
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 May 2017

by Jonathan Manning BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D1780/W/17/3170191

Ship Inn, 41 Old Redbridge Road, Southampton, Hampshire, SO15 0NN

- 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 Alison Burgwyn against the decision of Southampton City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01068/FUL, dated 20 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey structure to provide a covered area to the rear of the Public House.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue of the appeal is whether the scheme would preserve the setting of the Grade II listed Ship Inn.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on Redbridge Road and accommodates a Public House, known as the Ship Inn. The Ship Inn is a Grade II listed building. The proposal is for the erection of a single storey structure, however, I observed on my site visit that the structure is already in place. The structure is of a timber frame construction, with a slate tiled roof. The proposal is located immediately adjacent to the Ship Inn and is a sizeable structure. I observed that the curtilage of the Ship Inn, in which the structure lies, makes an important contribution to its setting. It is clear that the setting, along with the architectural style and appearance of the listed building contribute heavily to its significance.
 4. The timber structure occupies a significant footprint and is of such a scale that it is an overly dominant feature within the setting of the listed building. Further, the design and materials of the structure are not complementary to the architectural style and appearance of the listed building. The combination of these factors, results in a structure that has a jarring appearance against the listed building, which does not preserve its setting and causes harm to the character and significance of the listed building.
 5. The appellant is of the view that the structure is not largely visible from the road. I accept that this, to some degree, is the case, due to the large boundary hedge. However, I observed that the structure is visible from
-

neighbouring properties and I am mindful that the structure is, in any event, viewed readily from within the garden of the listed building, which is used by the public.

6. I acknowledge that the structure is adjacent to an extended part of the listed building. However, this does not affect my findings in terms of its setting or the inappropriate design and materials, which jar with the architectural appearance of the listed building, harming its character and significance.
7. In conclusion on this matter and for the reasons set out above, the scheme does not preserve the setting¹ of the listed building and causes harm to its significance. The scheme therefore runs contrary to Policies SDP1(i), SDP7(ii)(iv), SDP9(i)(ii)(iv) and HE3(i) of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (2015) and Policies CS13 and CS14 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2015).

Other matters

8. The appellant has set out that the scheme has replaced a large parasol that was used to provide cover in the same location. I accept that this offers limited cover for customers and is prone to weathering. Further, I acknowledge that the proposed structure was erected in response to concern from neighbours in relation to noise. However, I observed that the structure has open sides and therefore, I am not convinced that the structure provides for any meaningful noise mitigation. In addition, I note the petition in support of the scheme that has been provided. Whilst all of the matters above are acknowledged, these individually or in combination do not overcome or outweigh the identified harm.
9. The appellant has set out that she was advised by the Council that the scheme did not require planning permission. Whilst this may or may not have been the case, I nonetheless have a Section 78 appeal before me, which I must determine on its merits.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Jonathan Manning

INSPECTOR

¹ Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.