

Taunton Deane Borough Council

Planning Committee – 6 September 2006

1. The following appeals have been lodged:-

Applicant	Date Application Considered	Proposal
Mr T. Klimpke (43/2006/018)	15/05/06	Demolition of buildings and erection of 1no. flat over new arch to existing business, 58 - 60 Mantle Street, Wellington
A. Kemp	-	Appeal against Enforcement Notice - Site at Higher House Farm, Helland Lane, Stoke St. Gregory
Glenmill Homes Ltd	-	Appeal against Enforcement Notice – Site at Maidenbrook Farmhouse, Cheddon Fitzpaine
Cardinal Developments Limited (10/2005/023)	18/01/06	Change of use, conversion and extension to form dwelling at The Pound House, Trents Farm, Churchinford
Christopher John Mogg (38/2006/016)	DD	Retention of raised decking area at 1 Trevett Road, Taunton

2. The following appeal decisions have been received: -

- (a) **Erection of a two storey extension at Yeomans, East Combe, Bishops Lydeard (06/2005/041)**

The main issue was the effect of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

The proposed extension would be a large and bulky structure, at right angles to the main building, which would dominate views of the rear of the building and have a harmful effect on the general linear arrangement. In addition it would partially remove and obscure much of the important lean-to structure.

The Inspector acknowledged that the vegetation around the perimeter prevented public views of the rear of the building, however this did not prevent or mitigate the significant harm to the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

He concluded that the proposal would not preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and would conflict with the aims and objectives of Local Plan Policies.

The appeal was dismissed.

(b) Erection of one detached dwelling with integral garage, extension to No.1 Piffin Lane and erection of garages for Nos 1 and 4 Piffin Lane, land adjacent to north side of Piffin Lane behind 1-4 Church Street, Bishops Lydeard (06/2005/033)

The main issue was the effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including the Conservation Area.

In principle, a dwelling continuing the frontage development would be appropriate for this location. However, the proposal would be considerably forward of the general line of building on this side of the road and would be unacceptably dominant in views from Church Street.

The adjacent cottage had a particularly small scale created by its overall size and window level and the low ridge and eaves height of the proposal attempted to reflect the scale of this cottage. However, the Inspector felt the window arrangement would be a dominant feature and the substantial difference in levels between the windows of the cottage and proposed new dwelling would be stark.

The church was an important feature of the village and the current views to it would be obscured by the proposal, but the Inspector considered the impact of this change on the Conservation Area as a whole would be limited and important views of the church from elsewhere would be unaffected.

The proposal would increase the amount of vehicles using Piffin Lane, but the Inspector did not consider that it would be enough to affect highway safety or disrupt use of the lane.

Overall he considered that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation of the area as a whole.

The appeal was dismissed.

(c) Display of illuminated fascia sign at 42 Bridge Street, Taunton (38/2006/046A)

The main issue was the visual impact of the fascia sign on the premises and within the surroundings.

The appeal frontage had been modernised, with a low height shop front being installed. The appeal fascia, was considerably below the level of the retained fascia panel. It was also considerably deep, which made it look awkwardly sited and top heavy on the frontage. This was emphasised by its bold colour scheme and protruding spotlights.

The Inspector accepted that the premises were not within a designated Conservation Area and that there was a wide variety of signs in the vicinity. However, for the most part these seemed to relate acceptably in terms and size and position on the frontages. He considered that the appeal sign stood out with undue assertiveness within the surroundings and concluded that the display of the appeal sign was detrimental to the interests of amenity.

The appeal was dismissed.

(d) Retention of a boundary fence at 1 Burch's Close, Comeytrowe (52/2005/033)

The appeal concerned a 1.2m high fence, which had already been erected along part of the eastern boundary of the residential property.

The Inspector noted that the existing houses had small open plan front gardens which provided a soft landscaped setting. He was, therefore, concerned that the fence represented a form of hard landscaping, which would erode the spacious character of the front garden and detract from the pleasant open character of the area.

He felt that approval of this proposal would establish a damaging precedent and make it difficult to resist proposals for similar enclosures at nearby properties, which would cause a significant cumulative harm to the character and appearance of the area.

The Inspector acknowledged the fact that in some instances the front gardens were partially enclosed by shrubs and other plants, however this did not have the same effect as a solid means of enclosure. The appellant argued that the fence was necessary to improve the security of the garden and prevented littering, however the Inspector felt a hedge of an appropriate type and density would achieve the same effect.

The appeal was dismissed.

**(e) Formation of access and driveway to 2 and 3 Burnshill Terrace,
Norton Fitzwarren (25/2005/033)**

The appellant argued that the proposal would remove a number of parked vehicles from the highway, which could be regarded as a benefit. However, the site was situated on a long sweeping bend in the road and the Inspector noted that visibility was impeded in both directions, by the presence of the parked vehicles. As there were no restrictions to prevent vehicles from parking in the road, the benefit of removing one or two parking vehicles was far outweighed by allowing an additional access on a road where visibility might be restricted at any time, in either or both directions.

The Inspector was also concerned that there was insufficient space for a vehicle to turn on the frontage of the site. Although a turning space could be provided in the rear garden, the drive to it would be a considerable, narrow length such that vehicles would not be able to pass each other. Vehicles might therefore need to reverse onto the highway if two vehicles met on the driveway, or if access to the rear was obstructed by another parked car.

The Inspector acknowledged that other properties had vehicular access onto the B3227, but this was not a reason to allow the appeal which would perpetuate and exacerbate a potentially hazardous situation.

The appeal was dismissed.

Contact Officer: Richard Bryant Telephone 01823 356414 or
e-mail r.bryant@tauntondeane.gov.uk