
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 20 November 2019

by S J Papworth DipArch(Glos) RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 December 2019

Appeal A: APP/N1730/W/19/3231742

Orchards, The Street, North Warnborough, Hook RG29 1BE

- 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 & Mrs Homan against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00466/HOU, dated 1 March 2019, was refused by the Council by notice dated 25 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear/side extension.
-

Appeal B: APP/N1730/Y/19/3231755

Orchards, The Street, North Warnborough, Hook RG29 1BE

- 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 & Mrs Homan against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00467/LBC, dated 1 March 2019, was refused by the Council by notice dated 25 April 2019.
 - The works proposed are single storey rear/side extension.
-

Decisions

1. I dismiss both appeals.

Reasons

2. The building is Listed Grade II and the main issue in both appeals is the effect of the proposal on the architectural or historic significance of the building and its setting within the North Warnborough Conservation Area. The location within the conservation area is not mentioned in the Reason for Refusal, but whether there is any effect on the area's character and appearance is nevertheless a matter for the decision maker.
3. Sections 16(2) and 66(10) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Section 72(1) of the same Act requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.
4. Saved Policy CON17 of the Hart District Local Plan concerns proposals for the extension or alteration of listed buildings and requires that the scale of the building is not materially changed; and that the design is appropriate to the character and setting of the building. The Council have referred to emerging policy that reflects the more balanced approach in the National Planning Policy

Framework. Paragraph 193 of that document states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, while paragraphs 195 and 196 allow for a balance of harm and benefits to be struck.

5. The Odiham and North Warnborough Neighbourhood Plan has been 'made' and is part of the Development Plan. The goal of, as far as possible, not harming the heritage significance of the conservation areas and other designated heritage assets is stated, and Policy 5 requires development which affects any heritage asset to respect the significance of the asset and demonstrate how local distinctiveness is reinforced.
6. The listed building has been subject to many changes and some additions, and the appellants' analysis of it being once a small cottage with a door under one of the 2 upper floor windows appears a reasonable one. That arrangement was added-to by a two-storey extension to the south along the front, and there is a further rear projection expressed as a raised ridge and hip end to the street elevation. That resulting 'L' shaped plan then had a more recent flat lead-roofed addition to the courtyard side, to allow access to the rear rooms without passing through the nearer ones.
7. The link between this lead flat and the rear slope of the main house is not however attractive, with an isolated slope introduced at the junction. There is also evidence of the rearward projection being in two phases, by the step in the pitched roofline and in the brickwork facing the courtyard. Lastly, there is a rear porch in glazed timber which interferes with the presentation of the rear wall but does have the benefits of being limited in size and of an apparently lightweight, even temporary character and appearance.
8. The architectural significance of the building lies in the front and side elevations, and to a slightly lesser degree the main rear elevation, the shortcomings of the roof forms to the rear extension tending to dominate the courtyard. The historic significance however extends further and includes much of the 'L' shape as part of the evolution of this once modest cottage.
9. The proposed extension, described as a garden room and as being a traditional orangery approach, would remove the rear porch, and that is acceptable, and would not bring about the removal of any historic fabric. Fixings would be made into the more recent rear addition and to the significant rear elevation, but care could be exercised to utilise mortar joints, and there need not be a necessity for vertical damp-proofing to be chased-in for such a use. The roof would abut brickwork and is shown to be a lead-roll finish, but here some form of upstand, possibly chased into a mortar joint would be likely, to protect the fabric from damp. Nevertheless, harm could be avoided with details sought by condition.
10. However, whilst harm to the fabric of the building can be avoided, the new room would take over a large area of the courtyard and would obscure much of the ground floor of the main rear elevation, being placed close to the outer corner, as well as extending 3.5m out almost along the line of the side elevation. This size taken together with the height close to the cills of the upper windows would unbalance the composition and erode the historic and architectural significance of the front and side elevations. The orangery design would be at odds with that of the building and would introduce a historically inconsistent building form, with solid materials which would obscure the

building and a depth away from the walls which would not allow the addition to appear sufficiently transparent and lightweight as an addition. The use of a glazed lantern light would appear fussy and out of place, further disrupting the appreciation of the fenestration and brickwork of the rear elevation.

11. The proposal would cause harm to the listed building and its setting. That setting includes the conservation area, although limited weight attaches to the effect on that designated heritage asset due to the limited public views and the fact of the outbuilding to the rear, outside the designated area, providing a background that would reduce the impact in views along the driveway.
12. Nevertheless, harm would be caused and whilst the Council's analysis of this being less than substantial is concurred with, paragraph 196 of the Framework states that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.
13. There does not appear to be any risk of the dwelling falling out of its viable use and that continuing use as a dwelling should be regarded as the optimum one. There would be a benefit in the removal of the rear porch, although it is unassuming, small and the harm it causes is limited; far less than that identified with the appeal proposals. Other benefits to the occupiers of the dwelling carry limited weight, as although the preservation and care of listed buildings by private owners is for the public benefit, the addition does not appear to be essential to that end.
14. To conclude, the proposal would not satisfy the statutory tests in the 1990 Act and would not accord with Local Plan Policy CON17 or Neighbourhood Plan Policy 5. The harm is not outweighed by the public benefits, and the failure to accord with the policies and statute previously cited is not justified. For the reasons given above it is concluded that both appeals should be dismissed.

S J Papworth

INSPECTOR