



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 1 October 2019

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: 18th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/C1760/D/19/3234066

Fishing Cottage, Annexe, Church Lane, Upper Clatford SP11 7HB

- 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 Ray Palmer against the decision of Test Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00629/FULLN, dated 11 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 7th May 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'extension to Annexe building'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. Whether the proposed extension would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Upper Clatford Conservation Area, the locality generally and preserve the setting of All Saints Church, a grade II* listed building and Taskers Bridge, a grade II listed building.

Procedural Matter

3. During the course of this appeal the Council approved an extension to the appeal outbuilding, Ref 19/00629/FULLN. This has been taken into account in my decision.

Reasons

4. The appeal site includes Fishing Cottage and a small ancillary outbuilding set within a landscaped garden. The outbuilding is situated on the opposite side of Church Lane. It is weather boarded with a thatched roof and accommodates garaging and living accommodation designed to be used in association with the main dwelling. Due to its small scale in relation to the main house, its simple form and traditional design and detailing, it reads as an ancillary rural outbuilding.
5. The Upper Clatford Conservation Area includes the main street, with its many historic buildings, and the area around All Saints Church and Fishing Cottage, which sits close to the river some distance from the main area of settlement. Around the Church, there is a paucity of buildings and the river and countryside dominates. Overall, the Conservation Area has a distinctly rural and open character and appearance. The appeal site, comprising the main dwelling and its small ancillary outbuilding of traditional form and design, along with its generally open, spacious, landscaped gardens, significantly contributes to the

character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This is the case even though the appeal outbuilding was built in the 1990s.

6. The appeal proposal would alter the size and shape of the outbuilding, such that it would no longer appear as ancillary to the main dwelling. The proposed glazed gable would appear as a dominant feature which would harmfully diminish the simple linear plan form of the outbuilding, its rural traditional design and add to the resultant disruption to its ancillary relationship with the main dwelling. Due to these matters, it would appear as visually intrusive in the landscape and diminish the open and rural character and appearance of the Conservation Area. In addition, for the same reasons the proposed development would diminish the rural open setting of both All Saints Church and Taskers Bridge; settings that contribute to the heritage significance of those listed buildings.
7. Moreover, the large area of glazing would be likely to result in a greater level of light spill than exists at present, even though the glazing would be set back from the eaves and planting and trees would block some views. The additional light spill would be likely to result in a more urban type of development, which would diminish the rural and open character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the locality and the settings of the listed buildings identified. Controlling the light levels through a planning condition would be likely to be unenforceable. Further, alteration of the elevation to remove some of the glazed panels would result in a development that would be in substance not that which was applied for and therefore controlling such changes through a planning condition could prejudice the interests of third parties. I have had regard to the benefit of additional daylight and sunlight due to the glazing, but this does not outweigh my concerns.
8. In coming to these conclusions, I have had regard to other development in the Conservation Area and beyond brought to my attention. However, none replicate the circumstances of this appeal. That there are modern solar panels on the Church extension does not justify the proposed development. I acknowledge the proposed use of traditional materials and that the proposed approach can be a successful way to extend or alter a historic rural barn. However, for the reasons I have given, it is not a successful approach in this case. Whilst trees and planting would filter views of the proposed development, they would not sufficiently mitigate the harm identified, particularly when not in leaf. I have noted that the appeal building would sit back from the surrounding streets and sideways onto Church Lane, but the proposed addition would still appear prominent.
9. I conclude that the appeal proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Upper Clatford Conservation Area, the locality generally and the settings of All Saints Church and Taskers Bridge. It would therefore be contrary to policies E1, E2, and E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan DPD Adopted Local Plan 2011-2029 (2016). Those policies, together, seek high quality design, to protect, conserve and enhance landscape character and sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets. Further it would be contrary to policy COM11, which restricts development in the countryside that would be more visually intrusive in the landscape and policy E8, which seeks for development that would not have an adverse impact on the natural environment through pollution.

Other Matters

10. I have had regard to the benefits of the development, including providing a home office for the appellants, the related reduced need for travel and the provision of enhanced living accommodation for guests. I have also had regard to the personal circumstances of the appellants. However, even when taken together, those would not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Public Benefits

11. In accordance with paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), I accord great weight to the conservation of a designated heritage asset. I consider that the harm to the setting of the listed buildings identified and Upper Clatford Conservation Area would, together, be less than substantial. That is a matter to which I attach considerable importance and weight. In this case, no public benefits, as identified in paragraph 196 of the Framework, are before me, which would outweigh that harm.

Conclusion

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

R Barrett

INSPECTOR