



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 May 2023

by Robert Parker BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F0114/D/23/3317623

120C Charlton Park, Midsomer Norton BA3 4BP

- 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 Roddy Thorner against the decision of Bath and North East Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref 22/04825/FUL, dated 30 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is Alterations & Extension to Dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Charlton Park contains a mix of bungalows and houses, with the two property types being separated into discrete clusters. No 120C is located in an area characterised by bungalows. These vary in design, but they are low-level buildings with shallow pitched roofs and modest ridge heights. These are defining qualities which differentiate this locality from other parts of Charlton Park containing two-storey dwellings.
4. The appeal property is one of the largest bungalows in the road, with a wider footprint than many of the others. The simple, linear form is broken up by a forward projecting gable, but the building still has strong horizontal emphasis.
5. The proposal is to raise the height of the roof to create a second floor of living accommodation. The works would increase the width of the projecting gable and introduce a pair of dormers on the front roof slope. The new roof would be half-hipped, but this would not disguise the significant added mass and bulk which would give the dwelling a top-heavy appearance. The extended property would be prominent from public vantage points, sandwiched between modest bungalows, and it would stand out as an alien feature in a street scene which is dominated by single-storey buildings. Whilst I have noted the existence of two-storey houses in nearby Grange End, that development has a character of its own and No 120C does not read as part of it due to the intervening distance.

6. The appellant cites Paragraph 120 of the National Planning Policy Framework which supports opportunities to use the airspace above existing residential premises for new homes. However, this aspect of national policy is caveated by the statement that upward extensions should be consistent with the prevailing height and form of neighbouring properties and the overall street scene. That is clearly not the case here as the extended dwelling would be out of scale with those surrounding and it would be visually discordant as a result.
7. I conclude that the proposal would be materially harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy CP6 of the Core Strategy for Bath and North East Somerset (2014) and Policies D1, D2 and D5 of the Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset (2017). Amongst other things, these policies seek to secure high quality design which responds to local character and distinctiveness, including in relation to matters such as building heights, massing and scale.

Other Matters

8. I note that an appeal has been lodged in relation to the refusal of an application for prior approval (Ref 22/01666/EODPA) to enlarge the dwelling by construction of an additional storey. I have not had sight of the arguments for and against that scheme, but it is a materially different proposal in any event. I have dealt with the appeal before me on its merits.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Robert Parker

INSPECTOR