



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2025

by **O Tresise MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 April 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E3335/D/24/3355817**

**Pembroke House, Stone Lane, Parbrook, Glastonbury, Somerset BA6 8PD**

- 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 and Mrs Little-Komorowska against the decision of Somerset Council.
  - The application Ref is 2024/0491/HSE.  
The development proposed is described as 'Demolition of single storey parts including porch and erection of extensions and alterations'.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. Since the appeal was lodged, the National Planning Policy Framework has been revised. However, I am satisfied that there are no changes of any consequence for the main issue in this appeal.
3. The appellants' names were initially set out in the application form in the manner set out in the banner heading above. Subsequent correspondences have referred to various combinations. However, as I am dismissing the appeal, I am satisfied that it should in the terms set out in the banner.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the main dwelling and the area.

### Reasons

5. The appeal site consists of a two-storey detached red-brick dwelling, decorated with yellow brick quoins, set back from Stone Lane, situated within a hamlet of Parbrook. The appeal proposal comprises three key elements: a two-storey side extension, rear extensions and a replacement front porch.
6. The proposed two-storey side extension would be considerably narrower than the host dwelling and would be finished in matching brickwork with coordinated window detailing. These features would help the extensions to integrate with the existing dwelling. However, the ridgeline of the new extension would be only slightly set below the main ridgeline, while its eave level would remain aligned with that of the host dwelling. Consequently, this new extension would create an imbalance in appearance that would fail to maintain the existing architectural integrity of the host dwelling. Furthermore, the appeal proposal would also introduce an elongated, full height rear extension, resulting in a disproportionate

addition to this modest property, and this would further erode its distinctive character.

7. The appellant has drawn my attention to the neighbour's concrete foundations. However, I do not know the circumstances under which they were constructed or the full details of that scheme, and therefore cannot draw any direct comparison with the proposal that would weigh in its favour. I also do not find the approved side extension on the neighbouring property to be comparable to the appeal proposal as the details provided indicate that the approved extension is of a different scale and design, with both its ridge and eaves heights noticeably lower than the main dwelling, unlike the scheme before me. As such, the presence of these do not overcome the harm that I have otherwise found.
8. In terms of visual amenity, I appreciate that the property becomes more visible only when approaching the site more closely. However, due to the open nature of the surrounding area, the proposed extensions would be at odds with the street scene. Whilst the existing trees in the front garden may continue to mature, they can only soften the appearance and would not entirely mitigate the harm caused by the proposal.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the main dwelling and the area. As such, it would not comply with Policies DP1 and DP7 of the Mendip District Local Plan Part 1; Strategy and Policies (Adopted in December 2014). Taken together, these seek that development is designed to a high standard and is in keeping with the character of the area.

## **Conclusion**

10. The appellant has referred to the benefits of the scheme, including the use of modern construction methods to improve the energy efficiency and sustainability of the building. Additionally, the scheme would make use of the existing hard-standing area, thereby preserving green space and garden areas. Also the scheme has been designed to provide better integration with the surrounding area. Nevertheless, these benefits do not outweigh the harm that I have found.
11. With regard to the need for improving and increasing the living standard for the family, there is limited evidence to demonstrate that the appeal scheme is the only means by which such needs could be met.
12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

*O Tresa*

INSPECTOR