
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2022

by Rachael Pipkin BA (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R3325/D/22/3290062

Wynders, Wick Road, Milborne Port DT9 5HF

- 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 Paul Bungay against the decision of South Somerset District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01543/HOU, dated 10 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is extensions.
-

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 host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Wynders is a two-storey detached house with an integrated garage and rear single-storey extension. It is set back from the road behind a relatively deep front and driveway. Adjacent properties are of a similar design, although neighbouring Rivendell, to the south, has been substantially extended to the front. A grass verge extends either side of the road which together with the relatively deep front gardens contributes to the spacious character of the area.
4. The appeal proposal would add a number of extensions to the property including single-storey rear and front extensions and a first floor side extension.
5. The front extension would provide a substantial garage, workshop and store. It would project forward of the main front elevation, extending the full depth of the front garden and covering more than a third of its width. The ridge height of the tallest front section, which would accommodate the garage, would be at a similar level to the eaves of the main part of the house. Together its design, scale and massing would make it appear disproportionately large in comparison to the host property. It would thus dominate the host dwelling rather than appear as a subservient addition. Its excessive size would make it appear cramped within the plot. In this way, it would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property.

6. I observed the approved¹ front extension to Rivendell is a substantial and dominant addition to this property. In many respects it is similar to the appeal proposal in that it extends some way into the front garden area and occupies a large footprint. However, unlike the appeal scheme, it is set back from the front boundary fence and vegetation and lower in height than the eaves of the main property. This helps to reduce its visual impact and retain a degree of spaciousness within the plot. It is therefore not of a comparable scale and does not lead me to a different conclusion in respect of the front extension.
7. I have also been referred to another development at Sycamore House, also on Wick Road. However, the projection forward of the main elevation in this case is very modest and not comparable to the appeal scheme. This, therefore, does not alter my findings.
8. The side and rear extensions would be modest additions to the property that would be both subservient and in keeping with the character and appearance of the property.
9. The proposed alterations to the property would be visually prominent when viewed from the street. The altered appearance of the host property would be unlike other properties within the street in terms of size and plot coverage. This would erode the spacious character of the area. It would therefore be out of keeping and harmful to the character and appearance of the streetscene.
10. I conclude that the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Saved Policies SD1 and EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2015 which together require sustainable development which achieves a high quality and preserves the character and appearance of the district. It would not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure that development is visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. It would also not comply with the guidance set out in South Somerset District Council – Extensions and alterations to houses – a design guide 2010 which advises front extensions are always likely to be too prominent in the street scene, detrimental to the character of the area and that garages should not dominate the house.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has suggested that he could construct the rear extension as permitted development. The Council does not appear to object to the rear and first floor side extensions and I consider they are acceptable. I considered whether it would be possible to issue a 'split' decision in respect of these elements of the scheme. However, as both the side and rear extensions are integrated with each other and the side extension is linked to the front extension, I do not find that these elements of the scheme would be severable from the part of the proposal which I have found would not be acceptable. I am therefore unable to split my decision.
12. The appellant has raised a concern about the time taken by the Council to determine the application and the absence of working with the applicant to improve the proposal. Whilst I appreciate this must be frustrating for the

¹ Council Ref: 20/02709/HOU

appellant, this is a procedural matter and does not affect the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachael Pipkin

INSPECTOR