



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 22 July 2024

by J P Longmuir BA(Hons) DipUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date:

Appeal A Ref: APP/C1760/W/24/3339870

Kingfisher Lodge, Longstock, Stockbridge, SO20 6DW

- 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 Martin and Joy Cummings against the decision of Test Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/02924/FULLN.
 - The development proposed is proposed single storey, flat roof exercise swimming pool extension and plant room at Kingfisher Lodge.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/C1760/Y/24/3339871

Kingfisher Lodge, Longstock, Stockbridge, SO20 6DW

- 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 Martin and Joy Cummings against the decision of Test Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/02925/LBWN.
 - The works proposed are single storey, flat roof exercise swimming pool extension and plant room.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A: the appeal is dismissed.
2. Appeal B: the appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeals concern works and development at the Grade II listed Kingfisher Lodge (List Entry Number: 1093158).
4. Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) require special regard is given to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. I am also mindful of the historic environment policies within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) that relate to the significance of designated heritage assets and their settings.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in both appeals is whether the proposed works and development would preserve the Grade II Kingfisher Lodge listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is on the edge of Longstock village, where thatched roofs are prevalent; indeed, the house which is the subject of the appeal proposal is largely thatched except for a non-original small extension to the rear. It is just above the meandering River Test and overlooks its adjoining verdant meadows.
7. The Heritage Assessment explains the appeal building was originally 3 houses but is now one. It has a long narrow plan depth which appears largely unchanged from the historic footprint as evident in the above assessment. The list description suggests the building is likely to date from the eighteenth century.
8. I find that the special interest and significance of the listed building is derived firstly from its simple linear form and historic fabric, and secondly from its bucolic setting which emulates its rustic materials and simplicity. This setting includes its garden and riverside, where the proposal would be experienced.
9. The proposed extension would be to the rear of the house and the size of the extension would obscure much of the ground floor. As a result, the existing supporting wall beneath the thatched roof would no longer be seen, which would harm the perception of the architecture: the thatched roof would no longer be experienced in conjunction with its supporting wall.
10. The proposal would outwardly extend the footprint of the building to the side and in depth away from its original linear orientation. This would undermine the historic linear form, and the eye would no longer be focused along the length of its thatched roofline.
11. Whilst the rear elevation has a non-original extension and alterations, they are not so substantial to prevent the original form of the building being experienced. However, this proposal would obscure the overall impression of the historic building.
12. In addition, the extension would have a flat roof which would appear abrupt and harsh against the soft wavering lines of the thatched roof and its eyebrow dormers. Accordingly, it would appear discordant.
13. The proposal would use brick and flint in the walls, however, whilst they would be appropriate for the locality, they would not alleviate the above effects.
14. The proposal also includes a plant room. This would be a separate building to the side, which due to its small size and muted materials, would not compete with or detract from the original building.
15. I therefore find the proposed extension would harm the listed building, which would be less than substantial.
16. Policy E9 requires proposals make a positive contribution to sustaining or enhancing the significance of the asset and any harm should be considered against the public benefits. The proposal being harmful to the listed building would be contrary to the first criterion of E9 and I consider the public benefits in the balance below.

Heritage and Planning Balances

17. Whilst the harm arising would be less than substantial; however, Paragraph 205 of the Framework advocates great weight to the asset's conservation. I therefore give considerable importance and weight to the harm I have identified in my balancing judgment below. In addition, Paragraph 206 of the Framework emphasises that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset, should require clear and convincing justification.
18. The submitted evidence explains that the extension is intended as a hydrotherapy pool to help the well-being of the occupants. It is suggested that this would ease use and pressure on NHS services and the necessary travelling.
19. However, taking the public benefits together as a whole I conclude that they would not be of sufficient weight to outweigh the harm identified to the significance and special interest of the designated heritage asset.
20. I consider that the proposed works and development would fail to preserve the setting or special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
21. As I have found above the proposal would harm the listed building which would contravene Policy E9. The policy also requires harm to be considered against the public benefits which I have found above would not outweigh the harm. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policy E9 taken as a whole.
22. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Paragraph 11(c) of the Framework states that decision taking means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay. In respect of Appeal A, the proposal would be contrary to the Development Plan when taken as a whole and material considerations do not indicate the proposals should be approved.

Conclusion

23. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that both Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

John Longmuir

INSPECTOR