



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 22 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: 08 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/W/19/3223341

Myrtle Cottage, Lands End Road, Bursledon SO31 8DN

- 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 M Blackman and J de Pina against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref H/18/84112, dated 17 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2018.
 - The development proposed is described as 'two storey rear extension with glass link to existing cottage'.
-

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/Y/19/3223344

Myrtle Cottage, Lands End Road, Bursledon SO31 8DN

- 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 M Blackman and J de Pina against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application Ref L/18/84136, dated 17 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2018.
 - The works proposed are described as 'two storey rear extension with glass link to existing cottage'.
-

Decisions

1. Both appeals are dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The emerging Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 is being prepared. As it is currently still at examination stage, having regard to paragraph 48 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), I accord any conflict with those policies limited weight in coming to my decision.

Applications for costs

3. An application for costs in relation to each appeal was made by M Blackman and J de Pina against Eastleigh Borough Council. These applications are the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issues

4. Whether the proposed development and works would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of Myrtle Cottage, a grade II listed building; whether they would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the

Old Bursledon Conservation Area; and the effect on the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

5. The appeal site includes a small detached cottage with 18th century origins overlooking the River Hamble and its marina. It has an L shaped footprint, including two wings, with a prominent steeply pitched roof, extending down to a catslide, prominent gables and tall upright chimneys. Its elevations have a generally solid appearance, punctuated with small window openings, often with a horizontal emphasis. It sits in a large plot with a steeply rising bank behind and extensive tree cover, giving it a verdant, spacious, shoreline setting. This is the case, even though some of the green landscaping has been removed in the recent past. The property's historic fabric, modest and complex form, with prominent steeply pitched roof, upright chimneys and generally solid elevations, with small horizontally proportioned window openings, along with its spacious, verdant, shoreline setting, all contribute to its significance as a heritage asset.
6. The Bursledon Conservation Area includes many historic buildings, often associated with the area's ship building past. They display variety in their age, style, form and detailing. The settlement mainly sits above the River Hamble, with which it has a strong visual and historic relationship. It has a generally low density, open and verdant character and appearance, to which the appeal site significantly contributes. This is the case even though it is not visible in some public views.
7. The proposed extension would significantly increase the size of the host dwelling, such that it would erode its modest character as a small detached cottage. Even though it would be sited to the side and towards the rear of the existing dwelling, it would be significantly larger than it, would appear out of scale and dominate it. By extending over a significant part of the garden, it would noticeably diminish the listed building's spacious, verdant, shoreline setting, even though a garden area would be retained on the river side. Further, the proposed simple rectangular form, the relationship of roof slope to elevation, the hipped form of the roof, and its elevations with large, upright openings would all be at odds with the listed building's significant design features that I have identified. In addition, together, those design features would add to my concern for the proposed extension's disproportionate relationship with the listed building. Whilst the proposed materials would reduce the impact of the proposed extension, that would not overcome the harm identified.
8. As I have previously found that the listed building significantly contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, it follows that the appeal proposal would result in harm to it. This would be the case, even though views are limited from Lands End Road and trees and planting interrupt views from other public places.
9. In coming to these conclusions, I have had regard to the quality and amount of living space available in the host dwelling. However, its modest size is an essential part of the listed building's significance. I have also noted that the existing owners bought the appeal site as two separate plots and have carried out many repairs, which have been a benefit to the heritage asset. However, this does not justify the appeal proposals. I have limited substantive evidence

that there was a cabin on the appeal site used as a dwelling so accord this very limited weight. I note that other properties in the locality have been extended, including adjacent listed buildings. However, they do not replicate the circumstances of this appeal, and in any event the variety in built form in this locality, particularly appreciated from the river and Bridge Road, is one of its essential characteristics. Whilst development along the river and further afield is noted, this is not directly relevant to the appeal proposal.

10. I am aware that the Council's built heritage consultant took a view contrary to my findings. However, I have made my decision, as the Council did, on the basis of all the evidence before me. I have noted the appellant's concern regarding the way in which the Council determined the appeal application, but this is a matter between the Council and appellant in the first instance.
11. I conclude that the appeal proposals would fail to preserve the special architectural or historic interest of Myrtle Cottage, a grade II listed building and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Old Bursledon Conservation Area, along with the character and appearance of the locality generally. For these reasons, they would fail to accord with saved policies 59.BE, 169.LB, 174.LB and 179.LB of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011). Those policies, together seek development that would protect the special loose knit character of Old Bursledon, preserve or enhance the character or appearance of a conservation area and would not have a detrimental impact on a listed building or its setting. It would also fail to accord with policies DM1 and DM12 of the emerging Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036, which together seek development that takes full and proper account of the context of the site, and that conserves and enhances the Borough's heritage assets.

Public Benefits

12. In accordance with paragraph 193 of the Framework, I accord great weight to the conservation of a designated heritage asset. I consider that the harm to the significance of the listed building and Conservation Area would, together, be less than substantial. This is a matter to which I attach considerable importance and weight. However, in this case, no public benefits, as identified in paragraph 196 of the Framework, are before me, which would outweigh that harm.

Conclusion

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

R Barrett

INSPECTOR