

Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 25 January 2021

by S Edwards MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 March 2021

Appeal A Ref: APP/B1740/W/20/3261343 **83 Southampton Road, Lymington SO41 9GH**

- 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 Hyne against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/10446, dated 21 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing single storey rear extension and erection of single storey side extension.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/B1740/Y/20/3261349 **83 Southampton Road, Lymington SO41 9GH**

- 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 Hyne against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/10447, dated 21 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2020.
 - The works proposed are demolition of existing single storey rear extension and erection of single storey side extension.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The proposal relates to a listed building located within a conservation area, and I shall therefore have special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
4. Both appeals relate to the same site, and I shall consider the Council's decisions to refuse planning permission and listed building consent in a single document, given their similarities, and in the interests of brevity.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development and works on the significance of the Grade II listed building known as 83 Southampton Road, and the character or appearance of the Lymington Conservation Area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling dating from the early 19th century, which is jointly listed at Grade II with no 81 Southampton Road. Despite a number of alterations over time, the property retains much of its historic character and detailing, which include cornice and parapet features, and a recessed round arched doorway in moulded architrave. The stucco coating and large recessed sash windows add further elegance to the listed building.
7. The significance of this designated heritage asset derives primarily from the polite and restrained character of its front elevation. Nevertheless, the rear of the property also makes a positive contribution to the special interest of this Grade II listed building, by reason of its contrasting functional appearance, which also shows how the dwelling has been adapted and evolved over time.
8. The listing description refers to the group value which nos 81 and 83 Southampton Road, together with nos 85-89 Southampton Road (buildings of local interest) hold collectively. There is no doubt that these buildings, together with the terraces fronting Southampton Road, make a significant contribution to the Lymington Conservation Area as a whole, as an important part of the historic development of the settlement during the 19th century.
9. Following the demolition of the existing single storey element, the appeal scheme would fill in the L-shape created by the existing two-storey addition, and extend beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling. This would erode the appreciation of the listed house, notably by diminishing views of the historic rear elevation. Furthermore, and although a contemporary design approach, using overtly modern materials, may in some instances be appropriate, the proposed addition would in this particular case harmfully contrast with the host property.
10. The expansive use of glazing is intended to give the extension a lightweight appearance. However, this would be largely negated by the proposed aluminium metal frame and thickness of the red brick wall for the side elevation. The use of red brick is not widely apparent within the listed building, other than in respect of the chimney stacks and would therefore, relative to the overall size of the extension, appear disproportionate. Furthermore, the aluminium frame to the glazing would be in stark contrast to the softer palette which characterises the property and stand out as an alien feature. For these reasons, I find that the proposed development and works would not preserve the special interest of the listed building.
11. The loss of fabric required to enable the proposed development and works to proceed is not original, and small sections would be retained to inform the internal layout of the property. Additionally, a method statement has been provided by the appellants to ensure that the demolition of the existing single storey structure could be carried out without causing harm to the appeal property and neighbouring lean-to structure. However, there is limited evidence before me regarding the construction of the proposed extension and showing how it would be physically connected to the listed building. The imposition of a condition requiring the submission of a method statement would not be sufficient to outweigh my concerns in respect of the appeal scheme.

12. The Council has not taken issue with the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Lymington Conservation Area, and there are no reasons for me to take an alternative view. Despite the harm which the appeal scheme would cause to the listed building, I am satisfied that it would preserve the significance of the Conservation Area. This is because the significance of a conservation area is dependent upon how it is experienced.
13. Listed buildings are however safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest, irrespective of whether or not public views of the proposed extension could be gained. The proposed development and works would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed property, to which I ascribe considerable importance and weight.
14. In such circumstances, paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Although the existing single storey extension is proposed to be demolished, its replacement would be constructed in a more sensitive location, and would cause harm to the significance of the listed building. Therefore, only limited weight can be ascribed to this consideration. Overall, I have not been presented with any public benefits, which would outweigh the identified harm.
15. It is accepted that the proposal could improve the overall layout of the property and provide enhanced living conditions for its occupiers, having particular regard to the present condition of the existing single storey element. However, these would largely constitute private benefits. Any alterations would need to be undertaken in a manner which does not prejudice the significance of this designated heritage asset.
16. Given the above, the appeal scheme would fail to preserve the significance of no 83 Southampton Road. It would therefore conflict with Policy ENV3 of the New Forest District Local Plan 2016-2036 Part 1: Planning Strategy¹, Policy DM1 of the New Forest District Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management², but also Sections 12 and 16 of the Framework. Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that development proposals are sympathetic to their environment and context, and conserve or enhance the significance, character and appearance of heritage assets.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons detailed above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that both appeals should be dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR

¹ Adopted 6 July 2020.

² Adopted 2014.