



Appeal Decisions

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 A Ref: APP/H1705/W/25/3364284

Swampton House, Stoke Lane, St. Mary Bourne, Hampshire SP11 6AR

- 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 B Walpole against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
- The application Ref is 24/02786/HSE .
- The development proposed was originally described as “repair and partial reconstruction of existing boundary wall; repair, refurbishment and repurpose of existing outbuilding to kitchen & dining area with link-extension to existing house and associated works”.

Appeal B Ref: APP/H1705/Y/25/3364286

Swampton House, Stoke Lane, St. Mary Bourne, Hampshire SP11 6AR

- 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 B Walpole against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
- The application Ref is 24/02787/LBC.
- The works proposed are repair and partial reconstruction of existing boundary wall; repair, refurbishment and repurpose of existing outbuilding to kitchen & dining area with link-extension to existing house and associated works.

Decision

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

Preliminary Matters

3. As the proposal relates to a listed building within a conservation area, I have had special regard to sections 16(2) and 66(1) and paid special attention to section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).
4. The listing also mentions and describes the outbuilding, which I saw was attached to Swampton House by the shared outer boundary wall. Having regard to this and its historic association with Swampton House, the outbuilding, by virtue of section 1(5)(b) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), should “be treated as part of the listed building” of Swampton House. I have determined the appeal on this basis, having regard to the statutory duty set out in section 16(2) of the Act.
5. The proposal comprises a number of elements, namely i) repair and partial rebuilding of existing boundary wall, which also forms the outer wall of the outbuilding, ii) refurbish and repurpose the existing outbuilding as a kitchen, dining room and utility room with the installation of French doors and rooflights, iii)

erection of flat roofed single storey extension that would link part of the rear of the house to the outbuilding (hereafter the link-extension) that would also involve raising the height of part of the boundary wall, and iv) associated internal alterations to the ground floor of Swampton House to remove some later walls and openings and reinstate some room divides and re-open/block up some doorways to alter the flow of reconfigured internal accommodation with that which would be created in the outbuilding.

6. The Council raises no objections to the proposed internal ground floor works, to the alterations to the existing outbuilding, to the use of the outbuilding for kitchen/dining, or to the repair and partial reconstruction of the boundary wall. I have therefore confined my assessment to the proposed link-extension.
7. The two appeals concern the same scheme under different, complementary legislation. To avoid unnecessary duplication I have dealt with both appeals together in my reasoning.

Main Issues

8. The planning application (Appeal A) was refused for two reasons. The second reason was due to the lack of arboricultural information. However, as part of the appeal the appellant has submitted a Tree Survey¹. This concludes that the Whitebeam tree (T1) was leaning and in a poor structural condition and was recommended for removal. The Council has confirmed in its appeal statement that it raises no objection to the tree's removal and that this reason for refusal can now be removed. I saw on my visit that the tree had already been removed.
9. Furthermore, the Tree Survey also shows that the Yew tree (T2) and its root protection area lie a substantial distance from the outbuilding and proposed link-extension. The Council consider a condition could be imposed to secure compliance with the Tree Survey and its suggested protection zone and protection measures. From what I saw on site, I have no reason to come to a different conclusion. This could be conditioned, should I be minded to allow the appeals.
10. Therefore, considering the above the main issues are whether the proposal would i) preserve the Grade II listed building, its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, and ii) preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the St Mary Bourne and Stoke Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

Special interest and significance of the heritage assets

11. Swampton House is a Grade II listed² dwelling dating from the early 18th century, although the appellant's Heritage Statement (the HS) suggests it originated as a three-bay 17th century lobby entry cottage. The listing describes it as an L-shaped house, with a regular front of two storeys and attic, with a half-hipped tiled roof and red brick walling in Flemish bond with a first floor band. From the submitted evidence, the building is multi-phase and has been altered over the years. The early 19th century hipped slate roof outbuilding is mentioned in the listing. It is

¹ Tree Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Tree Constraints Plan, Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan dated March 2025

² National Heritage List for England: list entry number 1339484

described as linking to the roadside walling of brickwork with horizontal flint panels. The HS finds that the present outbuilding is likely younger than the listing suggests although some of the common timber rafters appear to be re-used and may have originated from an earlier structure. Being timber clad, it is likely that parts have been replaced or rebuilt over the years.

12. From the evidence and my site visit observations the special interest and significance of the listed building (Swampton House and outbuilding), insofar as it relates to this appeal, are largely derived from a combination of its historic and architectural interests as an example of an early 18th century vernacular domestic property in a rural village together with associated, later, ancillary outbuilding. The buildings' age, surviving historic fabric and features, and use of traditional construction and materials make important contributions in these regards. I also saw on my visit that the dwelling retained some historic internal features and layout.
13. The outbuilding, with its low lying form, simple lines, timber clad exterior with few doors and windows, the brick boundary wall with its flint panels typical of the area, and its ancillary use and function, separate and detached from the dwelling, are still clearly legible. The outbuilding thus contributes to the overall historic interest and significance of Swampton House.
14. The special interest and significance of the listed building and outbuilding are also derived in part from the surroundings in which they are experienced. Swampton House is prominently situated at right angles to the main street. The outer wall of the outbuilding forms part of the boundary wall running alongside the road, which allows the house and roof and outer wall of the outbuilding to be seen and experienced as part of the village street scene. The access, driveway and rear garden are also a main space in which the dwelling and outbuilding are experienced and their heritage merit more fully appreciated. Hence, in so far as pertinent to these appeals, the garden provides an immediate setting that positively contributes to the special interest and significance of the listed building and outbuilding.
15. The appeal site is also located within the CA, which includes the villages of Stoke, St Mary Bourne and the hamlet of Swampton, with mention in the Domesday Survey. The CA extends in a broadly linear fashion along the valley floor following the Bourne Rivulet, with sections of countryside and meadow between the clusters of built form. Indeed the Bourne Rivulet runs through the garden of Swampton House. Most built development generally fronts or is close to the road and comprises largely dwellings of different styles, designs and ages, many of which are listed and include a number of thatched roof dwellings. From the evidence before me and what I saw during my site visit, I consider the character and appearance of the CA, and thus its special interest and significance, are in part derived from the architectural richness and variety of its surviving historic buildings, use of local traditional materials and methods of construction, and the relationship of buildings and spaces to the street pattern, the Bourne Rivulet and surrounding countryside that reflect the growth of the villages over time and their agrarian past.
16. I saw that Swampton House occupies a visible location in the village adjacent to the main street, albeit end on to it, together with the outbuilding whose outer wall runs alongside the main road through the village. Indeed the CA Appraisal³ states that

³ St Mary Bourne and Stoke Conservation Area Appraisal 2003

Swampton House is one of the most prominent buildings and that the site is noted as creating a “visual pinch point before views open to the south”. Swampton House, the roof of the outbuilding and the boundary wall of typical flint and brick materials are important components of the streetscape and the CA. With their heritage merit and aesthetic charm, they positively contribute to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole and thereby to its significance as a designated heritage asset.

Appeal proposal and effects

17. The proposed link-extension would effectively cover over the small yard between part of the rear elevation of the house and the outbuilding. The extension would have a flat, standing-seam metal roof that would be hidden from the road as the boundary wall would be raised by about 0.4m, creating a parapet roof for the extension. The extension would have one exterior wall of full height glazing, including a glazed door. The link-extension would join onto the end elevation of the outbuilding closest to the house, although there are no details or sections to show how it would be physically attached and secured to the rear of the dwelling or the outbuilding. The end wall of the outbuilding would be removed so that the link-extension would open out into the outbuilding and create an open-plan dining room and kitchen. A utility room would be created in the far end of the outbuilding, which would also be accessed externally by a wooden door in the end elevation.
18. Glazing is often used to create light-weight structures and is a common design technique used to indicate junctions between older and new building fabric. The contemporary design used for the link-extension is relatively simple in its form and detailing and would be legible as a modern phase of intervention, and would allow the historic rear brick wall of the house to still be seen at close quarters. There would also be a limited loss of historic fabric of the dwelling, although I have not been provided with any details or sections showing the junction of the link. However, the link is not fully glazed as it would have a metal roof, and as a result the legibility between old and new is lessened.
19. The existing outbuilding is currently separate and detached from the house. Its simple linear construction and timber clad appearance, with few openings, is indicative of its ancillary and functional form. Even if the present day structure, or parts of it, are younger than the listing suggests, the relationship of the buildings would appear to have always been thus, as shown on the submitted map regressions. The tithe map of 1841 clearly shows the outbuilding and house as separate structures. This relationship is shown to remain the same a hundred years later, on the Ordnance Survey map of 1941, which also shows the rear of the house having been extended a little towards the outbuilding, but still distinctly separate. This separation continues to the present day. From the evidence there appears to be no historic precedent for the outbuilding to be linked to the main dwelling.
20. The proposal to link the rear of the house to the detached outbuilding, even if it would attach to parts of the outbuilding that may not be original, and to elevate the outbuilding into one of the main living areas of the house, would erode the plan form and historic hierarchy of the buildings. This would reduce the legibility of the heritage asset.
21. Whilst the link-extension would not be visible from the street, the rear garden contributes to the special interest and significance of the listed building. The

addition of the link-extension would visually disrupt the hierarchy of the buildings when viewed from the garden, as the outbuilding would no longer read as a detached, simple, ancillary building. This would thus alter the authenticity of how the buildings are experienced and thus affect the ability to appreciate their heritage merit. This would notably lessen the positive contribution that the buildings' setting makes to its special interest and significance. Listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest, irrespective of whether close public views of the building can be gained.

22. Drawing all the above points together, the proposed link-extension would fail to preserve the listed building, its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. In doing so, it would harm the significance of this designated heritage asset.
23. In terms of the effect on the CA, there would be no significant change to the street scene and the building's visual setting within it, or to the wider area, despite the raising of a section of wall to conceal the roof of the extension. The repairs to, and partial reconstruction of, the badly leaning boundary wall along the road, given its prominence in the street scene, would enhance the character and appearance of the CA as a whole.

Public benefits and heritage balance

24. The Framework states that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource. Paragraphs 212 and 213 of the Framework state 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. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset, from its alterations or destruction or from development within its setting, should require clear and convincing justification.
25. In finding harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, Framework paragraphs 214 and 215 require the magnitude of that harm to be assessed. Given the nature and extent of the proposed development and against the advice in the Framework and national Planning Practice Guidance (the PPG) I find the harm to the significance of the listed building would be 'less than substantial' and at the middle of that category. Nonetheless, a finding of less than substantial harm still carries considerable importance and weight.
26. In line with paragraph 215 of the Framework, less than substantial harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the works. Public benefits, as described in the PPG, can be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental objectives and do not have to be visible or publicly accessible. They can also include works to a listed private dwelling, for example, which secure its future as a designated heritage asset.
27. There would be some public benefits in the form of economic benefits to the wider local economy from jobs and the supply chain during the construction phase of the proposal. However, the extent and nature of the works would mean that any benefits would be limited and for a short duration.
28. The proposal would also see the repair of an historic boundary wall that is leaning towards the road and is clearly in need of attention to stop it falling over. Part of the roof of the outbuilding is resting on top of parts of the boundary wall, likely

contributing to its lean. To overcome this, the appellant proposes to independently support the roof of the outbuilding with an internal frame. This would be a public benefit in the interest of conserving the heritage assets.

29. However, there is no substantive evidence before me to indicate that the necessary repair works to the boundary wall and support for the outbuilding roof cannot be carried out independently of the link-extension and making the outbuilding part of the main living space for the house. Whilst the proposals as a whole might offer a convenient opportunity to reconfigure the living accommodation and use the outbuilding in a different way, there is nothing before me to suggest that the link-extension is the only way to achieve this. Therefore, the public benefits are limited in this regard.
30. The proposal would involve improvements to restore some of the historic internal layout of the ground floor of the house, such as removing the partitions in the living room and opening up/closing doors into the dining room. This would be a public benefit. However, these internal works could be undertaken any time independently of any works to the boundary wall, the outbuilding or the erection of a link-extension. Hence these public benefits are limited in this regard.
31. Nor is there substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that the proposed link-extension, and other proposed works, are necessary to secure the continued use of Swampton House and that its use as a dwelling would cease if the appeal was dismissed. Clear and convincing justification for the harm to the asset's significance has not been provided. The proposals may well provide the appellant and his family with improved living accommodation, but this is a personal preference and would be a private, not public benefit.
32. There are some public benefits in favour of the appeals. However, the weight I ascribe to them is not sufficient to outweigh the considerable importance and great weight I attach to the harm that would be caused to the significance of the listed building that includes the outbuilding, and the presumption in favour of preservation. As a result the proposal would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and the relevant provisions of the Framework.
33. The proposal would also conflict with Policies EM10 and EM11 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan (2011-2029) and Policy E7 of the St Mary Bourne Neighbourhood Plan (2016-2029). Collectively these seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development has regard to its surroundings and neighbouring buildings, including historic ones, and conserves the character of heritage assets.
34. Listed building appeals are not subject to section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and therefore development plan policies do not carry the same weight as when considering planning applications. Nevertheless, the Council refers to the same policies above, which the proposal would conflict with.

Conclusion

35. Appeal A: The proposed development would conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations which indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that Appeal A should be dismissed.

36. Appeal B: For the reasons given, I conclude that Appeal B should be dismissed.

K Stephens
INSPECTOR