



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2025

by B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E3335/D/25/3365607

9 Brendon Road, Wellington, Somerset TA21 8RL

- 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 & Mrs Darlow against the decision of Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref is 43/25/0004.
 - The development proposed is the erection of two storey extensions to the front, side and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Erection of two storey extensions to the front, side and rear at 9 Brendon Road, Wellington TA21 8RL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 43/25/0004, [and the plans submitted with it], subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: Location Plan, 2025006 001, 2025006 003, 2025006 005.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr & Mrs Darlow against Somerset Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. I have removed wording from the description of development above that does not describe development.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

5. Brendon Road is characterised by semi-detached properties of a similar scale and form, a number of which, on the appeal property side of the road, have two storey front projecting gables. I observed there is variable depth to these gables, in addition to the materials used.

6. The Council set out that the examples of the gables of larger depth were granted permission under previous policy contexts, nevertheless, they are part of the established immediate street scene. The example at No 4 is in close proximity and there is little material difference in the character of the street at this point compared to the appeal site. There is not therefore a clear consistent scale and design to the gables in the vicinity of the appeal site.
7. The Supplementary Planning Document 'Design Guide' (2021) sets out that in general, extensions should retain and enhance the character of the original building and the street.
8. The front gable would sit comfortably within the frontage of the dwelling and would be subservient in scale and design the front elevation. It would project further out than the immediately adjacent neighbouring examples, however, in the context of the varied length of gables evident nearby within the street scene, it would not appear incongruous nor out of keeping.
9. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling nor the surrounding area. There is therefore no conflict with Policies CP8 and DM1 of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy (2012) and Policy D5 of the Taunton Site Allocations and Development Management Plan (2016), which collectively require development to not harm the form and character of the dwelling or street scene.

Other Matters

10. The site lies within the catchment area for the Somerset Moors and Levels Ramsar site and Special Protection Area. The SPA is designated for overwintering bird populations. The Ramsar site is an internationally important wetland. The interest features of the Ramsar site are in unfavourable condition due to excessive phosphates.
11. The Council has confirmed that due to this unfavourable condition, Natural England have advised that certain types of development are subject to Habitats Regulations Assessment. This does not include householder development.
12. As the competent authority and, in accordance with this advice, I am satisfied that the proposed extension to an existing dwelling will not result in an increase in nutrient loadings at the catchment's wastewater treatment works. There will therefore be no additional impact on the Ramsar site as a result of the development. As such, I am satisfied that the development is not likely to have a significant effect on the Ramsar site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects) pursuant to Regulation 63(1) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 Habitats and a project level appropriate assessment is not required.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as this provides certainty.
14. A condition requiring the extensions to match the existing dwelling in terms of materials is necessary to ensure the development is in keeping with the existing property.

Conclusion

15. There are no material considerations that indicate the development should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

B Phillips

INSPECTOR