



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 28 May 2025

by **AJ Steen BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 July 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/C1760/W/25/3359837

Monxton Manor, Amport Road, Monxton, Hampshire SP11 8AH

- 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 & Mrs H Corroon against the decision of Test Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02549/FULLN.
 - The development proposed is repair and partial replacement of existing boundary wall.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/C1760/Y/25/3359838

Monxton Manor, Amport Road, Monxton, Hampshire SP11 8AH

- 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 & Mrs H Corroon against the decision of Test Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02550/LBWN.
 - The works proposed are repair and partial replacement of existing boundary wall.
-

Decisions

1. Both appeals are dismissed and listed building consent is refused for repair and partial replacement of existing boundary wall.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeals relate to a boundary wall that has been repaired and partially replaced such that the works and development set out in the applications are complete. For clarity, I have determined the appeals based on the site and location plans that identify the location of the wall along with the work and development as carried out.
3. In determining this appeal involving listed buildings located within a conservation area, I have had special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Main Issues

4. The boundary wall encloses the Grade II listed Monxton Manor within Amport and Monxton Conservation Area. Bec House over the road from the wall is also listed Grade II. Consequently, the main issue in both appeals is whether the works and development preserve the listed building at Monxton Manor or its setting or any features of special architectural and historic interest (or significance) which it possesses, preserve the settings of nearby listed buildings and whether the character or appearance of the conservation area would be preserved or enhanced.

Reasons

5. Amport and Monxton Conservation Area comprises development along the road between Monxton and Amport. The wall subject of this appeal is located on the outside of a bend in Amport Road within Monxton. As a result, it is prominent in views along the road. It is a relatively low wall around Monxton Manor with views over it toward the house. A yew tree is located adjacent to the wall that contributes to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Opposite is a higher wall of similar design and construction, being a flint wall with mortar between the flints, surrounding the Grade II listed Bec House. The significance of the conservation area comprises a collection of historic buildings including some high status dwellings such as Monxton Manor and Bec House surrounded by brick and flint walls.
6. Monxton Manor is a Georgian house of the late eighteenth century with alterations and extensions dating from the mid nineteenth century. It is of brick, Flemish bond, walls with bay windows and a hipped and tiled roof. It is visible through the wall at the entrance to the property and over the wall and through tree and other planting from the road, including the yew tree adjacent to the wall. Consequently, the significance of Monxton Manor as a heritage asset arises from its regular Georgian geometry, historic fabric and high status which provides an understanding of its social and agrarian history and that of the locality. The wall contributes to the understanding of the house as a heritage asset in being a prominent part of its boundary.
7. Bec House is located on the opposite side of the road, behind the high flint and brick wall. It is an 18th century building that was once a rectory with walls of Flemish bond with sash windows. The end elevations have flint panels. Its significance is derived in part from its substantial size but simple form and historic fabric to which its enclosing wall contributes. The listed buildings are in close proximity with characteristic prominent enclosing walls with views between and, therefore, the walls contribute to the settings of both houses as well as the conservation area.
8. The works and development carried out to the wall subject of the appeal replaces a previous wall with a portion built on a beam and block bridge to allow for the roots of an adjacent yew tree. This should ensure the wall will not be damaged by the tree over time, including from its roots at the base of the wall. It is constructed using some materials from the previous wall. This indicates that the flints originally used were larger than those of the wall around Bec House. The mortar, at present, is very light in colour which makes it stand out against the remaining sections of wall and most of the wall opposite. That is likely to weather in time.
9. The dispute arises from the amount of flint in the wall. It is evident that the new section of wall contains less flint and more mortar than the remaining sections of wall, the wall opposite and other walls in the village. Whilst the difference in proportions of flint and mortar is not large, it is noticeable and material. The proportion of mortar to flint clearly differs from that on the existing historic parts of the wall. For that reason it jars and diminishes the understanding of the traditional local working methods and materials employed on the wall and distorts its appearance. It alters the understanding of the wall in its contribution to the setting of the high status Monxton Manor and the character and appearance of the conservation area.

10. The wall is lower than that surrounding Bec House and over the road that bends around the house and its grounds. As such, its visibility in association with that listed building is limited. Given the relationship with that house, the works and development do not affect the setting of Bec House or its significance as a heritage asset.
11. For these reasons, I conclude that the works and development to the wall at Monxton Manor has resulted in permanent harm to the architectural and historic interest of Monxton Manor, its setting and the character and appearance of the conservation area. I accept that this harm is less than substantial and at a low end on the spectrum of such harm. Nevertheless, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises at Paragraph 212 that, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the assets' conservation.
12. Where there is less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated asset, paragraph 215 of the Framework states that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the development or works. In this case, the public benefits comprise the need for repair of the wall given its risk of collapse that could have affected highway safety on the adjacent road, including of pedestrians on the road. That could have been preserved had the wall been constructed in a different form or construction following the grant of consent. In addition, the way in which the wall is constructed has protected the yew tree adjacent. However, these benefits are modest and do not outweigh the identified harm to the listed building and conservation area.
13. For these reasons, I find that the works and development conflict with Policies COM2, E1 and E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (LP) and the Framework. These enable development that would make a positive contribution to sustaining or enhancing the significance of heritage assets taking account of character, appearance and setting. Where development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, they are required to be considered against the public benefit of the proposal.
14. I understand that Policy SD1 of the LP states that development that accords with the LP will be approved without delay. In this case, the repair and partial replacement of existing boundary wall does not accord with Policies COM2, E1 and E9 of the LP such that it conflicts with the development plan as a whole. I have not found any material considerations that would outweigh that harm.
15. For these reasons the appeals should be dismissed.

AJ Steen

INSPECTOR