



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 March 2022

by A Tucker BA (Hons) IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F0114/Y/21/3278294

Keynsham Conservative Club, 22 High Street, Keynsham, BS31 1DQ

- 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 David Johnson against the decision of Bath and North East Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01303/LBA, dated 11 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2021.
 - The works proposed are described as 'retrospective planning consent: external alterations to paint the front elevation blue, reverting back to the colour that was in existence when the building was listed in 1975'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The front elevation of the building has already been painted. The appeal proposal seeks to retain the existing colour.
3. On 20 July 2021, after the Council made its decision, the Government published its revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). I am satisfied that the changes are not significant in relation to the appeal proposal. I therefore do not consider it necessary to invite further comments from the parties on this matter.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal upon the special interest of the grade II listed building, and whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the Keynsham Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. Section 16(2) of the LBCA requires the decision maker to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Additionally, Section 72 of the LBCA requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.
6. The appeal building is a prominent terraced building, dating from the late 18th or early 19th century. It was built as a dwelling, and despite a change of use in the early 19th century retains a domestic appearance, retaining historic joinery and a fine doorcase at street level. The survival of historic fabric within the

building's front façade, as well as its interesting asymmetric composition, are primary contributors to the special interest of the building.

7. It stands within the Keynsham Conservation Area (KCA), which covers a large area that includes the densely developed historic core of the town and the loosely developed land associated with the River Chew, immediately to the east of the town centre. The appeal building is a significant positive contributor to the character and appearance of the KCA, by virtue of its prominently positioned historic façade. It also contributes to the setting of other historic buildings within the terrace and wider area.
8. The blue that has been used is a deep modern colour. It is at odds with the wall colours used on most of the painted buildings within the KCA, which although varied, are mostly more muted and pick up on the traditional hues and tones that would have been used historically to mimic expensive ashlar stone. The modern vivid colour appears overly stark against the pale colours around the building's window and door openings, harming the overall homogeneity of this most significant element of the building. The proposal thus harms the special interest of the listed building and the character and appearance of the KCA.
9. It is suggested that the proposal reinstates the colour of the building when it was listed in 1975. A photo before me from this time shows the building painted blue. The image has been reproduced and is not entirely clear, however the colour shown appears to be a softer and more traditional tone of blue than the intense blue that has been used. I am therefore not satisfied that the evidence of the previous colour of the building is sufficient to justify the appeal proposal.
10. In terms of the Framework, the harm would be less than substantial, but is nevertheless of considerable importance and weight. Paragraph 202 of the Framework establishes that any harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
11. It is suggested that the building was previously dirty and drab and that the redecoration contributes to the revitalisation of the town. The photo that shows the previous colour scheme in 2017 indicates that the building was in need of redecorating, however redecorating it without changing the colour would have improved its appearance. As I have found that the new colour harms both the special interest of the building and the character and appearance of the KCA I cannot agree that it contributes to the revitalisation of the town. These matters therefore attract very limited weight in support of the proposal.
12. I give the harm I have identified considerable importance and weight. Indeed paragraph 199 of the Framework establishes that great weight should be given to the conservation of a heritage asset. In this context I find that the suggested benefits of the proposal are not sufficient to outweigh the degree of harm identified.
13. In summary I find that the proposal would fail to meet the requirements of the LBCA as it would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building or the wider character and appearance of the KCA. Although development plan policies do not strictly apply to applications for listed building consent, with reference to the Council's refusal reason the proposal would also conflict with Policy HE1 of the Bath and North East Somerset Placemaking Plan 2017, which

seeks to sustain and enhance the historic environment and reinforces the great weight given in the Framework to the conservation of heritage assets.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons above, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Tucker

INSPECTOR