



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2017

by J Wilde C Eng MICE

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

Decision date: 20 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F0114/D/17/3175359
103 West Avenue, Bath, Somerset, BA2 3QB

- 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 and Mrs R Ford against the decision of Bath & North East Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00357/FUL, dated 25 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 21 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mid-terraced dwelling with a pitched roof. The proposed dormer would take up a large proportion of the roof, being very close to the centre party wall on one side and extending to the chimney stack on the other, and being relatively close to the ridgeline of the roof. I note the reasons in terms of the creation of usable space, the efficient use of land and future sustainability for the proposed dimensions of the dormer, but nonetheless consider that it would unbalance and dominate the rear of the property such that it would be harmful to its character and appearance. It would also have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the wider area, although I accept that this has already to an extent been compromised by other dormers.
4. The proposed development would therefore conflict with policies D.4 and D.2 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan (including mineral and waste policies). The former of these seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that development responds to the local context in terms of appearance. The latter makes clear that development will only be permitted where the character of the public realm would be maintained or enhanced.
5. My attention has been drawn to a variety of other dormers in the area, some of which have seemingly been in receipt of planning permission. Nonetheless, to my mind these other dormers have not necessarily maintained the character or appearance of the area and cannot therefore be taken as a compelling

precedent for allowing the present appeal. I also note that the proposed dormer would not be readily visible from the public realm. It would however be visible from the area around the junction of West Avenue and Brook Road and from many properties to the rear of No 103.

Conclusion

6. In light of my above reasoning and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Wilde

INSPECTOR