The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2017

by Debbie Moore BSc (HONS) MCD MRTPI PGDip

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

Decision date: 20th April 2017.

Appeal Ref: APP/C1760/W/16/3159943
16A Bridge Street, Andover, Hampshire SP10 1BJ

- 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 Ramazan Bilgic against the decision of Test Valley Borough Council.
- The application Ref 16/00342/FULLN, dated 5 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 31 March 2016.
- The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.

This decision is issued in accordance with Section 56(2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and supersedes the decision issued on 2 February 2017.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 16A Bridge Street, Andover, Hampshire SP10 1BJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/00342/FULLN, dated 5 February 2016, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following condition:

   1) Within three months of the date of this decision, the external wall of the extension hereby permitted shall be painted in a colour which has been approved in writing by the local planning authority, and retained as such thereafter.

Procedural matter

2. I saw from my site visit that the extension has already been constructed and is in use for storage associated with the restaurant. I have, therefore, dealt with the appeal on this basis.

3. I note the Parish Council's concern about the relocation of an extraction fan and the installation of an additional extraction fan. These do not form part of the development before me and consequently I have confined my consideration of the appeal to the rear extension.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on heritage assets in the vicinity, in particular, the Andover Town Centre Conservation Area and the Grade II listed White Hart Hotel.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two storey building constructed from brick and slate, which incorporates a relatively large front extension. The property is located within the Conservation Area, close to its historic core. The significance of this part of the Conservation Area is attributed to its tight urban grain and the relatively high number of listed buildings. The property is located close to the listed White Hart Hotel, which dates from the 18th Century and contains a distinctive Victorian / Classical façade.

6. No 16 Bridge Street is one of three formerly domestic buildings dating from the 18th and early 19th Century. The properties would originally have had front gardens but these have been lost to the single storey front extensions. Nonetheless, the Council considers the group of buildings, including the appeal property, to be non-designated heritage assets. Their significance is attributed to the historic interest of the buildings and a large sash window with coloured margin panes, located at the rear of the appeal building.

7. The premises are in use as a restaurant on the ground floor with offices above. The development is a single storey flat roofed extension at the rear of the building. It has been constructed between the walls of previous rear additions to the properties either side. The extension is attached to a two storey brick and slate early 19th Century addition to the original 18th Century building. It has been built with plain rendered walls, a felt roof and upvc rainwater goods.

8. The rear of the property is within a courtyard that is used for car parking and as a pedestrian route. The courtyard contains a varied mix of buildings, including a wing and covered seating area associated with the White Hart. Aside from the seating area, the courtyard is dominated by car parking and the rear elevations of the properties that surround it. There are a number of high walls constructed from brick or render, some of which include access doorways. Extensions to the White Hart are partially enclosed by panel fencing and there are views across the courtyard to a modern office building to the north. Overall, there is limited connection between the courtyard and the wider Conservation Area as it is dominated by the backs of the surrounding buildings, many of which have rear additions with blank walls.

9. The extension is located within a gap between two existing buildings and, as such, it does project into the courtyard. It is a relatively low key structure and is not unduly prominent. Within the context described above, it does not look out of place in the rear courtyard setting and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is preserved.

10. However, the extension partially obscures the rear sash window, which has been identified as making a contribution to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset. The National Planning Policy Framework states that, in weighing applications that directly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the asset.

11. The extension does not reflect the historic character of the building in terms of its design and materials. However the scale of harm is limited due to its siting and its relatively moderate size. Although the extension directly affects a window on the rear elevation of the 19th Century addition, the window itself is

not completely lost and it is still evident as a historic feature. Consequently, the harm from the development is minimal.

12. The development is close to rear additions to the White Hart, which enclose the courtyard to the north and east. However, the extension is separated by the parking area and is screened to a certain extent by the large two storey rear additions which are located either side. Consequently, the extension is not seen in the context of the listed building and I do not find that the setting of the listed building is adversely affected.

13. The appellant states that the structure is not yet complete, in particular, it is proposed to paint the external wall. I agree that this would improve the appearance of the building and I have attached a condition to ensure the work is carried out.

14. I conclude on this issue that the development does not have an adverse effect on the significance of designated heritage assets in the vicinity. I find that the development preserves the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of the listed White Hart Hotel. Whilst I have concluded that the development would affect the significance of the non-designated heritage asset, the harm is minimal. Consequently, the development accords with Policy E1 of the Local Plan[1], which seeks to ensure that, amongst other things, development integrates with, respects and complements the character of the area, and Policy E9 which seeks to ensure that development affecting heritage assets makes a positive contribution to sustaining and enhancing the significance of the asset.

15. The appeal is, therefore, allowed.

Debbie Moore

Inspector

[1] Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2011-2029)