

Appeal Decisions

Sites visit made on 25 October 2016

by J J Evans BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 14 November 2016

Appeal A Ref: APP/B1740/W/16/3147449

Foxglove Cottage, 114 Ashley Common Road, New Milton, Hants BH25 5AS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Sillick against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 15/11459, dated 1 October 2015, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2015.
 - The development proposed is extensions and alterations.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/B1740/Y/16/3147440

Foxglove Cottage, 114 Ashley Common Road, New Milton, Hants BH25 5AS

- 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 & Mrs Sillick against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 15/11460, dated 1 October 2015, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2015.
 - The works proposed are extensions and alterations.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A: the appeal is dismissed.
2. Appeal B: the appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

3. Foxglove Cottage, 114 Ashley Common Road is a grade II Listed Building. As required by Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 I have paid 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.
 4. The listing entry refers to the Listed Building as Wayside. The Council refers to it as Foxglove Cottage, 114 Ashley Common Road, as do the appellants. From the evidence before me, including what I saw at my visit, Wayside and Foxglove Cottage are the same building. The parties have confirmed this is the case. For the avoidance of doubt I have referred to the property as Foxglove Cottage above and in my decision.
 5. Reference is also made in the listing to Foxglove Cottage and 110 Ashley Common Road forming a group. However, it was apparent from my visit that
-

No 110 no longer exists. The Council have confirmed it has been demolished, and I have determined the appeal on that basis.

6. As set out above, there are two appeals on the same site, one for planning permission and the other for Listed Building consent, both seeking extensions and alterations to the cottage. I have considered each proposal on its individual merits, although to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two schemes together except where otherwise indicated.

Main Issue

7. The main issue for both appeals is whether the proposed extensions and alterations would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of a grade II Listed Building.

Reasons

8. The appeal property lies within a residential area, mostly surrounded by modern houses and bungalows of a variety of ages and styles. Constructed of rendered cob under a thatched roof with brick stacks, this detached house is positioned on the corner of Ashley Common Road and Brookhills Lane. Even with the hedges and fences around its garden, the historic vernacular form of the building draws the eye, and as such the house is a distinctive feature within the area.
9. The house has been extended to the side and rear. The historic core of the building has a simple two room plan form, with the modern extensions providing a hallway, study, kitchen, store, bathroom and conservatory. Despite these additions, the modest two storey form of the building remains dominant. The size of the historic building, its simple vernacular form and construction from traditional materials, are all part of the special interest of this Listed Building.
10. The proposed extension would be to the rear, and would extend the ground floor, replace the existing conservatory, and raise the height of the store room to provide an ensuite. The ridge lines of the extensions would be stepped down to replicate the existing, but the increased size and height of the additions to the building would unacceptably dominate the historic core.
11. The bulk of the extension would increase, and the replacement of the existing conservatory that has a light-weight impact on the cottage would harmfully exaggerate this effect. I appreciate the front elevation of the house would not be altered and that natural slate and render would be used for the works. However, the cumulative size of the proposal and its complex configuration, particularly the roofscape, would be such that it would unacceptably dominate the simple, modest form of the historic dwelling.
12. The appellants have pointed out that the scheme has been designed to minimise impact on the historic structure. I accept that existing openings would be utilised, and this is a positive aspect of the scheme. It may be difficult to ascertain the age of the roof, but I share the concerns of the Council that removing a further part of the rear roof to accommodate the increased height of the extension may result in the loss of historic fabric. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary I have to take a cautious approach.

13. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that where a development proposal would be less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The proposed extension would result in less than substantial harm due to the relative size of the proposed works compared to that of the house as a whole. The appellants require the extension to adapt the house to modern living, providing a home for a growing young family with the extensions having some thermal performance benefits. However, the latter would be of a limited public benefit, whilst family needs would be a personal not public benefit. Neither would outweigh the harm I have found to the special interest of the Listed Building.
14. The Framework advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The extended house may well be small compared to others nearby, but these houses and bungalows are very different to the appeal property. Moreover, the statutory requirement is to preserve the special architectural or historic interest of a Listed Building in all cases and this must be given considerable weight, irrespective of whether there is support for the proposal.
15. Thus, for the reasons given above, the proposed extension and alterations would unacceptably harm the special interest of the Listed Building. This would be contrary to Policies CS2 and CS3 of the New Forest District Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2009) and Policy DM1 of the New Forest District (outside the National Park) Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management Plan (2014). These policies seek, amongst other things, that development reflects local distinctiveness, and that which conserves and enhances the significance, character and appearance of heritage assets, reflecting objectives of the Framework.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, the appeals are dismissed.

J J Evans

INSPECTOR