



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 9 March 2021

by David Murray BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F0114/D/20/3262758

17 Grosvenor Bridge Road, Lambridge, Bath, BA1 6BB

- 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 Michael Grigg against the decision of Bath and North East Somerset Council.
- The application Ref 20/03159/FUL, dated 27 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 October 2020.
- The development proposed is erection of a first floor extension over a study at ground floor level.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host property and its setting within the Bath Conservation Area.

Reasons

Background

3. The appeal site comprises a two storey semi-detached house with stone elevations and a tiled roof. The property lies in a street with a variety of house types and designs and there is a small gap to the neighbouring detached property (No.19) to the south-east. The host dwelling has a single storey extension to the right hand side providing a shower room and study and there is a lean-to glass conservatory at the rear. It is proposed to construct a first floor extension above this and clad the whole structure in timber.

Effect on character and appearance

4. At the start of the assessment I recognise that the design philosophy of the extension put forward is to create a deliberate contrast with the form and materials of the host property and have a modern solution which fits in with the re-moulded interior of the property and also overcomes the current technical problems of water penetration. However, the scheme put forward would not result in an appropriate design that fits in with the prevailing character of the public realm.
5. Although the architecture of the properties in the street is mixed there is a common theme of natural stone or reconstituted stone elevations and the houses /semis along the north-eastern side of Grosvenor Bridge Road are individually distinct with important visual gaps between. The present single

storey side extension with the 'false' garage doors is of a design and form that maintains this visual form of the host property. The proposal to add a first floor would result in the loss of much of the visual gap to number 19 and the prominence of the extension would be increased by the lack of 'set back' from the corner of the front wall of the projecting gable of the property. Moreover, the prominent bulk of the extension would be made much more apparent by the use of 'rainscreen' cladding with vertical larch boarding over a two storey height.

6. I have taken account of the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) about the need to achieve well-designed places and that encouragement is given for innovative designs, but paragraph 131 of the Framework makes clear that such schemes still have to fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings. In this case I find that the scheme put forward would have a jarring and a visually harmful effect on the host property and on its setting in the wider street scene.
7. The design of the scheme put forward would harm rather than preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Bath Conservation Area, although I judge this harm to be 'less than substantial' as set out in paragraph 196 of the Framework. Overall, I find that the proposal would conflict with the requirements of Policies D1, D2, D3, D5 and HE1 of the Council's Core Strategy in terms of maintaining and enhancing the urban fabric of the area and especially where it is a historic environment.

Other Matters

8. A neighbour also raises an objection to the proposal on the grounds of loss of light into their property, overshadowing of the path and concerns about the effect on foundations. I noted at the site visit that the adjoining property has a blank side elevation but a glazed conservatory to the rear. The proposal would add a first floor over the existing single storey one but this would not extend further to the rear and I am satisfied that the relationship with the neighbouring property would not materially reduce the light to the conservatory or harm the living conditions of the occupiers. The effects of the proposal on other foundations is mostly a private matter or is addressed by other legislation such as the Building Regulations and/or the Party Wall Act.

Planning balance

9. On the main issue I have found that the proposed first floor extension and recladding in timber boarding would have a jarring and inappropriate visual effect on the host property and its setting in the street scene, contrary to the relevant stated policies in the development plan.
10. In considering the effect on the heritage asset of the Conservation Area I have placed great weight on the asset's conservation. The proposal would result in 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of this designed heritage asset but it has not been demonstrated that this harm is outweighed by any public benefits in the proposal.
11. Overall, the conflict with the development plan, when considered as a whole, is not outweighed by any other consideration and this indicates that the appeal should not be allowed.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Murray

INSPECTOR