



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 27 November 2020

by Graham Dudley BA (Hons) Arch Dip Cons AA RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 January 2021

Appeal A: APP/H1705/Y/20/3252978

Holly Cottage, Winchester Road, Newtown Common, RG20 9DD

- 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 R Ward against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council
 - The application Ref 20/00068/LBC dated 08 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension to the left of Holly Cottage, and a weather porch to the rear, and a partition wall to form a new downstairs WC.
-

Appeal B: APP/H1705/W/20/3252979

Holly Cottage, Winchester Road, Newtown Common, RG20 9DD

- 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 and Mrs R Ward against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00127/HSE, dated 17 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2020.
 - The works proposed are replacement of the rear porch and a single storey side extension.
-

Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to a single storey side extension to the side of Holly Cottage. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the weather porch to the rear, a partition wall to form a new downstairs wc and chimney and listed building consent is granted for the weather porch to the rear, a partition wall to form a new downstairs wc and chimney at Holly Cottage, Winchester Road, Newtown Common, RG20 9DD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/00068/LBC, dated 8 February 2020 and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the condition that external materials shall match the existing.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to a single storey side extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the replacement of the rear porch and planning permission is granted for replacement of the rear porch at Holly Cottage, Winchester Road, Newtown Common, RG20 9DD in accordance with

the terms of the application, Ref 20/00127/HSE, dated 17 January 2020 and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the condition that external materials shall match the existing.

Reasons

3. The main issue is the effect on the significance and special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.
4. The list description identifies Holly Cottage as being grade II listed and a C17 cottage, formed with a 2 bay timber frame. It has been faced up with masonry and has had later extensions to it. I consider that the significance and historic interest of the building relates to its age, materials, construction and cottage appearance.
5. The development plan included the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan with Policies EM10 and EM11 being relevant. Policy EM10 requires all development to be of a high quality. Household extensions will be permitted where they, amongst other things, have due regard to the density, scale, layout, appearance, architectural detailing, materials and history of the surrounding area and relationship to heritage assets. Policy EM11 notes that all development must conserve or enhance the quality of the borough's heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. Development must ensure that extensions and/or alterations respect the historic form, setting, fabric and any other aspects that contribute to the significance of the host building. There is also supplementary planning documents in terms of design and sustainability and heritage.
6. Currently there is a utilitarian flat roofed porch to the rear of the house that harms the character and appearance of the listed building. It is proposed that this is removed and replaced with a new porch. The new porch design is a simple timber frame with pitched roof over, which is an improvement to the character and appearance of the listed building and does not affect its significance.
7. It is also proposed to utilise an existing internal flue, providing a small brick chimney above the roof. The chimney is a minor feature in relation to the rest of the house, is in keeping with the other chimney and has no effect of the significance and special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.
8. Internally it is proposed to provide a small wall to form a new toilet area and this would have no major effect upon the original part of the building and would not affect its significance and special architectural and historic interest.
9. The main proposal is to extend the building at ground floor level. This would be proportionately a very large extension, particularly in relation to the floor area of the original building. The appellant has also provided an alternative roof proposal for the external arrangement. The alternative is with a flat roof and lantern, while the application has a flat roof and lantern, but with pitched roof sections to front and rear.
10. The main problem with the extension is the size of the proposed space in relation to the rest of the listed building which in my opinion would be disproportionate to it, both in terms of its plan form and elevations (in either form). While it is smaller than the existing building, it is still a sizable extension

that would appear prominent in views of the listed building and would not be sufficiently subordinate to the listed building.

11. I accept it is not visible from public positions but any harm to a listed building has to be considered. I also acknowledge that generally the materials proposed are reasonable. However, the flat roofed variation of the extension is not in keeping with the design of the listed building, and the small pitched roof sections suggested as additions in the other variation are also alien features that would harm the appearance of the listed building and its significance and special architectural and historic interest. There is also a significant potential for loss of the original outside wall. Although the opening is reasonably small, there is evidence that the existing wall has had alterations in the past and would be potentially unstable if altered as proposed. Overall, the proposal would not accord with Policies EM10 and EM11.
12. In terms of the National Planning Policy Framework the level of harm would be identified as 'less than substantial' and needs to be balance against any public benefits. There would be benefit to the owner and his family improving their living space and perhaps some benefit in maintaining and securing the future of the listed building. I also note that the owner has taken great care to preserve the listed building in terms of fire protection and plumbing. However, given the level of harm it clearly outweighs any of the benefits. I find that the proposal is unacceptable and should be dismissed. However, as the porch, flue and internal wall would be acceptable I will issue a split decision and allow these works.

Graham Dudley

Planning Inspector