

Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 22 May 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: 7th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B9506/W/16/3153980 (Appeal A)

Flat A, The Coach House, Northerwood House SO43 7DT

- 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 G Newman against the decision of New Forest National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref 16/00112, dated 8 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is installation of wood burning stove and flue (resubmission).
-

Appeal Ref: APP/B9506/Y/16/3153981 (Appeal B)

Flat A, The Coach House, Northerwood House SO43 7DT

- 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 G Newman against the decision of New Forest National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref 16/00159, dated 8 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 April 2016.
 - The works proposed are installation of wood burning stove and flue (resubmission).
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A and Appeal B 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. Whether the appeal proposals would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building and its setting.

Reasons

4. The appeal site includes an eighteenth century stable block, which is now converted to flats. It sits close to Northerwood House, and has a close and subservient relationship to that main house, which contributes to its setting. That relationship along with its simple form and footprint, the general symmetry of the front elevation, its simple detailing with prominent clear roof slopes and clean silhouette all add to its significance as a heritage asset.
-

5. The proposed flue, although located on the side elevation, would be visible when viewed from the front, which would disrupt the symmetry and uncluttered appearance of that elevation. It would be seen close to the prominent roof slopes, which would erode their clear appearance. That it would be close to the front of the building adds to my concern. Further, as it would be seen against a prominent chimney stack and would bend to accommodate the eaves, it would distort the clean silhouette of the listed building. For all these reasons, it would result in unacceptable harm to it. However, as it would be attached to the coach house and small scale, it would not materially disrupt its close and subservient relationship to the main house and its setting.
6. In coming to the above findings, I have taken into account the large flue that rises from the chimney stack on the other side of the Coach House. However that is set back from the front of the listed building. In any event, these appeal proposals would worsen the situation.
7. I conclude, although the appeal proposals would preserve the setting of the listed coach house, they would generally fail to preserve its special architectural or historic interest. For this reason they would fail to accord with Policies DP1, DP6 and CP7 of the New Forest National Park Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Management DPD (2010). Those policies, together, aim for the highest standards for the design, external appearance and location of new development and proposals to protect, maintain or enhance nationally important sites and features of the built environment.

Public Benefits

8. 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, mindful of my statutory duties¹. However, in this case, no public benefits, as identified in paragraph 134 of the Framework, are before me sufficient to outweigh that harm. In coming to this conclusion, I have had regard to the benefits of installing a wood burning stove, in terms of energy use and providing better living conditions for occupiers. However, I am unconvinced that those benefits could not be realised without causing this level of harm to the listed building.

Conclusions

9. For the above reasons, and taking all other matters raised into consideration, including a letter of support, I conclude that both appeals should be dismissed.

R Barrett

INSPECTOR

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