



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2025

by **N Perrins MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D0121/D/25/3369013
6 Herbert Road, Clevedon BS21 7ND

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Alexander Warner against the decision of North Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/P/0506/FUH.
 - The development proposed is removal of existing front boundary wall and creation of off-road parking including dropped kerb and landscaping alterations to the front of the property.
-

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 Clevedon Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located within a terrace of buildings on the western side of Herbert Road. Like most other properties in the area, there is a small garden at the front of the appeal site, situated behind a low boundary wall with a gate. The proposal involves demolishing part of the existing front boundary wall to create an off-road parking space for one vehicle, along with associated new landscaping.
4. The appeal site is located within the Clevedon Conservation Area (CA). The duty under Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas. I am also aware that there is an Article 4 direction in place that has removed some permitted development rights in the CA.
5. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. From the limited information before me and from what I observed on my site inspection, the significance of the CA derives from the visual quality of its period Georgian / Victorian architecture and buildings. This presents a visually consistent and attractive historic townscape with properties and front gardens appearing generally similar to each other in their form and overall design.

6. The appeal site contributes to the character of the CA by reflecting the key architectural features found along the street, particularly in its front boundary stone wall and small garden, which are similar to those on other properties. Although there are some breaks in the continuity of these low boundary walls, they generally create a consistent and uniform appearance, despite some variations in height, composition, and materials. The presence and general uniformity of the low boundary walls and front gardens play an important role in defining the visual qualities and significance of the CA.
7. Although the neighbouring property has had its front boundary wall removed, the resulting open frontage does not positively reflect the general character of the street, which overwhelmingly comprises traditional low front boundary walls in front of properties. Removing part of the appeal property's wall as is proposed would, therefore, further erode a feature that has a positive contribution to the special character of the CA along Herbert Road.
8. I recognise the appellant has sought to minimise the impact of this by incorporating elements such as supporting landscaping, suitable materials and retention of the existing gate section. However, they do not sufficiently mitigate the harm that would arise due to the extent of existing wall, and resultant prominently visible change to the character of the CA, that would be lost to create the parking space. Moreover, the retention of the gate and piers would appear as an incongruously isolated feature in the middle of what would then be two large gaps in front boundary walls along the terrace. Overall, the proposed development would remove an excessive amount of the wall, which is a valued component of the street scene that helps to preserve the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area (CA).
9. I have also considered the examples provided by the appellant regarding parking created at the front of other nearby properties in other parts of the CA where the Article 4 direction exists. Upon review, these instances are not directly comparable to the current proposal: one was refused, while others were either approved prior to the adoption of the current development plan, located on different streets with varying contexts, had alternative designs such as including gates, or were related to other types of developments. Therefore, these examples do not address the specific concerns identified with this proposal and consequently do not provide any justification for the harm identified in this case.
10. Consequently, and having carefully considered the proposed design and site-specific context, I find that the proposal would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the area and would result in less than substantial harm to the CA's special significance. In recognition of the attempts to arrive at an appropriate design, I find that this harm would be at the lower end of the less than substantial harm scale.
11. Nonetheless, Paragraph 215 of the Framework requires that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
12. In this regard, I have considered the potential public benefits and other material considerations presented by the appellant, including the identified support for the proposal.

13. Firstly, whilst the general lack of electric vehicle infrastructure in the area is recognised, from the information before me there are still other options available to charge a vehicle, albeit potentially less convenient and more costly. Moreover, public benefits that could be derived towards meeting climate targets from one electric vehicle parking space would be limited in isolation. For these reasons, the potential climate benefits of being able to charge an electric vehicle at the property are not sufficient to outweigh the harm to the CA in this case.
14. The appellant has also identified challenges in communication with the Council during and after the application process, including requests to discuss additional benefits or alternatives such as cross pavement charging solutions for potential inclusion in the proposals. However, other potential benefits and options are outside the scope of this appeal and would need to be addressed through a new application, where they could be appropriately considered afresh.
15. I also acknowledge the potential impact of proposed changes to parking in the area that could result in displacement from areas with controls and those that do not. However, as these changes are still in process of being implemented, their connection to the proposed development have not been clearly established for me to be able to attribute any weight to this in my assessment.
16. To conclude, the proposal would neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA and would result in less than substantial harm to its special significance. Whilst this impact would be at the lower end of less than substantial harm, there are no public benefits identified that would outweigh this harm. The proposal, therefore, does not accord with Policies CS5 and CS12 of the North Somerset Core Strategy (2017) and Policies DM3 and DM32 of the Sites and Policies Plan Part 1 Development Management Policies (2016), which state that the Council will conserve the historic environment having regard to the significance of heritage assets such as CAs, ensure new development will not cause harm to the existing character and appearance of the CA require proposals of all scales to demonstrate sensitivity to the existing local character. The proposal also does not accord with the requirements of Paragraphs 212 and 215 of the Framework.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above and considering all matters raised, I conclude that the proposal does not accord with the development plan, and the appeal is dismissed.

N Perrins

INSPECTOR