
Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 27 September 2021

by Mr S Rennie BSc (Hons), BA (Hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W3330/D/21/3266610

86 Belmont Road, TAUNTON, TA1 5NT

- 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 Ms Vicky Pritchard against the decision of Somerset West and Taunton Council.
 - The application Ref 38/20/0332, dated 14 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey extension to the side and rear of 86 Belmont Road, Taunton.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two-storey extension to the side and rear of 86 Belmont Road, Taunton TA1 5NT, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 38/20/0332, dated 14 October 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - 001 – Location and Block Plans
 - 005-002 Proposed Elevations
 - 006-002 Proposed Plans
 - 007-002 Measured Plans
 - 008-002 Proposed Views
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on (1) the character and appearance of the area and host dwelling, and (2) the living conditions of neighbours to the site.

Reasons

Design and Scale

3. The proposed extension is of a design and appearance that would be in keeping with the existing semi-detached house, particularly with regard to matching materials for example.
4. The proposal would be a large extension, being two storey to both the side and rear of the existing house. From the front and within the street scene the side extension would be most prominent, but it would be set back from the front of the existing house and also set down from the existing ridge, giving it a sense of subserviency. Also, there are other two storey side extensions in the area and so would not appear out of keeping. The scale and design of the side extension as proposed within the street scene would not appear overly large or dominant.
5. There is also the rear extension proposed, which would be a particularly wide addition. However, this has less of a visual presence in the area. Combined with the proposed side extension this would add a substantial amount of volume to the existing house. Even with this additional volume this is a spacious plot which would not be overdeveloped, as indicated by the sizable rear garden that would remain if the proposed extensions were built.
6. Overall, the proposal does not harm the character and appearance of either the existing dwelling or the wider area, thereby being in accordance with policies DM1 of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy and D5 of the Taunton Site Allocations and Development Management Plan. These policies require that street scenes are not unacceptably harmed and that house extensions do not harm the form and character of the dwelling, amongst other things.

Living Conditions

7. The proposed extension to the side and rear of the existing house would be close to the neighbour at No 84 Belmont Road. This neighbour appears to have extended to the side and rear of their property, if only at single storey. In these circumstances the proposed extension at No 86 would mainly be adjacent to the neighbour's extensions. Considering the layouts particularly, the proposed extensions would not result in significant overshadowing of this neighbour's garden which is towards the rear of their plot. There does not appear to be any windows that would be unacceptably overshadowed either.
8. Also, with the proposed extensions being mainly positioned near to this neighbour's own extensions, it would not appear overbearing when viewed from the rear garden of No 84. This is my conclusion on this matter even when considering the existing rear extension at No 82 also. The extensions proposal would also not appear overly dominant or overbearing from any windows in No 84, particularly given the separation distances.
9. The extensions as proposed would be to the north of No 88 and so would not result in any significant overshadowing impact. There would be the side elevation wall of the proposed rear extension near to the boundary, but this is not of a depth that would result in a significant overbearing or dominating effect.

10. Overall, the proposal would not result in unacceptable impacts to the living conditions of either neighbours at Nos 84 or 88. The development would not have any significant impact to any other neighbouring occupants also. The proposal is therefore in accordance with policy DM1 of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy and policy D5 of the Taunton Site Allocations and Development Management Plan. These policies require that extensions do not harm the residential amenities of other dwellings, amongst other things.

Conditions

11. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council against the requirements of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and the Framework.
12. I have attached the standard time limit condition and a plans condition as this provides certainty. I have also added a condition concerning materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should succeed, subject to the conditions included in this decision.

Mr S Rennie

INSPECTOR