



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2017

by Neil Pope BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 31 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D3315/Y/17/3173605

45, Bridge Street, Taunton, Somerset, TA1 1TP.

- 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 Vas Kimitri of Bare Grills against the decision of Taunton Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Ref.38/17/0045/LB, dated 6/2/17, was refused by notice dated 27/3/17.
 - The works proposed are described as the *regularisation of previous listed building consent 38/16/0261/LB to include the installation of three number bulkhead light fittings mounted to the flat pilasters on the front façade.*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for three bulkhead light fittings at 45, Bridge Street, Taunton, Somerset, TA1 1TP.

Preliminary Matter

2. A more concise description of the works is three bulkhead light fittings.

Reasons

3. 41-55 Bridge Street is a terrace of mid/late 19th century 3-storey houses (now in commercial use). The significance of this grade II listed row is derived primarily from its architectural qualities (including brick walls, parapets and sash windows) and historic associations with the development and growth of Taunton. No. 45 has been much altered and is now in use as a restaurant. The frontage includes a wide metal roller shutter, a plywood fascia sign and the three small lights which are affixed below the sign and to the sides of the modern shopfront windows. There are two sizeable lanterns on the frontage of No.41 and security/alarm boxes of various sizes and shapes across the terrace.
4. The bulkhead light fittings have a somewhat industrial appearance and do not enhance the appearance of the terrace. However, they are of a very modest size, do not protrude unduly from the façade of the building and the matt black finish ensures that they are not prominent additions. They sit comfortably alongside the metal roller shutter and illuminate business premises which are open into the evening. More importantly, they do not detract from the ability to appreciate or understand the significance of the terrace. I concur with the appellant's Architect that these minor works, which are reversible, preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building/terrace. There is no conflict with national or local planning policies for protecting heritage assets.

Neil Pope Inspector