



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 October 2023

by J Bowyer BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L1765/Y/22/3311142

Pinglestone Farm, Abbotstone Road, Old Alresford, Hampshire SO24 9TB

- 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 David Wakeham against the decision of Winchester City Council.
- The application Ref 22/01511/LIS, dated 7 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 November 2022.
- The works proposed are 'single storey extension to The Old Stables Block'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the application form and refers to an extension to 'The Old Stables Block'. However, both main parties refer to the appeal building as 'The Old Stable Block' in their evidence. This is also how the address is stated on a Certificate of Lawfulness granted in relation to the site¹ ('the Certificate'). I have therefore referred to the appeal building as The Old Stable Block in my decision.
3. The Old Stable Block is located to the south west of a group of buildings at Pinglestone Farm, including the 'Barn at Pinglestone Farm' which is a grade II listed building (Ref: 1095182) ('the Barn'). Section 1(5) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ('the Act') sets out the meaning of a listed building for the purposes of the Act. It provides that a listed building means a building which is included in a list compiled or approved by the Secretary of State and that any object or structure within the curtilage of the building which, although not fixed to the building, forms part of the land and has done so since before 1 July 1948, shall be treated as part of the building.
4. In making the appeal, the appellant expressed a belief that the proposal is not within the curtilage of the listed building. However, no accompanying reasons were provided to explain this statement which is not entirely consistent with comments in the appellant's fuller appeal statement that *'The Old Stable Block is not Listed but is considered curtilage listed due to its proximity to the Grade II Listed barn, however there is no functional use linking The Old Stable Block and the barn.'* It is also contrary to the appellant's Heritage Statement within the Planning Design and Access Statement Rev C submitted as part of the appeal which noted that *'due to the close proximity of The Old Stable Block to the Grade 2 Listed barn, it is classed as being curtilage listed.'*

¹ Application ref 23/00299/LDC

5. Key factors relevant to the assessment of whether a structure is within the curtilage of a listed building are the physical layout of the listed building and structure, ownership both historically and at the date of listing and their use and function, again, both historically and at the date of listing.
6. In this case, the Barn dates to the late 17th Century and is the earliest remaining working building constructed on the farmstead. The appeal building is later, but historic maps included within the appellant's evidence clearly show a cluster of buildings around the Barn, including a building in the approximate location of The Old Stable Block, in 1870 and 1908. The Heritage Statement also refers to the New Alresford Tithe map of 1843 as showing the appeal building and other farm buildings including the Barn, albeit that this map is not reproduced in the evidence that has been submitted. The appeal building is located in close proximity to the Barn and from the information before me, it has been an integral part of the courtyard complex around the Barn for a significant period of time.
7. In addition, stables would commonly be found on farmsteads supporting their operations. The use of the appeal building as stables is likely to have been important to support the overall function and workings of the farm business as an ancillary structure to the much more substantial listed building.
8. The Old Stable Block is now occupied as a dwelling and may no longer share a functional link with the Barn. However, there is a strong historical association between the buildings and I have no substantive evidence in respect of the circumstances at or prior to the date of listing of the Barn in 1983. Having regard to the above factors, I find that The Old Stable Block is within the curtilage of the Barn and is to be treated as part of the listed building.
9. As the appeal relates to a listed building consent for works affecting a listed building, I have had special regard to section 16(2) of the Act.

Main Issue

10. The main issue is the effect of the proposed works on the special interest of the Grade II listed building, 'Barn at Pinglestone Farm'.

Reasons

11. Pinglestone Farm comprises a group of buildings set around a courtyard within surrounding open fields and watercress beds. The late 17th century Barn occupies a broadly central position within the group and is a substantial timber-framed barn with weatherboarding above a flint plinth. There have been some alterations to its roof and repairs and replacements of some fabric, but its vernacular form and traditional materials are distinctive and its historic use and function as a working agricultural building remains readily identifiable. This is further reinforced by the legible courtyard layout around the Barn which is noted in comments made by the Council as a good example of Hampshire vernacular agricultural layout and the surviving historic buildings which illustrate the development of the farm over time. This context together with the surrounding rural landscape informs an understanding of the historic purpose of the listed building and its role in the local agricultural economy as part of a working farm complex.
12. The appellant's Heritage Statement suggests that the Old Stable Block was built in 1824. It is a much more modest one and a half storey brick and flint

structure with a shallow slate roof located at the south west corner of the courtyard and cluster of buildings around The Barn. It is now in residential use with domestic features including rooflights and dormers. Even so these are fairly discreet features and its scale, simple form and architecture provide for a generally functional appearance and there remains an impression of its historic use in supporting the operations of the farm. The flint to the walls is further of similar appearance to the plinth of the Barn providing for a visual link and emphasising the historic relationship between the structures as part of a working farm.

13. Given the above, I find the special interest of the listed building, insofar as it relates to this appeal, to be primarily associated with its evidential and historic value as part of a working farm complex. As part of this, the scale, form and appearance of the Old Stable Block suggest its historic use in association with the Barn and its location forming part of the edge of the courtyard around the Barn contributes to the legibility of the farm complex morphology and informs understanding of the historic role and function of the listed building as part of the farm.
14. The proposal as amended during the course of the Council's consideration of the application includes a glazed link from the southern side of the appeal dwelling connecting to an extension that would project towards the east beyond the front elevation of the dwelling on a perpendicular alignment to it. The extension would be of lesser height and depth than the host building, but it would still be a fairly substantial structure of around two thirds the depth and a similar width to the dwelling and it would project a significant distance from it. There would also be a set of 4 glazed doors to the southern elevation and a large 3 casement window to the west elevation of the extension. These may be of simpler design than windows to the existing dwelling, but they would result in markedly larger expanses of glazing. Irrespective of the contrasting external materials, these factors would cause the extension to compete visually with the host building. Moreover, the large glazing sections would be positioned on elevations facing out on to the surrounding open fields. Despite the 'barn-style' design and materials, the large windows would also give the extension an overly domestic appearance within the rural setting. As a consequence, I find that the simple functional character and appearance of the host building would be notably eroded by the proposal. This would diminish its legibility as an ancillary farmstead structure with consequent harm to the special interest of the listed building.
15. In addition, the appellant's evidence indicates that there was formerly built form running eastwards from The Old Stable Block towards Pinglestone House along the southern edge of the courtyard. This had disappeared by 1908, but the general extent and layout of the courtyard nevertheless remains legible with the appeal building marking the south western corner. The proposal indicates the provision of three parking spaces to the west of the northernmost part of the dwelling adjacent to a garden which would wrap around to the west and southern side of the extension and dwelling. The appellant asserts that the parking would be located on an area already used for parking. Based on my observations though, the spaces would be at least partly on an area that was at the time of my visit grassed. They would consequently lead to a slight increase in the spread of hardstanding and vehicles out from the existing courtyard causing some, albeit limited, urbanisation of this part of the site.

16. Moreover, the garden would be large relative to the dwelling and would encroach a considerable way into the open field to the south of the farm cluster. Although the boundaries to the garden are shown as hedgerow, the residential use of this space would nevertheless impart a strong domestic quality that would contrast sharply with the adjacent field. The garden would be clearly appreciated as forming part of The Old Stable Block property and would result in the significant and conspicuous encroachment of the envelope of development out beyond the historic extent of the courtyard arrangement into the countryside. This would unbalance and harmfully distort the morphology of the farm cluster which was historically centred around the Barn eroding the legibility of the complex. It would also urbanise this part of the agricultural landscape surrounding the listed building which currently informs an understanding of its historic function and role in the rural economy of the area. Together with the parking, this would weaken the relationship of the Barn with its surrounding agricultural landscape with detriment to the evidential and historic value of the listed building.
17. I note that the Certificate relates to the use of land ancillary to the residential use of the Old Stable Block as garden land and parking. However, the parking is in a different location to the proposal before me which also shows a larger area of garden encroaching further towards the south away from the courtyard. Even leaving aside the extension which is also part of the appeal, the effects of the schemes on the special interest of the listed building are not therefore directly comparable and the Certificate is not a compelling justification for the harm that I have identified.
18. The proposal also includes alterations to windows, doors and rooflights to the appeal dwelling. The current features are modern additions including unsympathetic brown upvc windows. The appellant suggests replacement with high quality painted timber frame units and sympathetic low profile conservation style rooflights which could enhance the appearance of the building. However, there would also be some loss of existing fabric through the insertion of additional rooflights in new locations within the roof and the replacement of a window with a door. Furthermore, there would be a loss of historic fabric to the southern wall of the appeal building in order to provide a doorway into the extension. The extent of fabric affected would be modest, but would inevitably result in some further erosion of the special interest of the listed building. In my assessment, the resulting harm would offset the potential enhancement through the more sympathetic materials of the replacement windows, doors and rooflights.
19. For these reasons, I find that the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building and would cause it harm.
20. The National Planning Policy Framework 2023 ('the Framework') advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. It goes on to advise that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.
21. In this case, there would not be a significant loss of historic fabric and bearing in mind the scale of the proposal and how it would affect the listed building, I find that the harm would be less than substantial in the terms of the

Framework. Nevertheless, this harm carries considerable importance and weight.

22. Where a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimal viable use.
23. The appellant refers to the alterations to windows, doors and rooflights of the existing building as enhancements. However, the benefit to its appearance overall would be modest. Furthermore, I have noted that there would also be a loss of existing fabric associated with these changes and I find that the extent of the heritage benefits of the proposal through replacement windows, doors and rooflights would be far outweighed by the cumulative adverse effects that I have identified. Solar panels are shown to the roof of the extension and the submission refers to a ground source heat pump, but there is no firm information before me about the contribution that this would make to reducing carbon emissions and this is likely to be limited by the scale of the proposal. I find that the public benefits of the proposal would be insufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.
24. Given the above, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the Grade II listed building 'Barn at Pinglestone Farm', thus failing to satisfy the requirements of the Act and the Framework. Although not determinative, it would also be contrary to Policies CP20 of the Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy 2013 and Policy DM29 of the Local Plan Part 2 Development Management and Site Allocations 2017 insofar as they are relevant and together broadly seek the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment and development that does not harm the special interest of listed buildings.

Other Matters

25. The effect of the proposal on Arlebury Park as a non-designated heritage asset on the local register of Historic Parks and Gardens is disputed between the main parties. However, such effects are not relevant to the assessment of an application for Listed Building Consent and I have not therefore considered this matter further as part of my decision.

Conclusion

26. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Bowyer

INSPECTOR