



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2011

**by Paul Griffiths BSc(Hons) BArch IHBC**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 20 July 2011**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H3320/D/11/2153278**  
**37 King George Road, Minehead TA24 5JE**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Terry Bevans against the decision of West Somerset Council.
  - The application Ref.3/21/11/037, dated 17 March 2011, was refused by notice dated 6 May 2011.
  - The development proposed is described as 'construct dormer to side elevation'.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the wider area

## Reasons

3. The eastern part of King George Road is made up of semi-detached dwellings with hipped roofs that form a pleasing uniformity and rhythm in the street-scene. The proposed side-dormer would have a substantial bulk that would radically alter the profile of the existing roof. It would unbalance the semi-detached pair of which No.37 is a part and introduce an incongruous element that would harmfully disturb the existing street-scene.
4. Policies BD/1 and BD/3 of the West Somerset District Local Plan require, in essence, alterations to existing buildings to be appropriate to the building affected and the wider area. For the reasons set out, the proposal does not comply with those requirements.
5. I saw the examples of side-dormers in the western part of King George Road that have been referred to in support. They are visually remote from the appeal site and it is not clear whether they needed or were ever granted planning permission by the Council. In any event they all relate rather poorly to the parent dwelling and detract from the street-scene. Harmful development carried out or permitted in the past is no good reason to justify more.
6. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Paul Griffiths*

**INSPECTOR**