



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2025

by **C Cooper-Young MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/E3335/D/25/3376188

2 Norwich Close, Taunton, Somerset TA1 4LH

- 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 G Shedden against the decision of Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref is 38/25/0335.
 - The development proposed is detached annex within rear garden of No 2 Norwich Close.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an extended link detached bungalow on a prominent corner plot fronting Norwich Close and lying adjacent to Langham Drive. No 2 Norwich Close has front, side and rear garden spaces and a front driveway.
4. The character of the immediate area is comprised of predominantly uniformly open-fronted and evenly spaced residential bungalows. Beyond the appeal site, the character develops into a mix of bungalows and two-storey dwellings with largely open frontages. This fundamentally consistent open pattern contributes positively to the area's overall sense of spaciousness and visual cohesion.
5. The appellant refers to examples of enclosed gardens and outbuildings in the immediate area. During my site visit I observed that there are some enclosing fences and structures but they are not common features and do not detract from the overall sense of openness.
6. The proposed annexe would be of a similar height to the host dwelling and due to its location, would be a highly prominent feature within the wider street scene. The proposal would appear disproportionately large and visually intrusive compared to existing surrounding garden structures and the setting of the host dwelling.
7. I find that the proposal would read as an overly dominant and incongruous feature, at odds with the spacious and consistent openness of the area. It would be readily visible from public vantage points directly adjoining the appeal site, compounding its visual impact and emphasising its incompatibility with the prevailing open character of the host dwelling and its surroundings.

8. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area contrary to the requirements of Policy DM1 of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy 2012 and Policy D6 of the Taunton Site Allocations and Development Management Plan 2016, which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development does not adversely impact the existing character of the local area.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has suggested that the proposed annexe would be occupied by elderly relatives. Limited evidence has been submitted to show that the needs of the family can only be met by the proposed development. Therefore, it has not been demonstrated that an alternative less harmful solution to their accommodation needs could not be brought forward.
10. I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty set out in the Equality Act 2010. I have found that the harm caused by the appeal development outweighs its benefits in terms of eliminating discrimination against persons with the protected characteristic of age, advancing equality of opportunity for those persons and fostering good relations between them and others. Therefore, I conclude that it is proportionate and necessary to dismiss the appeal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Cooper-Young

INSPECTOR