
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 31 January 2017

by R Barrett BSc (Hons) MSc Dip UD Dip Hist Cons MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 21st February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/W/16/3163805 (Appeal A)

Church Cottage, The Street, Rotherwick, Hook, Hants RG27 9BG

- 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 and Mrs Moore against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01870/HOU, dated 15 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is 'single storey side extension, replacement double doors, swap door and window in existing lobby'.
-

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/Y/16/3163808 (Appeal B)

Church Cottage, The Street, Rotherwick, Hook, Hants RG27 9BG

- 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 and Mrs Moore against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01871/LBC, dated 15 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 October 2016.
 - The works proposed are 'single storey side extension, replacement double doors, swap door and window in existing lobby'.
-

Decisions

1. Both appeals are dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Appeal A and Appeal B relate to the same site. Whilst I have considered each proposal on its own merits, given that they have much in common, and in the interests of brevity, I have dealt with them in one document.

Main Issue

3. Church Cottage is a grade II listed building located within the Rotherwick Conservation Area (RCA). The Council does not raise objection regarding the effect of the appeal proposal on the character or appearance of the RCA. On the basis of the existing garage extension, which would be replaced and the siting of much of the bulk of the proposed addition at the side and rear of the appeal property, I have no reason to take a different view on this matter, that the proposed addition would preserve the character and appearance the RCA. Therefore, having regard to the statutory requirements of sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the main issue in this case is whether the proposed side extension would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the grade II listed building and its setting.
-

Reasons

4. The appeal site includes a two storey detached house which fronts onto The Street. It is located between Rotherwick Church and the school house. It is red brick with a steeply pitched clay tiled roof, prominent chimney stack and a cat slide roof at its rear. The historic modest cottage, is the part nearest to the Church, is two windows wide, and includes some timber framing on its western elevation. It has been substantially extended over time, including a two storey element on the side nearest to the school, a side garage with a flat roof and large rear additions. The modest and simple historic cottage and its timber framing substantially contribute to the listed building's significance as a heritage asset.
5. The setting of the listed building includes its close relationship with Rotherwick Church and the school house. It is set behind a small front garden and includes a spacious rear garden. Trees, planting and the green space around contribute to the listed building's generally semi-rural setting.
6. The proposed extension, even though some distance from the historic core of the appeal property, would be large in relation to it. Whilst I acknowledge some visual advantage in using a pitched roof, the resultant height and bulk of the proposed addition would have the effect of visually elongating the appeal building. That would further diminish the special interest of the listed building as a modest cottage. The bulk of the proposed addition would extend rearwards past the rear elevation of the appeal property and would appear oversized in relation to it. It would result in extensions, which cumulatively, would be out of proportion with the modest historic core and erode its simple character. For these reasons, it would be unacceptable, even though I note it is intended to use materials to match.
7. The proposed addition would be to the side and rear of the appeal property and would not materially alter the separation distance between it and the neighbouring buildings. It would also generally maintain the nearby planting and trees. Therefore, it would not adversely affect the generally semi-rural setting of the listed building.
8. However, overall, I conclude that the appeal proposal would fail to preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the grade II listed building, Church Cottage. For this reason it would be contrary to Policy CON 17 of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 and First Alterations to the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 Saved Policies. That policy aims to preserve and protect listed buildings.

Public Benefits

9. In accordance with paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), I accord great weight to the conservation of designated heritage assets. I consider that the harm to the significance of the listed building would be less than substantial, a matter to which I attach considerable importance and weight. However, in this case, no public benefits, as identified in paragraph 134 of the Framework, are before me, which would outweigh that harm. In coming to this conclusion, I have had regard to the provision of better living space for the current and future occupiers and that the proposed addition would afford views of the Church. I have also had regard to the improvements to the rear single storey extension near to the Church.

Other Matters

10. I have noted the appellants' comments on the Council's pre-application advice. I acknowledge that this was the opinion of an officer of the Council and not binding upon it. I also note that it related, in the main, to a different proposal. It carries very limited weight in my decision therefore.

Conclusions

11. For the above reasons, and taking all other matters raised into consideration, I conclude that both appeals should be dismissed.

R Barrett

INSPECTOR