

<p>PADWORTH 11/00107</p> <p>Pins Ref 2157560</p>	<p>Comfort Inn And Land to the south west Bath Road Padworth SKC Group of Companies</p>	<p>Demolition of the existing hotel and proposed development and change of use of the site and the adjacent vacant site to provide 2 no blocks of 30 affordable residential flats.</p>	<p>Delegated Refusal</p>	<p>Allowed 10.1.12</p>
--	---	--	------------------------------	----------------------------

The Inspector considered that there were two main issues: The effect on the character and appearance of the area and AONB and secondly whether the developer contributions were satisfactory.

The inspector noted that the development to the south was fairly prominent and that there was a planning permission for three storey flats to the north of the site. He noted that the timber finish of the development would be novel in this locality but he felt that there is no typical appearance or size to structures in this part of the Bath Road and therefore a contemporary approach was appropriate and the design was acceptable in the setting. On balance he did not consider that it would be harmful to the AONB.

The inspector accepted the cases made by education open space, libraries health care and adult social care as well as recycling in respect of developer contributions. A Unilateral was submitted to cover these issues.

The Inspector allowed the appeal.

The applicants had also made a costs application partly on the grounds that the Council had discontinued its pre-application discussions. However it was clear that some pre-application discussion had taken place which helped to shape the scheme. The Council was not unreasonable in choosing not to continue the dialogue.

On other matters he considered that although he had reached a different conclusion to the Council, sufficient realistic and specific evidence was provided by the Council who adequately substantiated their reason for refusal and that the Council were not unreasonable in their handling of the decision.

The application for an award of costs was therefore refused.