



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 January 2026 by K Hole BA (Hons)

Decision by Mr D Szymanski BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/E3335/D/25/3375489

1 Torrells, Blagroves Road, Oake, Taunton, Somerset TA4 1DZ

- 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 M Perry against the decision of Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref is 27/25/0016.
 - The development proposed is erection of multi-storey extension to rear of property.
-

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 Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the living conditions of occupiers of No. 2 Torrells with regards to outlook and light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal dwelling is in a semi-rural area and located at the end of a row of two pairs of two-storey, semi-detached dwellings. Notwithstanding that there are several outbuildings in the rear gardens and a conservatory at No. 3 Torrells, the dwellings are comparable in scale, appearance and design.
5. Due to its position adjacent to Blagroves Road and the low hedged boundary to the rear garden, the proposed extension would occupy a prominent position that would be highly visible from the public realm.
6. The extension would substantially increase the depth of the dwelling as well as occupying almost the full width of the ground floor and around half the width of the second floor. The second storey of the extension would include a gable roof with ridge height matching that of the existing dwelling which would accentuate the overall scale and mass of the proposal. As a result, the height and depth of the extension would appear dominant and not be a subservient addition to the existing

dwelling. Furthermore, the increased scale and mass would significantly unbalance its semi-detached pair and would appear discordant when viewed alongside the other dwellings on Torrells.

7. The proposal would therefore have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.
8. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policies CP8, DM1, and DM2 of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy (TDCS) (2012) and Policy D5 of the Taunton Site Allocations and Development Management Plan (TSADMP) (2016). These policies require the character and appearance of the area to be protected, with development being of appropriate scale and design and extensions that are subservient to the host dwelling.
9. For the same reasons, the proposal would conflict with the requirements in section 12 of The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) for development to be sympathetic to local character.

Living Conditions

10. No. 2 Torrells currently benefits from open and largely unrestricted views to the south and east from its rear windows with outlook into gardens and the fields beyond. The second storey of the extension would be sufficiently set in from the shared boundary as to avoid any unacceptable effect on outlook or light. However, due to the depth of the ground floor extension and its close proximity to the shared boundary, it would be overbearing and dominate the views from the dining room window with the side wall creating a sense of enclosure.
11. Though noting the reference to BRE guidance, given the extension depth and orientation, there is no detailed substantiating technical evidence calculating the anticipated daylight change, which from the evidence before me, the level of natural light received through this window would be markedly diminished. Whether or not the eaves height falls within Class A parameters, this is not an indication of there being no adverse effects from the scheme.
12. The proposal would therefore have a significantly adverse effect on the living conditions of occupiers of No. 2 Torrells with regards to outlook and light.
13. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy DM1(e) of the TDCS and Policy D5 of the TSADMP which seek to protect the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. Furthermore, there would be conflict with the Framework which requires development to provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan read as a whole and the Framework read as a whole. There are no material considerations advanced, which indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance 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.

K Holé

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Mr D Szymanski

INSPECTOR