



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2025

by V Simpson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 January 2026

Appeal A Ref: 6000615

Flat 1, 9 Walcot Buildings, Walcot, Bath, Bath And North East Somerset BA1 6AD

- 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 Jonothan Hope against the decision of Bath and North East Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01750/ful.
 - The development proposed is single room extension from the existing ground floor flat to the side of the existing kitchen.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/F0114/Y/25/3369985

Flat 1, 9 Walcot Buildings, Walcot, Bath, Bath And North East Somerset BA1 6AD

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Jonothan Hope against the decision of Bath and North East Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01865/LBA.
 - The works proposed are described as single room extension from the existing ground floor flat to the side of the existing kitchen.
-

Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeals relate to the same site, and to very similar works and development. Therefore, and despite the differences in the planning permission and listed building consent regimes, both appeals are dealt with together. This is to avoid unnecessary repetition.
4. The appeal site comprises a single flat within the Grade II listed building at 8-11 Walcot Buildings¹ (the listed building). It is also within the Bath Conservation Area (the CA). Consequently, in reaching my decisions, I have exercised my statutory duties under 66(1) – for appeal A, 16(2) – for appeal B, and 72(1) – for both appeals, of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 – as amended (the Act).

¹ Official list entry number: 1395532

5. One of the plans listed on the decision notice for application ref 25/01865/LBA is 9WB-LB-06D. The Council has subsequently confirmed that this reference was made in error, and that plan ref 9WB-LB-02d should have been cited. I proceed on that basis.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is whether the development and works would i) preserve the Grade II listed building – 8-11 Walcot Buildings or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, ii) preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Bath Conservation Area; and, iii) safeguard the Outstanding Universal Value of the City of Bath World Heritage Site.

Reasons

Significance / special interest

7. The official list entry indicates that the listed building, which is of a much lower height than other buildings in the wider terrace, previously comprised 4 terraced houses with shops, and dates from the late 18th or early 19th century - altered in the 20th century. Two of the main contributors to this listed buildings significance are its surviving historic fabric – which includes elements of high-quality neoclassical design detailing and ashlar limestone walling, and the status differentiation between the front street-facing and rear garden-facing elevations. Although the property has been subject of many alterations over time, and despite the rear extensions that have been added, such works and developments have not wholly undermined the intrinsic heritage merit of the asset.
8. In so far as they relate to the appeal site, rear extensions have taken place which include a large ‘boxy’ 3 storey rendered extension to the rear of the building and a later single storey extension that projects further back into the site. These additions do not contribute positively to the listed building’s significance. However, there is also a 2-storey rear gable that projects further back into the appeal site than the main historic rear wall of the listed building. Although the evidence indicates that this element is unlikely to be an original part of the building, it reads as a clearly subservient addition to it. Moreover, this element is either constructed from or faced in large blocks of cut and dressed limestone, and it incorporates exterior openings of similar proportions to those found elsewhere within the building’s historic fabric. As such, and even if this rear gable has less significance than other parts of the historic fabric of the wider listed building, it displays an architectural authenticity that is appropriate to it, and it makes at least a modest positive contribution to the overall significance of the listed building.
9. The Bath CA encompasses much of the city. The Council’s Bath City-wide Character Appraisal Supplementary Planning Document², indicates that the hot springs and the associated royal patronage during the Georgian era led to an increase in Bath’s popularity as a fashionable resort - a place to see as well as to be seen. Bath’s increasing popularity during that time led to a period of development that was characterised by neo-classical architecture and frequent use of cut and dressed limestone blocks for the exterior walls of many of the terrace buildings within it. The pleasing beauty of much of the resultant

² Bath & North East Somerset – Bath City-wide Character Appraisal Supplementary Planning Document

architecture and the historic and cultural interest associated with this phase of the City's development, contribute to the special quality of the CA as a whole.

10. The site is also located within the City of Bath World Heritage Site (the WHS) which is internationally recognised to be of outstanding universal value (OUV), and which is a designated heritage asset of the highest significance. From the evidence before me, and pertinent to the appeal, the OUV and thus the significance of the WHS is primarily derived from its hot springs, Roman remains, and the collective beauty of many of the neoclassical Georgian era buildings and spaces within it. As a result, the WHS has extraordinary historical, architectural and cultural value as a historic spa town/city.
11. Although the flat subject to these appeals has been extended and altered over time, it is part of a wider building that evidence suggests dates from the latter end of the Georgian period. It also forms a small section of a wider terrace that is predominantly limestone-faced, with generally well-balanced neo-classical proportions and simple, harmonious detailing typical of that architectural style. As such, and despite previous boxy single- and three-storey rear extensions on the appeal site, other parts of the flat—such as its dressed limestone walls—continue to make a modest but positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area (CA) as a whole and to the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site (WHS).

Effects of the works and development

12. The form, design detailing and exterior materials of the proposed schemes would relate well to the existing single-storey rear extension on the appeal site. However, when considered in combination with the existing single and 3 storey rear additions, the proposals would result in an extension that would project across almost the entire width of the appeal site. Such development and works would also obscure the only remaining part of the ground-floor level limestone walling to the rear of flat 1. Furthermore, the wide glazed opening in the rear of the proposed extension would be incongruous with the more classically proportioned upper-floor window openings in that historic part of the building above the flat subject of this appeal. Consequently, the extension would read as a dominant addition to the rear of the building on the appeal site. Moreover, and even if the existing 2-storey rear 'extension' is not an original part of the building, the development and works would both obscure parts of the flat and visually compete with other parts of the building that contribute to its special interest. The addition would also further dilute the status differentiation between the front and rear elevations of the listed building. For these reasons, the schemes would cause harm to the significance of this listed building.
13. Irrespective of whether listed buildings or parts of them are publicly visible, these buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest. Although the proposals would be undertaken to the rear of the building, where boundary walls and other surrounding buildings mean they would not be visually prominent from outside the appeal site. However, Nevertheless, the harmful effects identified to the listed building would also result in some residual harm to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole and to the OUV of the WHS.

Public benefits / heritage balance

14. In line with paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), I give great weight to the conservation of the designated heritage assets, which in this case are the listed building, the CA and the WHS, and proceed on the basis that the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be.
15. I also note the principles set out in the Government's Planning Practice Guidance³. One of which is to protect the WHS and its setting from the effects of changes which are relatively minor but which, on a cumulative basis, could have a significant effect.
16. Even accounting for the fact that WHS's are heritage assets of the highest significance, the modest scale of the schemes, which are for a fairly small extension to the rear of a single flat, mean that the harm that would be caused to the listed building, CA, and WHS, would, individually and cumulatively, be at the lower end of the scale of less than substantial. Nevertheless, the harm that would be so caused to each of these designated heritage assets carries considerable importance and weight.
17. Paragraph 215 of the Framework indicates 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.
18. Economic benefits would arise during the implementation of the schemes. Moreover, I do not doubt that the enlarged dwelling would afford the appellant and future occupiers with improved living conditions and space for a home office. However, if the schemes subject of these appeals were not implemented, I do not anticipate the cessation of use of the property, or that it would fail to be adequately maintained. Therefore, and because of the modest scale of the proposals, each of the previously identified public benefits would be small, and very little weight can be attributed to them. Consequently, when taken together, these public benefits would not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the significance of the listed building, the CA or the WHS.
19. For the reasons given, the proposals would not preserve the Grade II Listed Building 8-11 Walcot Buildings or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, they would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Bath Conservation Area, and, they would cause harm to the outstanding universal value of the City of Bath World Heritage Site. Consequently, the appeal schemes would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and the provisions in the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment. The development and works would also conflict with policies B4 and CP6 of the Council's Core Strategy⁴, and policies D2, D5 and HE1 of the Council's Placemaking Plan⁵. Collectively and amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that schemes contribute positively to local character and distinctiveness, and to sustain and enhance the significance of the District's historic environment. This is unless the harm that would be caused to a designated heritage asset would be outweighed by the associated public benefits.

³ Planning Practice Guidance: Paragraph: 032 Reference ID: 18a-032-20190723.

⁴ Bath & North East Somerset Council - Bath and North East Somerset Core Strategy Part 1 of the Local Plan – adopted July 2014

⁵ Bath & North East Somerset Council – Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan 2011-2029 Core Strategy & Placemaking Plan - District-wide Strategy and Policies – Volume 1 – adopted July 2017

Other Matters

20. My attention has been drawn to a rear extension to 6 Walcot Buildings which was granted planning permission by the Council⁶. While I do not have a full understanding of the basis for that grant of planning permission, both the building subject of that application and the form and design detailing of the proposals were materially different from those in these appeals. Consequently, this other scheme is not directly comparable with the proposals subject of these appeals.
21. Even if there was previously a structure/structures in the location of the proposed development and works, it/they have since been removed. That being the case, the existing site context provides the baseline for these decisions.
22. That the development would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties is a neutral consideration.

Conclusion

23. The development subject of appeal A would conflict with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.
24. Moreover, and for the reasons previously given, I also conclude that appeal B should be dismissed.

V Simpson

INSPECTOR

⁶ Application ref: 22/01482/ful