
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 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: 30th August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y9507/Y/17/3170309

East Harting Farm, Hollist Lane, East Harting, Petersfield, Hampshire GU31 5LU

- 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 Nick Paul against the decision of South Downs National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref SDNP/16/04701/LIS, dated 25 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2016.
 - The works proposed works are described as 'extension to existing annex'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appeal works have begun on site and some of the outbuilding has been demolished. However, I am determining this appeal on the basis of the description of works in the banner heading above, which is taken from the appellant's application form, along with the appeal application plans before me.

Main Issues

3. Whether the appeal proposed works would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the grade II listed building and its setting, whether they would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the East Harting Conservation Area (EHCA) and whether they would conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the South Downs National Park (SDNP).

Reasons

4. The appeal site includes a large detached house, which sits in a prominent position at the junction of two roads in East Harting. It is located within the EHCA and SDNP. The appeal application relates to an outbuilding which sits behind the main house.
5. The host dwelling is a handsome, three window wide, two storey dwelling. It has a pleasing, balanced front façade, with a pitched roof and upright chimneys. It was once part of a wider farm complex, which included the open area immediately to its rear, including the appeal outbuilding and animal pen and the barns on the opposite side of Hollist Lane. Despite the general domestication of some of the land immediately surrounding it, the alteration and conversion of many of its outbuildings and its barns, the close physical relationship of the collection of buildings referred to and their relationship to

the surrounding land with historic field boundaries, serve as a reminder of the listed building's former farmstead use. The collection of buildings, including the appeal outbuilding have a historic and former functional association to one another and the surrounding land, which contributes to the significance of the listed building. This is the case even though a bank, road and hedge sits between the converted barns and the appeal outbuilding and main house.

6. Within the former farmstead complex, the appeal building, its historic fabric, physical proximity and secondary relationship with the main house, in terms of size and detailing, along with its generally agricultural, rural and utilitarian character, all significantly contribute to the significance of the listed building. This is the case even though the appeal outbuilding is now converted to a residential use, has been altered over time, the animal pen is not used and it is not readily open to public views. The garage to its rear, although large and on higher ground, does not materially diminish the physical, historic and former functional association of the appeal building to the main house and its contribution to its setting. Regardless of the exact age, quality of workmanship or condition of the walls of the animal pen, they constitute some historic fabric and form an open enclosure which significantly contributes to an understanding of the appeal outbuilding's former use and historic interest.
7. The EHCA includes a collection of mainly historic buildings within the hamlet and its rural hinterland. There are a number of dispersed farmsteads or former farmsteads, which include outbuildings, some historic, which generally have a close physical and historic relationship with the surrounding land. The appeal site and the converted barns opposite significantly contribute to the collection of former farmsteads and the contribution they make to the character and appearance of the EHCA. In turn, the appeal site and the EHCA, their historic buildings and close physical and historic relationship to the surrounding rural land, significantly contribute to the landscape and scenic beauty of the SDNP.
8. The proposed extension would involve the removal of the animal pen, which would involve the loss of some historic fabric, whether contemporary with the main listed building or not. It would erode an understanding of the appeal outbuilding's former function. By extending it in the manner proposed it would result in a larger building that would disrupt its secondary relationship to the farmhouse and former farmstead. That the Authority suggests that such buildings are under threat and rare adds to my concern. Further, the use of large areas of glazing would fail to relate to the generally solid elevations of the appeal outbuilding, which are punctuated by small glazed openings. In combination with the half hipped roof form with rooflights, it would appear particularly domestic and would erode the appeal outbuilding's generally agricultural, rural and utilitarian character. It would diminish its secondary relationship with the listed building in terms of its scale and detailing. All in all, it would adversely affect its significance as a heritage asset. The use of traditional materials seen in the locality would not overcome that harm.
9. In coming to this conclusion, I have had regard to the suggestion that the walls are of poor construction, subject to movement and tree damage. Whilst, I have limited evidence in this regard, as the proposed works would alter the appearance of the outbuilding and its secondary relationship with the main listed building, none of these matters justify the proposed development.

10. I have concluded that unacceptable harm would result to the listed building and its setting. As that listed building significantly contributes to the character and appearance of the EHCA, it follows that it would fail to preserve its character and appearance. Further, for the same reasons, it would also fail to conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the SDNP and its cultural heritage.
11. I am aware that the Authority granted planning permission for works to demolish the animal pen and extend the appeal outbuilding in 1994.¹ However, that was for a different scheme which was for a more solid structure with a different roof form. That decision is aged and I cannot be assured that all the information available today was available to those decision makers. In any event the policy position is different today and the appeal site is now included in the SDNP. All these reasons reduce the weight that I accord that planning permission.
12. I conclude that the appeal proposal would fail to preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the grade II listed building and its setting, would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the EHCA and would fail to conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the SDNP. For these reasons, it would be contrary to the Chichester Local Plan First Review (1999) Policies BE4, BE5, BE6, BE11 and BE12. Those policies, together, aim to place high priority on protecting the character and appearance of all buildings of architectural or historic interest, including listed buildings and their settings, preserve or enhance the special architectural or historic character or appearance of Conservation Areas, ensure that the design, detailing and materials of extensions or alterations are appropriate to the host building and generally aim for new development to not detract from the existing buildings or the surroundings. It would also fail to accord with paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which states that great weight should be given to conserving the landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks.

Public Benefits

13. In accordance with paragraph 132 of 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 and its setting and the EHCA would be less than substantial; a matter to which I attach considerable importance and weight, mindful of my statutory duties². However, in this case, no public benefits, as identified in paragraph 134 of the Framework, are before me sufficient to outweigh that harm. In this regard, I have taken into account the provision of additional and enhanced ancillary living space and the intention to fully utilise the existing building.

Other Matters

14. An enforcement notice is before me relating to the appeal works. However, I have dealt with the appeal on the basis of the appeal application before me as set out in paragraph 2 of my decision. On this basis, this matter has not materially affected the outcome of this appeal.
15. I have noted the appellant's comments regarding the Authority's handling of the appeal application and its informal advice regarding extending at right

¹ Ref 94/01736/LBC and 94/01632

² section 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

angles to the appeal outbuilding. However, that is a matter between the appellant and the Authority in the first instance.

Conclusion

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

R. Barrett

INSPECTOR