



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2023

by J White BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C1760/D/22/3307679

1 Park Lane, Quarley, Hampshire SP11 8QB

- 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 Anthony Whiting against the decision of Test Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01017/FULLN, dated 11 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is replacement of current wooden garage door with roller shutter door.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Within the decision notice and officer report the Council refers to 'Quarley Village Design Statement'. However, within its appeal questionnaire the Council advises that no such document exists.
3. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires special regard to be paid to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting. In addition, Section 72(1) of the Act requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area bearing in mind the special attention that should be paid to the desirability of preserving the setting of the host property 1 Park Lane (No 1), a Grade II listed building, and the extent to which it would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Quarley Conservation Area (QCA).

Reasons

5. The garage lies to the side of No 1, which is a Grade II listed building occupying a position beside Park Lane within the QCA. As stated in the Grateley and Quarley Conservation Areas Policy, there are several eighteenth-century thatched cottages along Park Lane, which together form an important historic group. These buildings are constructed from a mixture of local and traditional building materials. The buildings are arranged close to Park Lane and are prominent along it. The collection of historic buildings, the prominence of traditional and local construction materials and how they are experienced,

which includes the appeal site, provides a positive contribution to the area. These elements reinforce the local character, appearance and distinctiveness of the area and, insofar as it relates to this appeal, contribute strongly to the significance of the QCA.

6. No 1 is a detached cottage that was built in the early eighteenth-century. It is constructed from flint with brick bands and corners. The roof is thatched, and doors and windows are comprised of timber. The garage is a much later addition and has been built in materials matching that of the host dwelling. The existing garage door comprises two side hung ledge and brace timber doors with glazed lights.
7. Therefore, the use of traditional building materials, colours and detailing of windows and doors not only contributes directly to the significance of the QCA, but also the special interest of the host dwelling, reinforcing the distinctiveness of the area.
8. I acknowledge that the windows and doors within the garage are relatively modern, however, they are of a suitable material, design and constructional technique which is authentic and characteristic of its setting. Although I note comments that the appellant believes, if painted white, 'there would be virtually no visual difference' with the proposed metal door, as can be seen in the plans supplied with the appeal documents, the appearance and design of the metal door is noticeably different to the existing traditional timber doors in the surrounding area.
9. In my view, the metal door would have a very different appearance, with a single top opening roller shutter door. Even though a condition could be imposed, as suggested by the appellant, to require the door to be painted in the same colour and finished with a 'woodgrain effect', the metal door would have a glossier manufactured finish, that lacks finesse and craftsmanship, without the more organic, less uniform texture and appearance of timber which ages over time. Furthermore, it would have a horizontal emphasis and would be unadorned. As such, it would be readily apparent that the metal door is a modern replacement.
10. Although the garage building would retain its traditional general form and appearance, the material and detail of the metal door would significantly diminish the existing coherent appearance. In this particular location, despite the set back from the road and building line, the appeal building is experienced amongst a group of historic buildings where the built form and traditional materials reinforce local identity and are positive contributions to the character and appearance of the QCA. Notwithstanding that the existing garage is a more recent building or whether the existing shower room extension is appropriate or not, the proposed modern door would distract and be a discordant addition. Consequently, it would undermine the character and appearance of the QCA, and the proposal would markedly weaken the building's contribution to the integrity of the setting of the listed building. Whilst there would be occasions when vehicles are parked in front of the garage, the modern alteration would still be obvious and noticeable from Park Lane.
11. During my site visit I observed that the existing door is showing signs of rot particularly along the bottom edge and it is acknowledged that this has implications in terms of the security of the building. Nevertheless, it has not been demonstrated whether the door could be repaired. Even if repair were not

an option, there is no substantive evidence that a suitably designed timber door could not be provided or that the metal door would significantly outperform a well-maintained timber door.

12. The appellant confirms that the hedgerow beside the garage would be retained. Even if it were possible to secure the retention of this hedge via condition, I am not persuaded that its presence would mitigate the harmful effect the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the QCA or the setting of No 1.
13. Consequently, the proposed development would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the QCA and would erode the setting of the host property thereby causing harm to its special interest. Therefore, I find that the proposal would harm both the character and appearance of the QCA and significance of the listed building by way of impact upon its setting.
14. Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 200 goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets or from development within their setting and that this should have a clear and convincing justification. Given the limited scale of the proposal, I find the harm to be less than substantial in this instance but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight.
15. Under such circumstances, Paragraph 202 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, which includes the securing of optimal viable use of listed buildings.
16. There is no suggestion that the failure to allow the proposed door would prevent the use of the listed building. I acknowledge that the appellant considers that the proposed door would improve the housing stock for older people and, in turn, help to maintain the listed building. Nonetheless, there is no substantive evidence that a suitably designed timber door would be outperformed by the proposed metal door in these respects. I also note that the appellant believes that the metal door would have a smaller carbon footprint compared to a hardwood timber door. Nevertheless, I have no evidence about the relative environmental benefits of the different materials over the lifetime of the alternatives from manufacture to disposal once their useful life ends. I have insufficient information, therefore, to reach a view about whether the metal door would contribute more favourably in this regard in comparison to a timber replacement of an appropriate design. Accordingly, I give these matters limited weight and these are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.
17. Overall, I therefore find that there would be insufficient public benefit to offset the identified harm. Given the above, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the setting of the Grade II listed building and the character and appearance of the QCA. The development would thus fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 197 of the Framework and would conflict with Policies E1 and E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan. Together these Local Plan policies seek, amongst other things, development that is of high quality in terms of design and local distinctiveness, requires new development to integrate, respect and complement the character of the area, including in terms of materials, and requires that development makes a

positive contribution to sustaining or enhancing the significance of heritage assets.

Other Matters

18. I have been referred to case examples in the area. I observed during my site visit that those in Etwall are within a more recent housing development. As such, I do not find that the development is directly comparable with the appeal proposal in terms of the effect on the character and appearance of the area or setting of the listed building.
19. I also observed the example at Bridge Cottage, which the appellant advises was granted planning permission in 1993. Although I note that the QCA was designated in 1991, I have no evidence about what the key issues were in this case or how the decision was reached. In any case, the fact that apparently similar development has been granted permission is not a reason, on its own, to allow unacceptable development. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reason set out above. Therefore, these cases are matters to which I attach limited weight and they do not deflect from my concerns relating to the appeal scheme.
20. The appellant advises that there has been no local opposition to the proposal. Be that as it may, this does not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

21. In conclusion, the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the setting of the Grade II listed building and the character and appearance of the QCA. The benefits put forward for the proposal would not outweigh the harm caused when the scheme is considered against the Act, the Framework and Development Plan policy.
22. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J White

INSPECTOR