
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 6 June 2024

by A James BSc (Hons) MA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th July 2024

Appeal A: APP/H1705/W/23/3326507

Blaegrove Cottage, Blaegrove Lane, Up Nately, Hampshire RG27 9PD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Whatmough against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
 - The application reference is 22/03307/HSE.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Appeal B: APP/H1705/Y/23/3326513

Blaegrove Cottage, Blaegrove Lane, Up Nately, Hampshire RG27 9PD

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Whatmough against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
 - The application reference is 22/03308/LBC.
 - The works proposed are single storey rear extension.
-

Decisions

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

Preliminary Matters

3. As the appeal site lies within a conservation area and relates to a listed building, I have had special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).
4. Blae Grove House (Ref: 1179011) and its outbuildings¹ are located a short distance away from the appeal site, on the opposite side of the lane. These buildings are Grade II listed and date back to the 18th and 19th century. Jackdaw Cottage, which is a Grade II listed building and dates back to the 17th century (Ref: 1179036) is also sited on the opposite side of the lane. To the rear of the site is Upper House Farmhouse (Ref: 1339529), which is Grade II listed and dates back to the 17th century. I have had special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of these listed buildings in the

¹ 'Cartshed Range, West of Outbuilding West of Stable Block at Blae Grove House' (Ref: 1092977), 'Outbuilding, West of Stable Block at Blae Grove House' (Ref: 1179022), 'Stable Block, 10 Yards South of Blae Grove House' (Ref: 1092976), 'Granary, 10 Yards South-East of Stable Block at Blae Grove House' (Ref: 1179028) and 'Cartshed, 10 Yards South West of Stable Block at Blae Grove House' (Ref: 1339528).

determination of these appeals and I am satisfied that there would be no harm to the special interest of these listed buildings through changes to their setting.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are whether the proposal would:

- preserve a Grade II listed building, known as Blaegrove Cottage (Ref: 1092978), and any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses; and,
- preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Up Nately Conservation Area.

Reasons

Listed building

6. Blaegrove Cottage is a Grade II listed building, which dates back to the 16th century. It is a timber framed dwelling, which has a thatched roof, with a half hip to the roadside and full hip extending down over an outshot on the opposite side. The dwelling has a mix of wattle and daub or brick infill panels between the timber frame, which are painted white. The building was extended on both sides in the 17th century. A two storey rear projection was added in the early 21st century, which is constructed of brick and has a thatched roof.
7. Based on my site visit and the evidence before me, I find that the listed building's special interest insofar as is relevant to these appeals is derived from its historic and architectural interest, as an illustration of 16th and 17th century domestic architecture. The building's thatched roof, timber frame, surviving historic fabric, use of traditional materials, the legibility of its historic plan form and its pleasing architectural style and design make important contributions in these regards.
8. The proposal seeks to add a contemporary, single storey extension to the rear of the two storey projection. The proposed extension would have a flat roof, with overhang to provide shading. The proposal would feature a roof lantern and contain large expanses of glazing. A small area of the rear garden would be excavated to facilitate the proposal and the existing retaining wall would be relocated. Alterations are proposed to some of the existing openings on the modern, two storey rear projection. As the proposed extension would be attached to a modern part of the building and no alterations are proposed to the historic part of the building, the proposal would not result in the loss of any historic fabric.
9. Historically, the listed building had a simple, rectilinear form, which has been eroded by the construction of the two storey rear projection. The proposal would be low in height and would be subservient to the host building. It would also have brickwork to match the existing two storey rear projection. However, in combination with the existing rear projection, the proposal would result in further incremental extension and create a rear projection of excessive depth, which would be out of proportion with the historic building. As a result, the proposal would further diminish the simple form and architectural integrity of the listed building.

10. The proposal would introduce a flat-roofed, box-like structure that would be in stark contrast with the traditional form and pitched roofs on the existing building. While there are large areas of fenestration on the two storey rear projection, these are broken up by the timber framing. I acknowledge that the proposal seeks to reduce the size of some of the openings on the existing two storey rear projection, which would tie in with the size of the openings on the historic part of the building. However, the proposal would result in a greater expanse of glass, which would appear incongruous and out of proportion with the simple, far smaller windows on the historic part of the building. While the dark colour of the aluminium frames seeks to reflect the timbers on the listed building, I find that the large window openings and use of overtly modern materials would harmfully contrast with the traditional character and more domestic form of fenestration on the historic part of the building.
11. The property has a long rear garden, which slopes upwards away from the dwelling. Excavation works are required to facilitate the proposal, which would involve relocating the existing retaining wall and stepping it to respond to the changes in topography. While the proposal would require additional excavation of the garden, the property would still benefit from a very long rear garden. The proposed excavation works would not be dissimilar to the existing arrangement and as a result, I find that this part of the proposal would preserve the setting and therefore the special interest of the listed building.
12. Notwithstanding my findings in respect to the excavation works, for the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building.

Conservation Area

13. The appeal site lies within the Up Nately Conservation Area (CA). The significance of the CA insofar as is relevant to this appeal is derived from the high concentration of historic buildings, including thatched and timber framed properties, which are set within a gently undulating, agricultural landscape.
14. Blaegrove Lane is a no through road, which is sited on lower land than the appeal property. The front and east elevation of the appeal property are prominent in views from the lane. Glimpsed views of the proposal would be visible from the lane, over the existing boundary wall and through the soft landscaping, particularly during the winter months. However, given the scale of the proposal, the existing boundary treatment/soft landscaping and change in levels, I find that the proposal would not appear prominent in these views.
15. The Up Nately Conservation Area Appraisal, April 2004 (the CAA) highlights a viewpoint from the rear of the site to the appeal property, which is described as a 'viewpoint - to an important building.' This viewpoint is from private land. The appeal property is sited on lower level land than this viewpoint. There is also a hedge along the rear boundary. As a result, of the soft landscaping and change in levels, only the roof of the listed building is visible from this viewpoint and the proposal would be screened from this viewpoint. The proposal would also not be visible from the public right of way (PRoW) that leads to the field to the south of the site.
16. Another PRoW runs along the western boundary of the site. Given the height of the boundary hedge and the fact that the proposal would be sited on lower level land than the PRoW, the proposal would not be visible from the PRoW

during the summer months. While glimpses of the proposal may be available when the hedgerows are not in leaf, the proposal would not be prominent in public views from the PRow or private views from land to the rear.

17. Despite the harm that would be caused to the listed building, I do not find that the proposal would be detrimental to the character or appearance of the CA. This is because only glimpses of the proposal would be visible from the public domain and it would only have limited prominence from the private domain. Under such circumstances, case law² has established that proposals must be judged according to their effect on a CA as a whole and must therefore have a moderate degree of prominence. Given the above, I find that the proposal would not be detrimental to the CA as a whole and would thus preserve its significance.

Public Benefits and Heritage Balance

18. Although I find that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA, for the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building.
19. Paragraph 205 of 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. Paragraph 206 advises that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets and that any such harm should require clear and convincing justification. Given the nature and extent of the proposal, I find the harm to be less than substantial in this instance but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight.
20. Where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, paragraph 208 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing the asset's optimum viable use.
21. The proposal would improve the internal living accommodation, be more energy efficient than the existing building, have high levels of insulation and enhance views of the garden, which are private benefits. The proposal also seeks to resolve design issues with the existing extension, including those relating to drafts and water ingress. However, these matters could be resolved without the need for an extension and I do not find this justifies a further extension on this listed building. There is also no substantive evidence before me that the proposal is necessary in order to secure the optimum viable use of the asset.
22. The proposal would result in investment into the property and the employment of local contractors and craftsman would have a small economic benefit, which carries limited weight in favour of the proposal as a public benefit. There is also limited evidence before me that the proposal would reduce carbon dioxide emissions for the dwelling as a whole and I therefore give this matter limited weight in my decision.
23. Overall, there would be limited public benefits from the proposal. Consequently, in attributing considerable importance and weight to the identified harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset, I find that

² South Oxfordshire DC v SSE & J Donaldson [1991] CO/1440/89

there would be insufficient public benefits arising from the proposal to outweigh this harm. Given the above, I conclude that, on balance, the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building and would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and paragraph 203 of the Framework.

24. The proposal would also conflict with Policies EM10 and EM11 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan (2011 to 2029) adopted May 2016. These policies among other things require that proposals conserve or enhance the quality, distinctiveness and character of heritage assets; that extensions and/or alterations respect the historic form and any other aspects that contribute to the significance of the host building; and, that proposals have due regard to the scale, layout, appearance, architectural detailing, materials and relationship to heritage assets. As a result, in respect of the section 78 appeal, the proposal would not be in accordance with the development plan.
25. The proposal would also conflict with the Heritage Supplementary Planning Document March 2019 (the SPD). The SPD among other things requires that proposals to alter or extend a listed building respond sensitively to the design of the listed building and that materials, finishes and construction details respect those of the listed building.
26. As the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA, I find no conflict with the CAA.

Other Matters

27. The appellants have provided photographs of contemporary single storey extensions on other listed buildings. The other listed buildings differ considerably in design to the appeal property. Full details of the circumstances of the other cases are not before me. As a result, I give them very limited weight in my decision.

Conclusion

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

A James

INSPECTOR