



Appeal Decision

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

Decision by Paul Thompson DipTRP MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/E3335/D/25/3375603

1 Trevett Road, Taunton, Somerset TA1 5DJ

- 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 Mihai Iacob against the decision of Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref is 38/25/0316.
 - The development proposed is described as “double storey side extension between the existing garage and house to match the existing”.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. On my site visit, I observed that development has commenced but was not complete. In any event, my recommendation is based on the development as shown on the plans considered by the Council.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling located within a small row of detached dwellings that are distinctive within the street scene due to their similar style and the comparable width of their main two-storey front elevation. Notably, they all incorporate hipped roof forms and are constructed in red brick. The surrounding area is primarily residential and aside from the detached row, is largely characterised by semi-detached dwellings, many of which are pebble-dashed.
6. The Somerset West and Taunton Design Guidance SPD (2021) indicates that side extensions should be set back from the main front elevation and that roof construction should be identical to the original as to retain the character of the existing dwelling.
7. While the roof of the extension would be hipped, with the ridgeline at the same height of the existing roof, the pitch of the front roof slope would be substantially

shallower. It would therefore appear discordant due to it not reflecting the proportions and angles of the existing roof form. Furthermore, as the extension would sit flush with the main front elevation of the dwelling, there would be a significant increase in its width with the resulting scale, mass and bulk not appearing subordinate to the original dwelling. This is further accentuated due to the positioning of the extension between the main house and detached garage which would provide a cramped appearance.

8. The proposal would therefore have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. This would be regardless of whether the external walls were red brick as indicated on the application form or rendered as asserted by the appellant as the harm identified relates to the design and form of the proposal.
9. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with Policies D5 of the Taunton Deane Adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Plan (2016) and DM1 of the Adopted Taunton Deane Core Strategy (2012). These policies permit extensions to dwellings provided they do not harm the form and character of the dwelling, are subservient in scale and design, and do not unacceptably harm the appearance and character of any affected building.

Other Matters

10. Any compensation sought from the Council by the appellant in terms of pressure, delays or construction works initiated by workers instructed by themselves are not a matter which alter my findings on the planning merits of the appeal. Moreover, any ongoing issues relating to enforcement is a matter for the main parties.
11. The appellant has also drawn my attention to several other planning permissions that have been granted in the area. However, I have not been provided with any further details, so I am unable to make any meaningful comparisons with the appeal scheme before me. In any event, each proposal must be considered on its own merits.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Hole

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Paul Thompson

INSPECTOR