



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 August 2020 by Ben Phillips BSc MSc

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/D/20/3251411

Stable Cottage, Vyne Road, Sherborne St John RG24 9HL

- 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 Mrs Nicola James against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
- The application Ref 19/02358/HSE, dated 21 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2020.
- The development proposed is the erection of two storey extension to the north elevation following demolition of existing single storey extension, single storey extension to the south elevation and relocation of porch.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the two storey extension to the north elevation. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the single storey extension to the south elevation and relocation of porch at Stable Cottage, Vyne Road, Sherborne St John RG24 9HL in accordance with the terms of application Ref 19/02358/HSE, dated 21 August 2019 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, insofar as they relate to the development hereby permitted: 539-001-PL01 Location Plan, 539-012-PL02-Proposed Site Plan, 539-013-PL03-Proposed Ground and First Floor Plans, 539-015-PL04-Proposed South and West Elevations, 539-016-PL03-Perspective Views of Proposal, 539-017-PL00-Perspective Views of Proposal 2 of 2, 539-014-PL03-Proposed North and East Elevations.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The Council make reference to the Sherfield on Loddon Conservation Area (CA) in their refusal reasons, however the delegated report and CA Appraisal and

map name the CA as the Sherborne St John CA. Given the property is clearly located within the Sherborne St John CA I have assessed the proposal against the documents provided. The appellants have pointed out this mistake and discussed the proposal in this context in the appeal statement, and as such are not prejudiced by this.

4. The above description of development is taken from part E of the appeal form and the Council's decision notice, in the interest of clarity. Finally, the proposal was amended during the consideration of the planning application. The Council based their decision on the amended plans, and I have considered the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area, including the Sherborne St John Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for Recommendation

6. The appeal property is a detached dwelling set in a prominent location on the corner of Vyne Road and a rural access (and public right of way) lane. The rural surroundings are characterised by sporadic development set along the main road heading out of the settlement.
7. The site is located within the CA, the significance of which is largely derived from the special architectural and historic interest of the village. The appeal property is identified in the Sherborne St John CA Appraisal Map as a Notable Building, contributing positively to the character and appearance of the CA. Although not on a local list, the Council describe the property as a non-designated heritage, which is disputed by the appellant.
8. In this regard the Council's Supplementary Planning Document Heritage (2019) sets out at 6.2.5 '*... that inclusion on a local list is not a prerequisite for consideration of a building or structure as a non-designated heritage asset.*' The Glossary to the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) sets out under the definition of heritage asset that these include designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority. In this regard, I find that the Council has identified the host property as having a degree of significance with specific reference made within the CA Appraisal to it, in terms of its value with nearby properties and that its gable is identified as '*particularly important in punctuating the long view towards the village*'. Given the above I consider that the appeal property has been identified by the Council as a non-designated heritage asset, and I have treated it as such.
9. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out that special attention should be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas and the guidance contained within the Framework states that local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, which in this case is the CA and the host property, and that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
10. The proposed single storey front extension and new porch would be limited in scale and would not detract from the character and appearance of the existing

dwelling. Moreover, given their siting and design set behind the existing front projection and boundary walls of the dwelling, they would also have no visual impact on the wider street scene. In this regard these aspects of the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the host property, the surrounding area and the CA. It is noteworthy that the Council reached a similar view in respect of these elements of the proposal.

11. The two-storey rear extension would be prominently sited however, and clearly visible from Vyne Road when approaching from the north-east and the access lane/path running along the side of the property. Whilst incorporating a pitch roof design and materials to match the main house with a set down from the main ridge, the height and depth of the extension would mostly obscure the original simple form of the dwelling, including a large part of the tile detailing on the elevation to which this extension would be attached. This part of the proposal would prevent appreciation of the building's original character and appearance and would compromise the significance of the property as a non-designated heritage asset.
12. The two storey extension would be seen in the context of the main house and as such would not be harmful to its rural surroundings. However, given that I have found that this part of the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property, it follows that the dwelling's contribution to the character and appearance of the CA would be eroded by the extension. The two storey extension would neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA as a designated heritage asset. This is a matter to which I give great weight.
13. It is noted that an application¹ has been recently approved for an extension to the property, however the detailed drawings of this is not before me and as such comparison is not possible. It is noted however that the extension proposed was a '*part two storey, part single storey extension to the north elevation*' rather than the two storey proposal before me. It does not therefore appear to be comparable to the appeal proposal.
14. The identified harm to the significance of the CA as a designated heritage asset would be localised and therefore less than substantial. In accordance with the Framework paragraph 196 this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this instance, the private benefit of increased accommodation space for the appellants does not represent a public benefit which outweighs the identified harm.
15. In light of the foregoing, I conclude that the proposed two storey extension to the north elevation would detract from the existing character and appearance of the existing property and would harm the significance of the non-designated heritage asset. Moreover, it would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the wider CA. Accordingly there is conflict with Policies EM1, EM10 and EM11 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-2029 (2016) (LP) which, amongst other matters collectively require development to be sympathetic and contribute to local distinctiveness, in addition to respecting the historic form of a host building and conserving or enhancing the quality, distinctiveness and character of heritage assets by ensuring the use of appropriate design. There is also conflict with Section 16 of the Framework

¹ Planning application number 20/00427/HSE

which seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment and the statutory test.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. I find that the two storey extension to the north elevation are clearly severable from the rest of the proposal and therefore, based on my findings above, I recommend that a split decision is issued in this case, dismissing the two storey extension and allowing the single storey extension to the south elevation and relocation of porch.
17. For the part of the proposal that I am recommending is approved, conditions are necessary requiring that the development is undertaken in accordance with the approved drawings and that materials match the existing property, to protect the character and appearance of the property and wider CA.

Recommendation

18. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

19. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the two storey extension to the north elevation and allowed in all other respects.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR