



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 1 March 2022

by A Tucker BA (Hons) IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 March 2022

Appeal A Ref: APP/N1730/W/21/3283431

Burgess House, Odiham Road, Heckfield, HOOK, RG27 0LE

- 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 Gallagher against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01388/HOU, dated 17 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing conservatory and erection of single storey rear extension with internal reconfigurations.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/N1730/Y/21/3283430

Burgess House, Odiham Road, Heckfield, HOOK, RG27 0LE

- 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 & Mrs Gallagher against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01389/LBC, dated 17 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 July 2021.
 - The works proposed are demolition of existing conservatory and erection of single storey rear extension with internal reconfigurations.
-

Decision – Appeal A

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing conservatory and erection of single storey rear extension with internal reconfigurations, at Burgess House, Odiham Road, Heckfield, Hook, RG27 0LE, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01388/HOU, dated 17 May 2021, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Decision – Appeal B

2. The appeal is allowed, and listed building consent is granted for demolition of existing conservatory and erection of single storey rear extension with internal reconfigurations, at Burgess House, Odiham Road, Heckfield, Hook, RG27 0LE, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01389/LBC, dated 17 May 2021, and the plans submitted with it, substituting drawing No. 20-4827-P-02 with 20-4827-P-02 Rev A, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeals relate to the same proposal under different legislation. Appeal A is made in respect of the planning application and Appeal B in respect of the listed building consent. I have considered each appeal on its own merits.

4. On 20 July 2021, after the Council issued its decisions, the Government published its revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). I am satisfied that the changes are not significant in relation to the appeal proposal. I therefore do not consider it necessary to invite further comments from the parties on this matter.
5. Revision A of drawing No. 20-4827-P-02 was submitted with the appeal. The drawing removes the external boiler flue that was previously proposed and retains a nib of masonry in the proposed WC. Both revisions are minor. I do not consider the interests of any party to be prejudiced if I take this plan into account. I shall therefore determine the appeals on the basis of the plans submitted to the Council, substituting drawing No. 20-4827-P-02 with 20-4827-P-02 Rev A.

Main Issue

6. The main issue for both appeals is the effect of the proposal upon the significance of the grade II listed building known as Burgess House, and the character and appearance of the Heckfield Conservation Area.

Reasons

7. Section 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCA) requires the decision maker to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Additionally, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
8. Burgess House is a substantial dwelling that was significantly extended during the mid 20th century. Its historic core is limited to its western half, of which the rear part is suggested to be an historic extension. These older parts of the building have seen significant intervention that has included the replacement of windows and doors with modern fittings that do not respect the special interest of the building, and associated changes such as the soldier courses of brick over window openings. The western part of the building does however appear to retain some of its historic plan form. Some curved brick lintels are retained on the north side of the building as are areas of blue faced bricks on the south elevation. These elements, along with historic roof coverings, the substantial chimney at the building's western end and the general form of the western half of the building are attributes of the building that contribute towards its special interest.
9. The Heckfield Conservation Area (HCA) covers a small rural settlement. It is characterised by country lanes and traditional buildings that utilise local materials with many retaining traditional detailing, joinery and fittings. The HCA covers an extensive area of parkland around Highfield Park, which forms the setting to the village. The appeal building is within a detached area, separated by the modern main road, that features a small number of historic buildings, of which the appeal building is a part, that stand at the road edge and present a traditional rural village scene. The informal arrangement of these buildings, their traditional appearance, materials and detailing are factors that contribute to the significance of the HCA.

10. The majority of the internal works are accepted by the Council. Based on my own understanding of the building, which includes a review of the information before me and my observations on site, I am satisfied that the internal alterations to which the Council did not object would not harm the building's special interest.
11. The revised plan modifies the proposal in the area of the proposed WC. This would allow the small projecting nib of what appears to be historic masonry with a projecting plinth to be retained in situ. The revised plan removes the previously proposed extension to the boiler flue.
12. The proposal would see the existing sun room replaced with a larger extension. This would have a more solid appearance than the existing sun room, and would extend further out, beyond the existing back wall of the dwelling. I accept that this would have a greater physical presence than the existing extension. However, it would primarily be viewed from the road, where it would be seen beyond the older two storey part of the dwelling. It would be viewed alongside an elevation that presents itself as the building's rear façade, reinforced by prominent service fittings such as a flue and soil pipe. This façade faces out towards a narrow space that is enclosed by a high boundary wall. The manner by which the extension would project out from this rear wall would thus appear as an ordinary rear extension and would not harm any characteristic of the building that contribute to its special interest.
13. The extension to the east would reduce the gap between the dwelling and the large detached garage. However, the buildings would remain detached, and the extension would have a lower roof form than the garage. I am therefore satisfied that the extension and garage would still appear as two separate structures. The proposed extension would have a low and additive form that would not increase the building's mass in a harmful manner when viewed from the road. Neither would it overwhelm the scale of the historic building beyond the significant existing impact of the large extension to the east.
14. In terms of the impact of the proposal on the HCA, whilst the extension would be more prominent than the existing sunroom, the traditional form of the building and its prominent road side position would be unchanged by the proposal. It would be in a position set back from the road, and would be viewed as a secondary element to the building, with a simple additive form.
15. In summary, the proposal would not cause harm to the significance of the listed building or the HCA. It would thus preserve the special interest of the listed building and the character and appearance of the HCA, in accordance with the requirements of the LBCA and paragraph 199 of the Framework, which states that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets. It would also accord with Policies NBE8 and NBE9 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2032 and Saved Policy GEN1 of the Hart District Local Plan 1996-2006, which together seek to ensure that development proposals are well designed and conserve or enhance heritage assets.

Conditions

16. I have had regard to the planning conditions suggested by the Council. I have considered the conditions against the tests in the Framework and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. I have imposed a condition for the planning permission that specifies the approved plans as this provides certainty.

17. I have imposed a condition for the planning permission and the listed building consent to require the submission of details of external materials to avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building and preserve the character and appearance of the HCA.
18. I have imposed a condition for the listed building consent relating to the use of breathable materials, to ensure that any works to historic fabric do not cause physical or visual harm to the listed building.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons above, appeal A and appeal B should be allowed.

A Tucker

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

Appeal A Ref: APP/N1730/W/21/3283431

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, Block Plan, 20-4827-P-01 and 20-4827-P-02 Rev A.
- 3) Notwithstanding the approved plans, no work or development above ground level shall take place until details and samples of all materials, including windows and doors, to be used on the exterior surfaces of the proposal hereby permitted have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Good quality manufacturers information or weblinks which accurately show the details may be acceptable. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Appeal B Ref: APP/N1730/Y/21/3283430

- 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.
- 2) Notwithstanding the approved plans, no work or development above ground level shall take place until details and samples of all materials, including windows and doors, to be used on the exterior surfaces of the proposal hereby permitted have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Good quality manufacturers information or weblinks which accurately show the details may be acceptable. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 3) Any making good of historic fabric shall be carried out in a traditional breathable material, to match as closely as possible the appearance and performance of the existing building.