

## Bath & North East Somerset Council

**MEETING:** Development Control Committee

**MEETING DATE:** 18<sup>th</sup> January 2012

AGENDA  
ITEM  
NUMBER

**RESPONSIBLE OFFICER:** Lisa Bartlett, Development Control Manager,  
Planning and Transport Development (Telephone:  
01225 477281)

**TITLE:** NEW PLANNING APPEALS, DECISIONS RECEIVED AND DATES OF  
FORTHCOMING HEARINGS/INQUIRIES

**WARD:** ALL

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:** None

**AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM**

### APPEALS LODGED

**App. Ref:** 11/01614/FUL  
**Location:** Lock Up Garages Adj To Royal British Legion Club High Street Paulton  
Bristol  
**Proposal:** Erection of 3no flats following demolition of garages  
**Decision:** REFUSE  
**Decision Date:** 10 August 2011  
**Decision Level:** Chair Referral  
**Appeal Lodged:** 15 December 2011

---

**App. Ref:** 11/03794/FUL  
**Location:** 358 Bloomfield Road Bloomfield Bath BA2 2PD  
**Proposal:** Provision of a loft conversion with 2no. dormer windows.  
**Decision:** REFUSE  
**Decision Date:** 15 November 2011  
**Decision Level:** Delegated  
**Appeal Lodged:** 22 December 2011

---

### APPEAL DECISIONS

**App. Ref:** 10/04570/FUL  
**Location:** 178 Englishcombe Lane, Southdown, Bath  
**Proposal:** Provision of rear dormer window for loft conversion  
**Decision:** Refuse  
**Decision Date:** 30 December 2011

**Decision Level:** Delegated  
**Appeal Decision:** Dismissed

**Summary:**

This application sought planning permission for the provision of a dormer roof extension to the rear elevation of the property. The reason for refusal relates to the detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area. The Inspector agreed with the Council that the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area.

---

**App. Ref:** 10/05211/FUL  
**Location:** 7 Entry Rise, Combe Down, Bath  
**Proposal:** Conversion of loft with 1no side dormer and 1no rear flat roof dormer (Resubmission)  
**Decision:** Refuse  
**Decision Date:** 13 April 2011  
**Decision Level:** Delegated  
**Appeal Decision:** Dismissed

**Summary:**

This application sought planning permission for the provision of a dormer roof extension to the side elevation of the property. The reason for refusal relates to the detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host building and the street scene. The Inspector agreed with the Council that the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the host building and the street scene.

---

**App. Ref:** 11/01297/FUL  
**Location:** Pizza Express, 8 Southgate Place, BATH, BA1 1AP  
**Proposal:** Display of 1no non-illuminated projecting sign (Retrospective) (Resubmission)  
**Decision:** Refuse  
**Decision Date:** 28 March 2011  
**Decision Level:** Delegated  
**Appeal Decision:** Dismissed

**Summary:**

This application sought retrospective advertisement consent for the display of a non-illuminated projecting sign. The reason for refusal relates to the detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host building and the Conservation Area. The Inspector agreed with the Council that the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the host building and the Conservation Area.

---

**App. Ref:** 11/02342/FUL  
**Location:** 7 Kingsway, Bath BA2 2NH  
**Proposal:** The development proposed is a rear dormer  
**Decision:** Refused  
**Decision Date:** 23 August 2011  
**Decision Level:** Delegated  
**Appeal Decision:** Dismissed

**Summary:**

The reason for refusal related to the design, size and width of the proposed dormer which would detract from the character and appearance of the existing building, within the World Heritage Site, and the terrace of which it forms a part.

The Inspector considered that the principal issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

The proposed dormer would have a flat roof and would occupy most of the rear roof-plane. Although it would be set down from the ridge, away from the sides, and well up from the eaves, it would still have the appearance of a large and dominant feature. It was considered that it would overpower the existing dwelling and would not be in keeping with it.

Upon site inspection it was noted that one of the houses (no.11) has a large rear dormer. It appears incongruous and intrusive in the otherwise untouched roof-scape at the rear of this handsome terrace, which appears to date from the early 19<sup>th</sup>-century. The Inspector commented that the building lies within the designated World Heritage Site, where design standards assume a particular importance.

The appellant had brought to the Inspector's attention other examples of rear dormers in the wider area. While these were acknowledged the existence of such dormers, and the subjective nature of any assessment of design merits, it was considered that the proposed development on this specific site would result in an over-dominant and bulky dormer.

It was concluded that the proposed development would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the host building and of the area, contrary to policies BH1, D2 and D4 of the 2007 Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan.

---