
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 June 2017

by Neil Pope BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3305/Y/16/3164614

Bishops House, Moffats Drive, South Horrington Village, Wells, BA5 3LA.

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Paul Edwards against the decision of Mendip District Council.
 - The application Ref. 2016/2180/LBC, dated 25 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 November 2016.
 - The works proposed are an attic conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. Bishops House is part of a grade II listed mid-19th century chapel with covered approach to the rear of the former Mendip Hospital/asylum. Designed by G G Scott and W B Moffatt, the significance of this heritage asset is derived primarily from its architectural qualities (such as the coursed and square rubble walls, octagonal stone spire, bridge and slate roof) and its historic value, as an important example of Scott's early industrial work, as well as its original fabric.
3. The proposal would provide an en-suite bedroom within the appellant's house. This would include removing and re-fitting some raised collars to the roof trusses and fitting a new ridge beam to allow sufficient headroom. Whilst these works would be limited in their extent they would involve the loss/disturbance of part of the original fabric of the building. Eroding physical evidence of the skills/technology used to construct the building would diminish the architectural and historic interest of this nationally important building.
4. In the context of paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework this adverse impact would be at the lower end of less than substantial harm. Nevertheless, this does not amount to a less than substantial objection. There could also be future pressure to approve an external opening to provide natural light or ventilation to an otherwise rather oppressive habitable space. This would be likely to detract from the simple, pleasing appearance of the roof slope and further diminish the heritage interest of this designated asset.
5. When the building was adapted for residential use many of the original roof trusses were truncated. However, unlike the situation before me, these works were approved to secure the optimum viable use of the building. This approval does not set a precedent and there are no public benefits to outweigh the above harm. The proposal would fail to preserve features of architectural and historic interest which the listed building possesses. The appeal therefore fails.

Neil Pope Inspector
