



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2025

by **K Stephens BSc (Hons) MTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/D/25/3364420

1 Tanhouse Cottages, Ashford Hill Road, Headley, Hampshire RG19 8AP

- 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 Clive Watson against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
- The application Ref is 24/01831/HSE.
- The development proposed is erection of a new roof with dormer windows over existing garage with single storey side extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires me to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the setting of the Grade II listed building.

Reasons

Special interest and significance of the heritage asset

4. According to the official listing¹ the host dwelling is a Grade II listed building known as "Tanhouse"². It is a designated heritage asset that dates from the 17th and 18th centuries. It is one storey with attic and with a tile roof. The upper walling has exposed framing in part; with painted brick infill and other walling. It also has a massive brick stack with a moulded base and three flues, with the other two being diagonal.
5. From the submitted evidence and my site visit observations, the special interest and significance of the listed building, insofar as it relates to this appeal, are largely derived from a combination of its historic and architectural interests as an example of a 17th -18th century vernacular domestic rural dwelling. The building's age, surviving historic fabric, and use of traditional construction and materials make

¹ National Heritage List for England: list entry number 1166687

² The official 'list entry name' of the property as Tanhouse differs from the postal address of the property in the banner heading above, which is taken from the application form.

important contributions in these regards. The building also has group value with the adjacent timber-framed Grade II listed dwelling, officially known as “Tanhouse Cottage”³. They sit together at the bottom of the valley on a bend in the road, in a countryside setting beyond the village of Headley.

6. Pertinent to the appeal, the special interest and significance of a heritage asset can also be derived in part from its setting, which are the surroundings in which it is experienced. The property fronts the road which allows the building to be seen and experienced as part of the rural landscape. The listed building is also experienced, and its heritage merit appreciated, from the garden. What looks like a later, single storey, side extension to the host dwelling has been respectively built, with its roof at a lower height than that of the main house and can be read as part of the evolution of the dwelling over time. Hence the garden provides an open and immediate setting that positively contributes to the special interest and significance of the listed building.
7. The existing detached garage is a more modern addition to the site. The garage is located to the west side of the dwelling, some distance from it across the driveway and nestled close to the site’s western treed boundary. It is single storey with a pitched roof of plain tiles and is timber clad, some of which is painted black, and there are two double, side-hung garage doors. With its simple design and modest size, and height that is lower than the main dwelling, the garage reads as a relatively unobtrusive, low key and simple ancillary outbuilding.

Appeal proposal and effects

8. The proposal would involve increasing the height of the garage by adding a new steeper pitched roof to create a first floor for use as a study and store. The height to eaves would be raised from about 2.29 metres to 3.03 metres, and the overall height of the building would be increased by about 1.78 metres, taking it to about 5.6 metres, a height that would be similar to the host dwelling. The proposal also includes a single storey extension to the side of the garage, which I understand to be similar to a separate planning permission already granted.
9. Six dormer windows would also be installed in the new raised roof - three on the rear and three on the front roof slope. The dormers would be sited fairly centrally in the roof slope, some distance up from the eaves and close to the ridge of the main roof. They would be unduly wide and project out a significant distance from the roof plane. As a result, the dormers would add significant bulk and massing to the roof as well introducing an unduly ‘fussy’ feature, compared the simplicity of the existing garage as a straightforward outbuilding. With its increased height, bulk and massing and array of large dormers, the resulting garage building would be over dominant and would visually and physically compete with the host dwelling such that it would cease to be subordinate to the host property.
10. Hence the proposal would disrupt the relationship and hierarchy between the listed dwelling and compromise its significance. From the rear garden this hierarchical disruption would be particularly noticeable as the garage and the dwelling are seen in one line of sight. Moreover, dormer windows of the size and design proposed are not a prevailing design feature of the host dwelling and I saw that the dormer

³ National Heritage List for England: list entry number 1092496

windows on the adjacent listed building are much smaller and are fitted at eaves level.

11. Furthermore, the full height first floor glazed end gable would also be a somewhat alien addition to a timber clad garage outbuilding. Together with the multiple dormer windows and French doors the fenestration would create an unduly domestic appearance to the outbuilding. This would further antagonise the relationship between the listed building and garage and further undermine the hierarchy of buildings and significance of the listed building.
12. The Council's Heritage Supplementary Planning Document (the Heritage SPD) offers specific guidance for proposals for garages and other outbuildings within the setting of listed buildings. It states they should generally be subordinate to the original building in order to ensure the appropriate hierarchy of built form and should ensure the significance of the listed building is not unacceptably eroded or compromised. New and altered buildings should generally be smaller than the principal building and ridge heights should generally be lower. Hence, the proposed changes, including trying to match the height of the altered garage with the host dwelling, would be contrary to this advice in the Heritage SPD.
13. I accept that a single storey extension has been granted planning permission to the existing garage and that as a result an extended footprint has already been approved. However, the creation of a first floor would nearly double the floor area of the building and increase the overall height of the structure. Whilst the garage would not be unduly visible from the road from all directions, due to the bend in the road and roadside vegetation, it would nonetheless still be visible from certain approaches and highly visible from the rear garden. In any event, listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest and national importance irrespective of whether or not close public views of the building can be gained.
14. Drawing all the above points together, the proposed changes to the garage would erode the setting of the listed building and harm its significance.

Public benefits and heritage balance

15. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that when considering the impact of development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
16. I have found the proposed development would cause harm to the setting of the listed building. Given the nature and extent of the development, and in line with the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance, I find the harm would be 'less than substantial' but at the middle to lower end. Nonetheless this harm still carries considerable importance and weight. Where harm is 'less than substantial' paragraph 215 of the Framework requires the harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
17. There would be some economic benefits to the wider local economy during the construction phase, but due to the nature and scale of the works the benefits would be limited and short-lived. I have no reason to doubt the build quality of the proposed alterations, and external materials would match those on the existing building. I acknowledge that the appellant has looked after the listed building and

undertaken various repairs, such as replacement timber windows, and made energy improvements to help secure the future longevity of the designated heritage asset. However, this has little bearing on the design and form of the proposal before me.

18. I am led to understand that a number of other outbuildings in the grounds have been removed over time. The appellant also advises that they no longer wish to build the other two structures that have been granted planning permission⁴ within the grounds and instead rely on the consolidated proposal before me. I do not have the full details or plans of the other developments granted planning permission, so I cannot make any meaningful comparisons. I am not aware that any formal process has been entered into, or that there is a legal agreement in place, that would revoke the previous planning permissions and ensure they were not built. Even if the previous planning permissions were revoked and not implemented, this would not overcome the concerns I have detailed above with regard to the specific proposed alterations and extension to the garage before me.
19. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the setting of the Grade II listed building, known as 'Tanhouse', and its significance. Although the harm would be less than substantial, the limited public benefits would not outweigh the harm in this case. As a result, the proposal would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and the relevant provisions of the Framework.
20. The proposal would be contrary to Policies EM10 and EM11 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan (2011-2029) and Policy HA of the Ashford Hill with Headley Neighbourhood Plan (2022). Collectively these seek, amongst other things, to promote high quality development and ensure that development has regard to its surroundings and neighbouring buildings, including historic ones, and conserves the character of heritage assets. It would also be contrary to the guidance in the Council's Heritage SPD.

Other Matters

21. Whilst I understand a local Councillor supports the proposal, this does not diminish the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

22. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

K Stephens
INSPECTOR

⁴ One adjoining the garage to the side closest to the road, and a separate annexe (same footprint as the garage) to the other side of the garage closest to the garden.