



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 24 July 2024

by R J Redford MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 September 2024

Appeal A Ref: APP/B1740/W/24/3341648

The Pour House, 17-19 West Street, Ringwood BH24 1DY

- 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 Helen Homewood for The Pour House Ringwood Club Limited against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/10595.
 - The development proposed is described as "to remove bifold doors to the rear of No 17 and replace with wooden double glazed french doors; ground floor sash window, and first and second floor timber sash windows; single wooden cellar door on rear elevation; external cellar cooler unit on rear elevation; external heat dump unit on rear elevation; rear cctv cameras; rear external lights".
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/B1740/Y/24/3341650

The Pour House, 17-19 West Street, Ringwood BH24 1DY

- 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 Helen Homewood for The Pour House Ringwood Club Limited against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/10596.
 - The works proposed are described as "remove bifold doors to the rear of No 17 and replace with wooden double glazed french doors; ground floor sash window, and first and second floor timber sash windows; single wooden cellar door on rear elevation; external cellar cooler unit on rear elevation; external heat dump unit on rear elevation; rear cctv cameras; rear external lights".
-

Decision

Appeal A Ref: APP/B1740/W/24/3341648

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B Ref: APP/B1740/Y/24/3341650

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

3. The description differs from that on the application forms due to changes made during the planning process prior to the decision notice being issued.
4. For clarity both Appeal A and Appeal B refer to the same proposed scheme. As such in this decision I have referred to them jointly unless specified otherwise.
5. Some parts of the proposed scheme have already been undertaken and therefore planning permission and listed building consent is sought to

regularise those elements. It is also noted that there are discrepancies between the plans and what has been completed on site and that multiple plans have been submitted, some including elements that do not form part of the proposal¹. Therefore, I have made my decision considering the following plans: 1093P/301; 1093P/101d; 1093P/109a; 1093P/105a; 1093P/110a; 1093P/107h; and 10936P/108b regarding the works set out in the descriptions above.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are whether the proposal would preserve 2 adjoining Grade II listed buildings known as "Chiropodist" (Ref: 1094978) and "CIU" (Ref: 1178560) (the LBs), and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that they possess, and the extent to which the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ringwood Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

7. As the proposal is in a conservation area and relates to listed buildings, I have had special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act).
8. The LBs are a pair of semi-detached, unsymmetrical, 3-storey properties whose frontages are the least altered of the elevations. Although each building is different, they are a complementary pair with a similar cadence and regularity in dimensions and fenestration positioning. They have been combined internally to create a singular property and the ground floor is largely open plan and currently used as a public house. Previously it was a social club and had a large sprawling rear extension which has been removed. This has meant the ground floor rear elevation has been rebuilt and it is noted when I visited the site this is stepped out from the upper floors of the building and not flush as shown on the plans.
9. It is clear the LBs have gone through a series of alterations and changes, and these inform the historic story of their significance as good examples of 18th century town centre buildings and their evolution through the 19th century. It is, nevertheless, appreciated that most of the historically significant fabric is retained within the frontage, side, and upper floors.
10. West Street marks the graduation of development from the river Avon bridge, and gardens beyond, towards Market Place. This area along with the High Street, beyond Market Place, comprises the traditional town centre typifying a rural English market town. The LBs are located relatively prominently on West Street and inform this transition from the river to town centre and thereby characterise the significance of this part of the CA. Nevertheless, it is noted that there are views of the LBs from the rear and therefore its importance to the CA is in the round and not just limited to the front, street facing elevation.
11. The proposal constitutes a series of changes to the rear elevation of the LBs, the most prominent being the replacement of the bifold doors. The regular cadence of fenestration placement within the frontage of the LBs would be replicated on the rear elevation for the upper floors and retains the cohesion

¹ Plan 1093P/100f shows a proposed layout of the site which includes additional dwellings, all elements which do not form part of the proposed scheme.

within the appearance of the buildings. Although it is not unusual in buildings of this age, and indeed reflective in the LBs frontage, for ground floor fenestration to be larger than the floors above, the proposed French doors would not be aligned with the window above. This would unbalance the rear elevation and draw attention to the modernity of the proposed French doors as a feature. It is acknowledged the small pane design is more in keeping than the plain glazing in the existing bifold doors. Nevertheless, the location of the proposed French doors would detract from the overall cohesion of the LBs.

12. This in combination with multiple modern external light fittings, CCTV cameras and the cooler unit and heat dump unit, all located at high level, creates an overly modern and awkwardly cluttered ground floor elevation at odds to the simple lines of the upper floors. It is noted that none of these elements have required the loss of any historic fabric. This, however, does not detract from the harm the proposal would have on the overall visual character of the LBs at ground floor level and thereby their significance.
13. The Council have not objected to the first and second floor timber sash windows and single wooden cellar door. On review of the evidence and through my observations on site I conclude similarly to the Council that these elements would not harm the historic significance of the LBs.
14. In relation to the ground floor sash window, it is recognised that the window installed is different from that proposed on the plans. As I am considering that which is shown on the plans, I am satisfied the dimensions would be in keeping with the first-floor windows and reflect a similar window ratio between floors as seen elsewhere on the buildings.
15. However, the neutral impact of the sash windows and the cellar door do not outweigh the harm identified in relation to the other proposed works, which would constitute less than substantial harm to the significance of the LBs.
16. It is acknowledged that the LBs relationship with the CA is dominated by its frontage and the proposal would not alter that part of the buildings. Nevertheless, the rear elevation would be visible and the disconnection between the ground floor and upper floors of the rear elevation would detract from the overall character and appearance of the CA. This again would constitute less than substantial harm.
17. That other buildings have cooler and heat dump units similarly located high on walls within the CA are noted, but due to the specificity of heritage assets, each proposal must be considered on its own merits and not simply considered acceptable because it has occurred on other buildings, be that with consent or not.
18. Where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, paragraph 208 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimal viable use.
19. It is accepted that as a public house, the LBs have been brought back into use from years of unoccupancy. However, this use has already been permitted and is active. It is, nevertheless, appreciated that the cooler unit, heat dump unit, CCTV and external lighting all assist with the safety and running of that use and so constitute a public benefit. Still, the evidence before me has not

satisfactorily shown that these are the only or best possible options available to provide the necessary security for the building, and cooling of the cellar.

20. It is also acknowledged that the proposed French doors are more aesthetic than the current bifold doors. However, the Council assert the bifold doors are not regularised and there is nothing before me to conclude otherwise. Therefore, that the proposed French doors would be a visual improvement does not satisfactorily evidence the necessity for a door in this specific location nor how that would ensure the future of the existing use.
21. Consequently, although there are some public benefits to the scheme, and the harm identified is moderate, it has not been satisfactorily shown that the existing use is dependent on all these elements. As such the public benefits are not sufficient to outweigh the identified harm in this instance.
22. The proposal would therefore not preserve the historic interest of the LBs nor conserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Accordingly it would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and the Framework. It would also conflict with Policy ENV3 of the Local Plan 2016-2036 Part One: Planning Strategy for the New Forest District outside of the National Park, and Policy DM1 of the Local Plan Part 2 Sites & Development Plan, insofar as they require development to contribute positively to local distinctiveness, and conserve and seek to enhance the historic environment and heritage assets.

Other Matters

23. It is noted that since the appeal was lodged the Ringwood Neighbourhood Plan has been made and now forms part of the development plan. The Council have directed me towards Policy R2 of this document which seeks to maintain a successful and prosperous town centre with specific regard to the established mix of uses and potential changes in those uses. As the scheme does not propose a change of use this policy has not been determinative in my decision. This is also the case for the Framework paragraphs identified by the appellant relating to sustainable development.
24. That the Council have suggested other locations for the cctv, lighting, and cooler and heat dump units are noted but these have not been formalised within the proposal and so do not alter my findings.

Conclusion

25. For the reasons given above the proposal would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole and there are no sufficiently weighted material considerations, including the Framework, which would indicate a decision otherwise. Appeal A and Appeal B are, therefore, dismissed.

RJ Redford

INSPECTOR