



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 March 2023

by J Evans BA(Hons) AssocRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R3325/D/22/3310452

24 Robins Court, Chard, Somerset TA20 1LY

- 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 Klaudia Sowa against the decision of South Somerset District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02611/HOU, dated 9 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 2 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as a single storey front extension and the installation of two rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension and the installation of two rooflights at 24 Robins Court, Chard, Somerset TA20 1LY in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 22/02611/HOU, dated 9 September 2022, 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: Location Plan – 1:9 ARD299; Existing Site Plan 2:9 ARD299; Existing Elevations 4:9 ARD299; Existing Ground Floor & Roof Plan 5:9 ARD299; Proposed Site Plan 6:9 ARD299, Proposed Elevation 7:9 ARD299, Proposed Ground Floor & Roof Plan 8:9 ARD299

Procedural Matter

2. I have reworded the description of the development as set out above, as I consider this better describes the proposals before me as set out on the submitted plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effects of the development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal proposal seeks to extend the appeal property on the front elevation underneath and projecting forward of an existing roof overhang. Part of the forward projection would be open fronted to provide for a covered entrance. Two rooflights are also proposed to the existing front roof slope.

5. The appeal property is of a modern appearance, is semi-detached and is positioned to the north-eastern corner of Robins Court, a narrow access lane is positioned adjacent to the neighbouring property no.22, which is situated to the east, this lane leads to a nearby enclosed parking area for residents.
6. The appeal property and no.22 have a similar appearance, however, the forward building line of no.22 adjacent, steps forward to that of the appeal property. Other properties in Robins Court in the immediate vicinity to the appeal property have similar design characteristics, albeit, there are variations found in terms of external materials, solar PV provision and similar householder adaptations. I also noted that properties to the south-east of the appeal site, have forward projections, albeit narrower in width than the appeal proposal, from their principle rooflines.
7. Following my observations from my visit, I consider that the appeal proposal would represent a modest addition to the front elevation of the property, which due to its staggered relationship with the building line of no.22 adjacent, would not noticeably project forward to any significant degree. This factor, alongside the limited locations from which the proposal would be readily appreciated due to the set back positioning of the appeal property in the street scene, and the other front projections found nearby, would enable the extension to be undertaken without any undue harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and that of the wider area. I also have no objections to the provision of the two rooflights, which would not appear uncharacteristic in the street scene where other roof alterations have taken place.
8. On the above basis, the proposal would accord with Policy EQ2 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028, which amongst other matters sets out that extensions and alterations to existing buildings are required to reinforce local distinctiveness and respect local context. The proposal would also align with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, which amongst other matters requires development to be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

Conditions

9. The standard time limit is required together with a condition listing the plans in the interests of certainty. The Council have suggested a condition is necessary requiring that the materials to be used should reflect those as specified on the application form and on the proposed plans. However, I am satisfied that the requirements of condition 2 already address this matter.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Evans

INSPECTOR