



Appeal Decision

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

Decision by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

An appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/D/20/3250731

The Stables, Home Farm, Ridge Lane, Rotherwick, Hook RG27 9AX

- 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 Carruthers against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02747/HOU, dated 10 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a single storey rear extension within existing courtyard.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension within existing courtyard at The Stables, Home Farm, Ridge Lane, Rotherwick, Hook RG27 9AX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/02747/HOU dated 10 December 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: P.11 rev A.
 - 3) 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.

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the building and wider site and whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Rotherwick Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a unit located within a former agricultural building and part of a farm complex, converted to residential use in the 1990's. The whole building

is a rectangular shape formed around a central courtyard divided into garden spaces, with a large detached outbuilding centrally sited within the courtyard.

5. The site is located within the Rotherwick Conservation Area (CA) and the building is a non-designated heritage asset, contributing positively to the character and appearance of the CA. The significance of the CA is largely derived from the quality of its traditional buildings and rural setting, and the non-designated heritage asset (locally listed) nature of the building is set out in the Supplementary Planning Document Rotherwick CA Character Appraisal and Management Proposals (2011) as being derived from its history as 'a purpose-built quadrangle of farm buildings associated with Tylney Hall and dating to the early 20th century.' It also confirms that locally listed buildings provide well detailed facades.
6. 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 National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
7. The extension proposed would be a modest rear single storey projection, with a design and materials to match the existing building. The Council have raised no issue with the design, and I have no reason to disagree. The rear of the units within the quadrangle are divided by boundary walls and fencing and given the visible domestic paraphrenia, small outbuilding and alterations such as solar panels, rooflights, rear dormers and flues, the character is more private and residential than the unaltered frontage of the building. As such, whilst the extension would erode the space to the rear and alter the original simple form of the wider building, the impact on the wider character of the building is modest.
8. Moreover, I note that there is no disagreement between the parties that permitted development rights were not removed when planning permission for the conversion of building into residential units was originally granted. The appellant has indicated that they would be prepared to slightly alter the scale and design of the proposed extension to comply with the restrictions of permitted development rights and have stated that an application for a certificate for these works has been submitted. This may well result in a less appropriate design, for example in including a flat roofed element. There is a reasonable prospect of this fall-back position being pursued and erected, and as such I give this significant weight.
9. The minor scale of the proposed extension would ensure that it remains subservient, would not create a sense of enclosure for neighbouring occupiers, and would not detract from the original character of the building. Tylney Hall is located on the other side of the road and given the distance between the two buildings and the scale and location of the proposed extension, it would not affect the setting of this building or the appeal property's relationship with it. Moreover, the impact on the wider CA would be minimal given the extension's position wholly surrounded by the building. The proposal would not detract from the non-designated heritage asset or wider site and CA, thereby causing no material harm to the significance of the heritage assets.

10. In light of the foregoing, I conclude that the proposed extension would be in keeping with the existing character and appearance of the existing property, would not detract from the significance of the non-designated heritage asset and would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. There is therefore no conflict with Policy BE02 of the Rotherwick Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2032 (2016), saved Policies CON13 and CON17 of the Hart District Local Plan 1996-2006 (Saved Policies) (2020) and the Framework, which collectively seek, amongst other things, to ensure that the character or appearance of the CA is preserved or enhanced and that design is appropriate to the character and setting of the locally listed buildings.

Conditions

11. The standard conditions relating to the start date and approved plans are considered necessary in the interest of clarity. In addition, a condition requiring the external materials to match the existing building is considered necessary to ensure that the development is in keeping visually with the existing dwelling and terrace.

Recommendation

12. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed with the suggested conditions.

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed with the conditions set out above.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR