

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2016

by David Walker MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/F0114/W/16/3153919

1 Meadow View, Radstock BA3 3QT

- 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 Powney Ford against the decision of Bath & North East Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01226/FUL, dated 11 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Radstock Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The proposal would be a small detached two storey dwelling in a plot formed from part of the existing garden to No 1. It would be located at a corner position on the junction of Meadow View with Kilmersdon Road and within the Radstock Conservation Area. The latter is an extensive heritage asset that covers much of the town including its centre.
 4. Although outer lying in the conservation area it is a prominent site. The openness of the existing garden allows views into Meadow View from along the Kilmersdon Road toward the stone gable and stack of No 1 and the traditional architecture of the street. These elements of the vernacular building traditions of the area are defining features at this part of the conservation area. The openness of the appeal site thus plays an important role in setting the scene at this part of Radstock for the remainder of the heritage asset.
 5. In this context the proposal would fill most of the plot with a new building. It would close off views of the entrance of Meadow View and erode the contribution that the openness of the site makes to the conservation area. Moreover, the central position of the dwelling in the plot would be a departure from the existing pattern of semi-detached houses in narrow linear plots along this side of the street. The dwelling would accordingly be out of character and appear as a disjointed element in the streetscene.
-

6. I acknowledge that the design of the proposed dwelling has sought to integrate it with the design of the other houses at this part of Meadow View. In particular, the white lias stone, slate finished roof, and sash windows with Bath stone dressings would be sympathetic to the architectural traditions of the locale. However, such details would not offset the harmful effect of the discordant pattern of development and the loss of a significant open area I have identified. Such harm would be compounded by the reduction in height of the prominent stone wall that surrounds much of the appeal site.
7. My attention has also been brought to a recent house provided opposite the appeal site and to 200 new houses under construction nearby, also within the conservation area. Of these, the house opposite occupies an infill plot and is less prominent, and I have no details of the other development before me to draw any parallels between the cases. I have thus determined the appeal on its merits and in the light of the relative prominence of the site within the available streetscene views.
8. As a result I find the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area. With regard to paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework the harm I have identified would be less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset, but would not be outweighed by the limited public benefits that would accrue from an additional single dwelling.
9. I conclude therefore that as the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Radstock Conservation Area it would conflict with saved Policy BH.6 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan 2007 (the Local Plan). This policy requires particular attention to be given to the impact of a proposed development on townscape, and the relationship of buildings to open space and historic grains, among other matters. The proposal would also conflict with saved Policies D.2 and D.4 of the Local Plan and their requirements to respond positively to the character of the public realm and local context.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and with regard to the development plan read as a whole and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Walker

INSPECTOR