



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2020

by M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y9507/W/19/3224690

22A Stable Cottage, High Street, Petersfield GU32 3JL

- 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 David Graver, David Graver Building and Property Services Limited against the decision of South Downs National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref SDNP/18/04431/HOUS, dated 19 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 3 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is extension to existing outbuilding to form a single garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. To address inconsistencies in the submitted plans the appellant has provided an amended proposed block plan (LCC01/0/2) during the appeal. This is to clarify the location of the proposed garage. The South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) does not contest the submission of this plan. Therefore, I am satisfied that the interests of no party would be prejudiced by taking this into account in determining the appeal.
3. Since the determination of the application, the SDNPA has adopted the South Downs Local Plan (LP). The policies in the LP replace those contained in the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy and the saved policies of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Second Review.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are: a) whether the information submitted with the application was sufficient to determine it; and, b) whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the setting of nearby listed buildings, and the character and appearance of the Petersfield Town Centre Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

Submitted information

5. There is an inconsistency in the position of the proposed garage between the location plan and the proposed block plan. The appellant advises that this has arisen as a consequence of using an Ordnance Survey Extract for the block plan. Whilst plan CC01/0/2 provides a dimension of the proposed garage from

the western boundary of the site, it does not specifically address the inconsistency.

6. Notwithstanding the discrepancy between the submitted plans, I am not aware of the SDNPA requesting clarification of this from the appellant during the application process. Indeed, based on its delegated report, decision notice, and in particular the first reason for refusal, it is clear that SDNPA had sufficient information to consider and determine the application.

Character and appearance

7. Located to the rear of 22 High Street (No 22) within Petersfield town centre, the appeal site comprises part of an outbuilding, Stable Cottage and part of a 12th Century burgage plot. No.22 is Grade II Listed building and Stable Cottage is a 'curtilage listed' building which has been converted to a dwelling. The appeal site is also within the CA.
8. Based on the Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan Petersfield, April 2017 (Character Appraisal) the appeal site forms part of Character Area 3. This includes period buildings and some modern development. As such, its significance is derived from the quality architecture and materials of the individual buildings, which along with spaces about them contribute to the high-quality character and appearance of the area. In particular, the Character Appraisal identifies the historic layout of the 12th century burgage plots as a key positive feature of the CA. The appeal site is part of one of the last two such plots in the area.
9. The forms and materials of the existing outbuilding to the rear of No 22 and Stable Cottage complement each other, along with the walled enclosure of the wider burgage plot. Furthermore, these buildings are set back towards the southern boundary of the burgage plot and therefore retain its largely open character and appearance. Accordingly, the appeal site enhances the setting of the listed buildings and positively contributes to the character and appearance of the CA.
10. The proposed garage extension would utilise traditional materials and its ridge height is to be consistent with the host outbuilding. It also incorporates a pitched roof to match Stable Cottage. Nevertheless, due to the projecting nature of the garage extension and its higher eaves height than the host outbuilding, it would appear incongruous in views from the burgage plot. This incongruity would be compounded by the proposed Hazel Coppice fencing which would contrast starkly with the traditional walled enclosure of the burgage plot. Together, these elements would detract from the appearance of the existing outbuildings to the rear of No 22.
11. Moreover, the combination of an additional physical structure and associated fencing would result in the permanent erosion and subdivision of the burgage plot. The installation of the proposed clay brick paving will contrast with the existing gravelled surface, thereby further highlighting the subdivision of the burgage plot.
12. I acknowledge that the proposed development would be largely screened from Folly Lane by the existing buildings. Irrespective, the desirability of preserving the setting of a listed building and preserving or enhancing the character or

appearance of the CA applies whether or not the proposal is prominent or in public view.

13. Accordingly, the proposal represents poor quality design which would be harmful to the setting of the listed buildings, and the historical significance of the burgage plot. This would also fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. I consider such harm to be less than substantial.
14. Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
15. The appellant advises that "*the tenant has previously installed an unsightly prefabricated garage building so that the proposed building will not only provide secure garaging but also there will remain less scope for further unsightly paraphernalia within the garden area*". However, Paragraph 191 of the Framework advises that the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision. The provision of covered parking for Stable Cottage would be a personal benefit. Consequently, there are no public benefits which outweigh the less than substantial harm that I have identified.
16. For the above reasons, the development fails to accord with the purposes of the South Downs National Park and conflicts with Policy SD15 of the LP, which only permits development proposals within a conservation area, or within its setting, where they preserve or enhance the special architectural or historic interest, character or appearance of the conservation area. I also find conflict with Policy BEP1 of the Petersfield Neighbourhood Plan, which amongst other things requires that all development will be expected to meet the highest standards of design and make a positive contribution to the character of Petersfield, this includes the grain of plots.

Other Matters

17. In the absence of an alternative scheme, I am unable to suggest alterations to the proposed fencing through the use of a planning condition.
18. Although the submitted scheme is different to a previously refused proposal for a detached double garage at the appeal site, this does not alter my findings on the second main issue. In any event, each application is determined on its merits.

Conclusion

19. For the above reasons, although I have found that the submitted information was sufficient to determine the application, this does not outweigh the harm to heritage assets and conflict with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Aqbal

INSPECTOR