



---

## Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 7 April 2025

**by Guy Davies BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 15 April 2025**

---

### **Appeal A Ref: APP/N1730/W/24/3351217**

#### **Tudor Cottage, Wedmans Lane, Rotherwick, Hook RG27 9BN**

- 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 Adam and Johanna Hunt against the decision of Hart District Council.
  - The application reference is 24/00750/HOU.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey extension with single storey link to dwelling following demolition of existing garage.
- 

### **Appeal B Ref: APP/N1730/Y/24/3351218**

#### **Tudor Cottage, Wedmans Lane, Rotherwick, Hook RG27 9BN**

- 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 Adam and Johanna Hunt against the decision of Hart District Council.
  - The application reference is 24/00751/LBC.
  - The works proposed are the erection of a two storey extension with single storey link to dwelling following demolition of existing garage.
- 

## **Decisions**

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

## **Preliminary Matters**

3. The planning and listed building appeals relate to the same scheme. The legislative regimes dealing with these aspects are different but to avoid repetition I have dealt with both appeals together unless otherwise noted in this decision letter.

## **Main Issue**

4. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve the Grade II listed building, or preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Rotherwick Conservation Area.

## **Reasons**

5. Tudor Cottage is a Grade II listed, timber framed dwelling with brick infill under a tiled roof. It consists of a principal range to the east with a narrower gable ended addition alongside and a later half hipped extension to the west. All three elements have separate pitched roofs. Its historic and architectural interest lies in the original framed part of the building which, according to the list description, dates from the 16<sup>th</sup> century, although its form and layout have been much altered since then. A

modern detached single storey garage/outbuilding lies to the west and rear of the dwelling.

6. The Rotherwick Conservation Area covers the village of Rotherwick as well as Tylney Hall and its associated parkland. The village is a linear settlement based along The Street with smaller lanes leading from it serving small groups of buildings which retain a close association with the surrounding countryside. The property is characteristic of this layout, forming part of a loose knit cluster of dwellings accessed along a narrow lane and interspersed with small fields, hedgerows and trees.
7. The proposed two storey extension would replace the existing garage on the site. It would have a similar eaves height to the garage although the greater footprint, wider span and higher ridge line would result in a noticeably larger building. I appreciate that considerable care has been taken to limit the increase in scale and bulk, including lowering the ground level and accommodating the first floor in the roof space as much as possible. Nevertheless, the proposed structure would be substantial and would not appear subservient in size or scale to the dwelling. The small gable on the front of the structure would not in my view reduce that scale. It would as a result draw attention away from the historic structure and appear overly dominant within its setting.
8. In terms of design, the half-hipped roof would echo that of the main range of the listed building, and the use of timber weatherboarding would give it a barn-like appearance. However, the barn-like appearance would be undermined to an extent through the use of bi-fold doors on two elevations, and the use of large roof lights in the roof. The size and undivided nature of the glazing in the bi-fold doors would distinguish them from the smaller, divided windows and doors found in the dwellinghouse. The use of large roof lights would interrupt the otherwise unbroken plane of the roof and is uncharacteristic of the fenestration on the main building.
9. The extension would be seen from the adjacent public footpath behind and above the boundary hedge. Additional planting could be used to further soften its outline, but the size and scale of the extension would nevertheless be apparent and would compete in views of the house. To that limited degree it would detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area. However, neither the bi-fold doors or roof lights would be readily visible from the public footpath, and unlike the Council I do not consider the design of the windows in the west elevation would be harmful.
10. Sections 16, 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require that special regard is paid to the desirability of preserving the listed building, or the character or appearance of the conservation area. I conclude that the proposed extension would not achieve those aims. For the same reasons it would conflict with Policy NBE8 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2032, Policy GEN1 of the Hart Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 Saved Policies and Policy BE02 of the Rotherwick Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2032, all of which seek to preserve heritage assets and their settings.

## **Conclusion**

11. Adopting the terminology used in paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the harm caused by the extension to both the listed building and the conservation area would be less than significant. In such circumstances, it is

necessary to weigh that harm against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

12. The extension would benefit the appellants in providing additional living accommodation for their family. However, that is a private rather than a public benefit and is intended to meet the needs of the occupants rather than preserve the significance or special interest of the listed building. Furthermore, the extension is not essential to ensure the continued use of the property in its optimum viable use as a dwellinghouse, as it already contains all the necessary facilities to enable domestic use. While I understand the personal desire of the appellants for the extension, the private benefit only carries limited weight in the planning balance.
13. Although I have found that the harm to the listed building and conservation area would be less than substantial, it nevertheless attracts great weight by virtue of paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The limited weight arising from private interests does not outweigh the great weight attributed to the harm to the listed building and conservation area.
14. Consequently, I conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

*Guy Davies*

INSPECTOR