The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2019

by R Cooper BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/F0114/W/19/3228871
20 Shickle Grove, Odd Down, Bath BA2 2TP

- 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 Good against the decision of Bath & North East Somerset Council.
- The application Ref 19/00932/FUL, dated 4 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 May 2019.
- The development proposed is the building of side and rear roof extensions to facilitate proposed loft conversion.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant's description of the development is a loft conversion. The submitted plans show that this would consist of a pitched roof dormer extension to the side and a flat roof dormer extension to the rear. I consider this a more accurate description of the proposals and have proceeded on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed roof extensions on the character and appearance of the area including on the setting of a Bath World Heritage Site.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located at 20 Shickle Grove, within a residential street that comprises mostly of two storey, semi-detached dwellings with some terraced corner dwellings, all of a similar design and appearance, and the use of honey-coloured Bath stone finish, and a uniform hipped roof appearance which contributes to the area's prevailing suburban character. The site also falls within the Bath World Heritage Site (WHS), whose significant physical and cultural attributes consist of Roman remains, honey coloured stone buildings, many Georgian buildings and Neo-classical architecture, which contribute to a high quality design character and appearance of the WHS.

5. The proposed dormers would be setback from the side and rear external walls, however, they would occupy a significant proportion of the side and rear facing roof slopes. They would also be interlinked so that from the rear elevation

their combined appearance would extend almost the full width of the property when viewed from the rear. Furthermore, the roof of the dormer to the rear would have an uncharacteristic flat roof design, which would have a box-like appearance. In combination the dormers would result in a significant building mass which would appear over-dominant when viewed from properties and the access road to the rear, and from Shickle Grove to the front.

6. By reason of their combined size and design, the dormers would appear unacceptably dominant, unsympathetic to the property's character and appearance, which by consequence would be substantially harmed. Furthermore, the introduction of the dormer would appear obtrusive and interrupt the uniform appearance of the dwellings in the area. This would result in an incongruous feature, causing harm to the street scene and the prevailing character and appearance of the area.

7. The WHS encompasses much of the city of Bath, the main features the appeal property shares and contributes to the special character of WHS is the use of honey coloured Bath stone. The dormer extensions would not affect this and would not cause harm to, or loss of the special architectural, cultural or historic interest which contribute to the outstanding universal value of the WHS and its setting. The integrity of the WHS would be maintained, in this respect and the proposals accord with Policy B4 of the Bath and North Somerset Core Strategy 2014 (Core Strategy) and Policy HE.1 of the Bath and North Somerset Core Strategy and Placemaking Plan 2017 (Placemaking Plan). However, this does not alter my conclusions on the effect the dormers would have on the character and appearance of the area.

8. As such, the proposed dormer extensions would not respect the local character and distinctiveness and would fail to accord with the standards of design required by Policy CP6 of the Core Strategy and Policies D1, D2, D3 and D5 of the Placemaking Plan and paragraph 127 of the Framework, which collectively seek to ensure that new development is of high quality design, which respects local character, integrates with its surroundings.

Other Matters

9. I have considered the submissions from the appellant and local residents who consider the proposals to be a positive, that they do not consider there to be negative visual implications and that there are others in the area, this does not alter my findings on the main issue above. However, as outlined above I have found that the scheme would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

R Cooper

INSPECTOR