect to the main roof and be no higher than the existing ridge.
7. Policy D5 of the Council's 2016 Site Allocations and Development Management Plan supports extensions to dwellings provided they do not harm the form and character of the dwelling, and are subservient to it in scale and design. Due to its large scale and massing it is considered the two storey extension fails to be subservient to the dwelling and harms its form and character. Although the effect on the wider rural area is minimal owing to the secluded nature of the site, it nevertheless conflicts with Policy D5.
8. However, the appellant has the fallback of the permitted single storey rear extension which, excluding the roof, is essentially the same as the ground floor to the appeal proposal. It would therefore be equally wide and deep but have a very large and uncharacteristic flat roof form. Furthermore, the approved scheme enables the extension roof to be used as a balcony. There would be an external staircase on one side and projecting above the roof would be a perimeter balustrade and a log burner flue. The placement of seating and other domestic paraphernalia on the balcony can also be expected.
9. Consequently, the fallback would also vastly change the form and character of the dwelling at the rear ground and first floor levels. Despite the appeal proposal's additional bulk and mass, it is considered the roof form and the cohesive form of a simple two storey extension would more sympathetically integrate with the dwelling's form and character than the fallback. This material consideration is afforded significant weight and leads to a conclusion that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has queried the Community Infrastructure Levy required by the Council. However, that is a matter to be agreed between the parties.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, it is concluded that the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

12. The standard time limit condition is imposed, as is a condition specifying the approved plans to ensure certainty. A condition requiring the external materials to be as set out in the application form, (as opposed to simply matching the existing dwelling as suggested by the Council) is imposed to ensure the walls are rendered to purposely contrast with the original brick built part of the dwelling.

C J Ford

PLANNING DECISION OFFICER