

**APPEAL DECISIONS FOR COMMITTEE AGENDA –29 April 2015**

<b>APPEAL</b>	<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<b>REASON(S) FOR INITIAL DECISION</b>	<b>APPLICATION NUMBER</b>	<b>INSPECTOR'S REMARKS</b>
APP/D3315/E/14/2 228525	DEMOLITION OF OUTBUILDING AND ERECTION OF EXTENSION AT HIGHLANDS MANOR, 55B TRULL ROAD, TAUNTON	The proposed single storey extension by reason of its design and location would have a detrimental impact on the integrity of the building and its setting to the detriment of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. It is contrary to Policies CP8 and DM1 of the Taunton Deane Core Strategy, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservations Areas) 1990 and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.	38/14/0291	The appeal property is a well proportioned, pleasingly elevated, detached two storey Victorian villa that has been subdivided to create two dwellings. It is located on a corner plot within the Haines Hill Conservation Area. The Conservation Area is residential in character, with large Victorian villas in substantial gardens, which creates a very agreeable street scene. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated

				<p>heritage asset.</p> <p>Taunton Deane Borough Council Core Strategy 2012 (Core Strategy) Policy CP8 states that the Council will conserve and enhance the natural and historic environment and will not permit development proposals that would harm these interests. Furthermore, Core Strategy Policy DM1 provides a criterion based approach for development proposals. Criteria (d) states that the appearance and character of any affected landscape, settlement, building or street scene would not be unacceptably harmed by the development proposals. I find that these policies are in general conformity with the Framework.</p> <p>As I saw on my site visit there is an existing two storey rear extension, with a single storey sunroom attached. The proposed development would extend this sunroom, forming an 'L' shape running in a north/south direction along the rear elevation, which fronts Trull Road. As part of the proposal an</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>existing outbuilding would be removed.</p> <p>7. The proposed extension would not be open to wide views due to the extensive boundary landscaping but nevertheless with a property of this elevational quality within a Conservation Area it is important to ensure that any additions would harmonise with the host dwelling. The proposal here would have an awkward visual relationship to the main building. It would obscure some of the picturesque gothic style architectural features of the rear elevation, in particular it would impinge upon the extremely attractive casement door.</p> <p>Furthermore the gable roof would be a bulky addition and would awkwardly cut across the windows at first floor level. Accordingly, the proposal fails to fully appreciate and relate to either the site or its immediate surroundings. I consider that it would be an</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>inappropriate form of development which would detract from and result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the Conservation Area.</p> <p>8. In reaching this opinion I acknowledge the comments regarding the quoin detailing and whether the property is the work of the local architect Richard Carver. However, these matters do not add weight either in favour of or against the development. The absence of harm in one respect cannot outweigh harm in another. Such factors are essentially neutral in the final balance.</p> <p>9. I have had regard to the removal of the existing outbuilding. I note that the Council has not raised any specific objection to its removal and I see no reason to disagree with its stance. However, the appellants have not indicated that they would wish to implement this part of the scheme in</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>isolation.</p> <p>10. Whilst the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the Heritage Assets, it has not been demonstrated that any public benefits would outweigh the harm identified. It would, therefore, conflict with paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>11. This leads me to conclude on this main issue, that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and that the proposal would be contrary to the Framework and Core Strategy Policies CP8 and DM10, the objectives of which are set out above.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>12. I conclude, for the reasons set out above, and taking into account all other matters raised, that the appeal should be dismissed.</p>
--	--	--	--	--