
Appeal Decision

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/Y9507/18/3219345

Court House, East Street, Hambledon PO7 4RX

- 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 Jay against the decision of South Downs National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref SDNP/18/01154/LIS, dated 27 February 2018, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2018.
 - The works proposed are described as 'proposed new internal opening'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. During the course of this appeal the Authority adopted the South Downs Local Plan 2014-2033 (2019) (SD Local Plan). Both parties were invited to comment on the implications of this for the appeal before me. I have made my decision in accordance with the adopted Plan.

Main Issue

3. Whether the appeal proposal would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of Court House, a grade II listed building.

Reasons

4. The appeal site includes a large dwelling situated within spacious grounds within the Hambledon Conservation Area. With 18th century origins, it has been extensively extended and altered throughout its history. Its 18th century core, and later 19th century additions on either side and to its rear, provide an insight into its layered history. Its historic fabric and internal layout provide some understanding of the property's history and contribute to its significance as a listed building.
5. The proposed opening up of the wall at ground floor level would result in the loss of historic fabric. By visually linking the ground floor room and the corridor in this part of the house, it would erode the historic plan form and an understanding of the property's history, in particular the relationship of this part of the house, which appears to have formed a separate dwelling, to the 18th century core. This would be the case even though some reference to the wall would remain, through the retention of nibs on either side, a down stand and reference in the flooring. That the internal layout of the property has been much altered over time adds to my concern for the impact of this proposal on

an understanding of the property's history. Whilst the proposed arrangement may provide more usable space and enable adaptation to suit modern living, those matters do not outweigh the harm that I have identified. Recording of the property as it is today, would not overcome my concerns in this regard.

6. 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 listed building would 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.
7. I conclude that the appeal proposal would fail to preserve the special architectural or historic interest of Court House, a grade II listed building. It would therefore be contrary to policies SD12 and SD13 of the SD Local Plan. Those together, state that development proposals will only be permitted where they conserve and enhance the historic environment and in particular they preserve and enhance the significance of a listed building and its setting by demonstrating that loss of historic fabric and detail of significance, including internal features, floor plans and the integrity of the rooms, is avoided or any harm is outweighed by public benefits by the Authority.

Conclusion

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

R Barrett

INSPECTOR