

## Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 22 May 2017

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

**Decision date: 7<sup>th</sup> June 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/W/17/3169464 (Appeal A)**  
**Rambler Cottage, Fox Pond Lane, Pennington SO41 8FW**

- 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 Henson against the decision of New Forest District Council.
  - The application Ref 16/11312, dated 20 September, 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 November 2016.
  - The development proposed is described as 'proposed single storey rear extension'.
- 

**Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/Y/17/3169461 (Appeal B)**  
**Rambler Cottage, Fox Pond Lane, Pennington SO41 8FW**

- 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 Henson against the decision of New Forest District Council.
  - The application Ref 16/11313, dated 20 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 November 2016.
  - The works proposed are described as 'proposed single storey rear extension'.
- 

### 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. Whether the appeal proposals would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of Rambler Cottage, a grade II listed building and its setting.

### Reasons

4. The appeal site includes a small listed cottage, which has light coloured walls and a prominent thatched roof. Its small scale, simple footprint and plan form, its prominent thatched roof with soft lines and historic fabric, all contribute to its significance as a heritage asset. It sits adjacent to larger later properties, and in comparison is small, which serves as a reminder of its history as a small rural cottage, which adds to its significance. The appeal property has a large garden and the space to the side and front contribute to its generally spacious and green setting.
-

5. The proposed extension would be large in relation to the main listed building. Even though it would be single storey, it would span its full width and would be roughly half its depth. It would be out of proportion with the main listed building and its bulk would dominate it. Further, its regular form, which includes a flat roof, would fail to relate to the softer lines of the thatched roof of the host dwelling which would jar. The inclusion of large areas of glazing would appear out of place against the more solid elevations of the main building.
6. I have limited information before me regarding the attachment of the proposed extension to the listed building and as it would be large, I am not satisfied that harm to the historic fabric would not be consequence. If this were the case, it would add to my concern. As the proposed addition would be to the rear of the listed building, it would not materially affect the spacious and green setting of the listed building that I have identified.
7. In coming to the above conclusions, I have had regard to the appellant's suggestion that the proposed extension would provide structural support for the rear wall of the main building. However, I have limited substantive evidence in this regard. In any event, even if this were the case and such works and development were considered both necessary and appropriate as a means of structural support, that matter would not outweigh the concerns for its effect on the significance of the listed building identified.
8. Other development nearby has been brought to my attention. However, the circumstances that led to those extensions are not before me. In any event, The Cottage by The Green is a different property and does not replicate the circumstances of this appeal.
9. I conclude that the appeal proposals would fail to preserve the special architectural or historic interest of Rambler Cottage, a grade II listed building, even though they would preserve its setting. For this reason, they would fail to accord with Policies CS2 and CS3 of the New Forest District Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy New Forest District outside the National Park (2009) and Policy DM1 of the New Forest District Council Local Development Framework Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management New Forest District outside the National Park. Those policies, together, aim for development that is well designed to respect the character, identity and context of the area's towns, villages and countryside and to conserve and seek to enhance the historic significance and context of heritage assets.

#### *Public Benefits*

10. 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 duty<sup>1</sup>. 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 provision of better living space for the current and future occupiers.

---

<sup>1</sup> section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

## **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