



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2025

by **David Murray** BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/D/25/3361100

Orchard House, Old Potbridge Road, Winchfield, HOOK, RG27 8BT

- 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 Wellington Estates (BH) Ltd against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02367/HOU.
 - The development proposed is the erection of extensions and alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

Background

3. The appeal site contains a large, detached property situated in its own landscaped garden and lies in the countryside. The building is of two storey form with a rear single storey extension under a 'cat slide' roof. The property has two prominent and elaborate chimneys.
4. It is proposed to add various extensions including, a single storey to the south-west side, a double garage with play room above linked to the house by a single storey element, and a two storey extension to the rear.
5. The application is accompanied by a Heritage Statement (HS) which sets out that while there is some ambiguity over the origins and date of the property and whether locally listed, the historic building consultant recognises that it should be regarded as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset.
6. The HS describes the heritage asset in detail and sets out the significance of the house. The HS assesses the building as a good example of "the modest Gentlemen's residence of the late 19th century/ early 20th century which has adopted the Arts and Crafts style of architecture particularly the vernacular revival...."

Effect on the character and appearance of the heritage asset

7. Little of the property is seen from outside of the site because of the degree of landscaping which exists around the boundaries, however, it is viewed through the

entranceway. Approaching the property along the driveway it has a striking symmetrical appearance (apart from the position of the main chimney stack) and central, projecting timber porch. The parts of the rear single storey extension that project at the sides are clearly subordinate to the principal front and side elevations. Overall the building has a very attractive and uncluttered architectural form in the Arts and Crafts style and this forms its significance.

8. Taking the proposed extensions in turn, the single storey lean-to on the south-west elevation is subservient in scale and character and would maintain the appearance of the host building even though it is sited as a continuation of the front wall.
9. However, I have concerns about the scale and presence of the proposed double garage building and connection to the main house. While this has been designed with a subordinate link to the house, the height of the garage and its projection well in front of the house would cause it to be an imposing element particularly in views of the property from the main driveway. Even with contrasting external materials, the position and prominence of the 'L' shaped building would visually rival the scale and uncluttered appearance of the present main house. Garages in such forward positions may be a common feature locally, as suggested by the appellant, but in this case, such siting would have a significant and harmful effect on the individual setting of the house.
10. Regarding the proposed extensions at the rear, in principle I am satisfied that visually the property can accommodate a two-storey extension notwithstanding the Council's comments about any addition harming the scale and form of the present cat slide roof addition. I also note the HS refers to the extension replacing a historic building in this area but this appears to be long gone and I have assessed the proposal in terms of what exists at the moment.
11. Again I understand the underlying design philosophy, however rather than appearing subservient, the considerable height and depth of the two storey extension in the main element and link would rival and dominate the height and simple proportions of the main house.
12. In addition to the visual effect on the side and rear elevations, the rear two storey element would project beyond a continuation of the existing east side flank wall of the property. Accordingly, the gable and half hip end would, visually, appear to 'creep around' the end wall of the main house so as to be apparent in the main view of the property from the driveway. This would detract from the proportions and symmetry of the main dwelling.
13. Overall, I have taken account of the appellant's team's design-led approach to the form of the three sets of extensions proposed, however, I disagree that these produce a sympathetic enlargement of the property. Taken as a whole the additions put forward would visually dominate and detract from the simple, symmetrical form of the existing property and not be subservient to it in scale and appearance. Thus the proposal would materially harm the significance of this non-designated heritage asset.
14. The proposal therefore conflicts with the provisions of Policy NBE8 of the Hart Local Plan as it would not conserve or enhance the heritage asset.
15. In terms of the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) this harm constitutes 'less than significant harm' as set out in paragraph 215.

Other matters

16. Winchfield Parish Council also raised a number of other concerns at application stage. In terms of the effect on landscape character, I am satisfied that the impact of the extensions proposed is a local one mainly contained within the site, because of the present landscaping within it, and there would not be an adverse effect on the wider landscape. As a large dwelling on the site currently exists the proposed extensions should not result in a material to change to the effect on 'dark skies' and specific controls over stand-alone external lighting on the site could be dealt with by a condition. In terms of seeking a 10% gain in biodiversity, as the proposal involves an extension to an existing dwelling this is not included in the statutory provisions on securing Biodiversity Net Gain. Finally, the need for water harvesting, sustainable energy production and foul sewerage disposal facilities could be conditioned if the development was otherwise acceptable.

Heritage and planning balance

17. The existing dwelling should be regarded as a non-designated heritage asset because of its significance as an attractive property of an Arts and Crafts form. Great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The proposed extensions would in total cause 'less than substantial harm' because they would visually dominate and detract from the simple, symmetrical form of the existing property. This harm has to be balanced with any public benefits of the proposal but none are present to outweigh the harm.
18. Overall I conclude that the conflict with the relevant part of the development plan, as identified in paragraph 14 above, is not outweighed by any other consideration. This indicates that the appeal should not be allowed.

Conclusion

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

David Murray

INSPECTOR