



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2024 by M Long BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E3335/D/24/3354381

Grove House, Tolland Road, Tolland, Bishops Lydeard, Somerset TA4 3PN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ogden against the decision of Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref is 41/24/0004.
 - The development proposed is removal of existing single storey conservatory to be replaced with new two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a two-storey dwelling located in a rural area. The original house has a traditional form with modestly proportioned fenestration, including small windows with sills and brick detailing above. To its rear is a large, two-storey extension and a single-storey conservatory. Even so, the host dwelling retains a cohesive character and appearance.
5. In combination with the existing two-storey extension, the proposal would result in an elongated two-storey rear projection which would compete with the scale of the original house. Moreover, the proposal's stepped down eaves and ridge line would give the rear projection a disjointed appearance. This would be compounded by the misalignment of the first-floor windows relative to those on the existing extension. In addition, the multiple large windows would not be reflective of the traditional character and modest fenestration pattern on the host dwelling. Consequently, the proposal would be an unsympathetic addition which would not be subservient to the scale or design of Grove House. It would conflict with the Somerset West and Taunton Design Guide which seeks to ensure good design that responds to the context of the site.
6. The proposal would be discernible from along the highway, as well as in some private views from land and buildings on Grove Lane. In any event, I do not consider that the limited public visibility due to the rural location obviates the

need to achieve good design in this instance. Indeed, Paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.

7. My attention has been directed to examples of extensions which have been approved in the local area at 'Bells House' and 'Burts Farm'. I am not aware of the material considerations in each instance and so I cannot be certain of the planning context in which they were granted planning permission. In any case, from what I have seen those dwellings are of a different appearance to Grove House. Furthermore, those extensions do not justify the disjointed design of the appeal proposal and the unsympathetic scale of the rear projection relative to its host.
8. I conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policy D5 (Extensions to dwellings) of the Taunton Deane Adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Plan (2016) which permits extensions to dwellings provided they do not harm the form and character of the dwelling, and are subservient to it in scale and design. It would also conflict with Policy DM1 (General Requirements) of the Adopted Taunton Deane Core Strategy (2012) which seeks that the appearance and character of any affected building would not be unacceptably harmed by the development. There would be additional conflict with the Framework which seeks that development is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

9. I accept that the proposal could improve the quality of living accommodation for the appellant and their family, in particularly in terms of the light and views facilitated by the large windows. Nevertheless, these are private benefits to a single household and do not outweigh the harm identified to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The proposal would conflict with the development plan. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Long

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR