



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2021

by David Smith BA(Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C1760/W/21/3275525

Balksbury House, Balksbury Hill, Andover, SP11 7LW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval to details required by a condition of a planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr David Heelas against the decision of Test Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00133/COND5, sought approval of details pursuant to condition No 5 of planning permission Ref 19/00133/FULLN, granted on 23 April 2019.
 - The application was partially refused by notice dated 27 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing prefabricated garage, replacement with garage and workroom and a single bedroom and bathroom adapted for a disabled person.
 - The details for which approval is sought are external materials.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and the details of the proposed roofing materials, submitted with application Ref 19/00133/COND5 pursuant to condition No 5 attached to planning permission Ref 19/00133/FULLN granted on 23 April 2019, are approved.

Main Issue

2. The Council has approved the timber cladding and brick plinth for the permitted building. However, the proposed roofing material was not accepted. Therefore the main issue is its effect on the character and appearance of the area, including the setting of the Upper Clatford Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The permitted building is 'L' shaped with a shallow pitched roof and would be located at the end of the garden where a prefabricated garage previously stood. The cluster of buildings to the north of Balksbury House includes other dwellings but also an industrial estate, tennis centre and day nursery.
4. The predominant roofing materials within this group are concrete interlocking tiles with some corrugated sheet roofing. There are slates on Valley House directly adjoining Balksbury House and on its roadside outbuilding. Nevertheless, in this context the use of Marley Modern roof tiles in smooth grey would integrate satisfactorily with the immediately surrounding development. Furthermore, they would match the main roof covering of Balksbury House in line with Policy COM11 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan. This requires ancillary domestic buildings in the countryside to be designed to be in keeping with the existing dwelling.

5. The Upper Clatford Conservation Area lies some 90m to the south and is separated from the appeal site by open meadows. The view from it along Balksbury Hill is identified as important in the character appraisal. However, from this direction the roof would be a minor element in the overall scene. The proposed tiles would be viewed against the mixed development with its diverse roof forms that ascends the hill. Therefore, the proposed roofing material would not detract from the historic village qualities of the conservation area.
6. According to the Council, Balksbury House is a non-designated heritage asset. It was built as a small farmhouse in the mid-nineteenth century. Given the use of matching materials as well as the position of the permitted building, the proposed details ensure that it would be a subsidiary structure. The significance of both these heritage assets would therefore not be harmed.
7. As is evident, tiles of this type are frequently used on domestic buildings and so are not intrinsically industrial in style. The Council seeks the use of a smaller tile in a dark colour to reduce the bulk of the building but the proposed tiles would be muted and so would blend in with the surroundings. Interlocking tiles have a chunkier profile than slate which would provide a smoother appearance. However, the roof pitch was lowered to 18 degrees during negotiations on the original application. At this angle the evidence is that neither plain clay tiles nor slates would be watertight. In any event, the proposed tiles are unobjectionable in this location.
8. Therefore the proposed roofing materials would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Local Plan Policy E1 expects high quality development that should, amongst other things improve the character, function and quality of the area. The details proposed are acceptable and the development as a whole would be an enhancement when compared to the former garage.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given the submitted details should be approved and the appeal succeeds.

David Smith

INSPECTOR