



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2025

by Samuel Watson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/W/25/3365471

Warbrook House Reading Road, Eversley, Hook RG27 0PL

- 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 Varun Chadha against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01730/FUL.
 - The development proposed is for the temporary extension of the existing planning consent for the marquee structure at Warbrook House.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the temporary extension of the existing planning consent for the marquee structure at Warbrook House Reading Road, Eversley, Hook RG27 0PL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01730/FUL, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my visit the marquee upon which this appeal turns was in place. I understand that it was covered by a temporary permission that expired in 2024. The appeal before me seeks the granting of a further temporary permission. The description in the header above has been taken from the planning application form but I have removed any superfluous details to make a clear description of development.
3. The Council's decision notice set out four reasons for refusal. As part of their appeal submissions however, they have decided not to defend the reasons related to noise impacts on neighbouring living conditions, and regarding biodiversity net gain. It has not therefore been necessary to consider Biodiversity net gain in further detail.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - Whether it is suitably justified that the temporary development be granted an additional permission; and,
 - Whether the development preserves the significance of the listed Warbrook House¹, and Warbrook House Registered Park and Garden².

¹ Warbrook House, Grade I (List Entry Number: 1260096)

² Warbrook House Park and Garden, Grade II* (List Entry Number: 1000249)

Reasons

Justification for Extension of Temporary Permission

5. I understand that there has been a marquee at the appeal site since 2012 and that this has been covered by three temporary permissions. The most recent of these was approved in 2019 meaning that the five-year permission would have expired in 2024.
6. The Planning Practice Guidance (the PPG) states that it is rarely justifiable to grant a second temporary permission unless changing circumstances provide a clear rationale to do so. It goes on instead to say that either the temporary scheme should be refused or a permanent permission granted. I have, therefore, been mindful of this guidance in my considerations below.
7. Since the grant of the last temporary permission, I understand that Warbrook House entered a period of financial losses, was bought by the appellant, the use of the marquee was then expanded and now, a permanent replacement is being considered. Cumulatively, and in particular as a result of the change in ownership, these have resulted in a significant change in the circumstances at the appeal site.
8. I understand from the details before me that the application for a permanent replacement is at a very early stage. The appellant has suggested that any temporary permission could be restricted to only two years. I am content that this period of time would be sufficient for an application to be submitted and decided. Moreover, should the application fail, it would also provide sufficient time for an alternative financial plan to be considered.
9. In light of the above, the changing circumstances have provided a clear rationale for a further grant of temporary planning permission to at least be considered. My assessment below has been made in this context.

Effect on Heritage Assets

10. Warbrook House was designed and built by John James in 1727. He was well known for his translation of the book *The Theory and Practice of Gardening* as well as for designing a number of properties and being the surveyor for St Pauls Cathedral. Warbrook House is formed of a central core with two wings finished in brick with stone detailing. These are of a relatively formal design and present a strong degree of symmetry which is repeated across both main elevations. The sense of symmetry is however, somewhat eroded by the later editions that form a large northern wing. The significance of this building stems in part from its age and connection to John James, but also as a result of its largely intact historic design and the legibility of the building within its wider grounds.
11. Warbrook House is located within a registered park and garden that was also designed by John James to reflect the ideals set out in the abovementioned book. The grounds immediately surrounding the building, and primarily between it and the canals, are formal gardens surrounded by grazed parklands. Long views are afforded, especially from the rear of the house but also to its front along the retained tracks, and these borrow upon the wider countryside beyond the gardens. I understand that although ownership of the land has changed numerous times, its layout changed little into the middle of the 20th century. Changes of particular relevance to this appeal include the creation of a lily pool in the 1930s, its

replacement with a swimming pool and, in turn, its replacement with the temporary marquee the subject of this appeal. The significance of this area partly arises from the extent to which its original layout is legible, its demonstration of grazed parkland, the ideals set out within *The Theory and Practice of Gardening*, as well as its connection to John James.

12. At the time of my visit the marquee, along with a small area of decking, was present. It sits away from the dwelling, as noted above, on the site of the former swimming pool. It is behind a tall brick wall that separates the marquee from one leg of the canal. It is constructed from a range of modern materials that cumulatively create a large, white building that is visually clearly very modern and temporary in nature. As such, the marquee does not reflect, and is not sympathetic to, the appearance, form or design of Warbrook House, or any of the associated buildings within the park. The marquee's white and utilitarian appearance therefore forms a prominent alien feature within the registered park and garden to the detriment of the interest of both assets.
13. This impact is exacerbated by the location and size of the marquee, allowing it to be readily visible in long views across the garden, including within the context of Warbrook House. Although the brick wall provides some degree of screening, it isn't sufficient to suitably hide the building, especially given the roof projects above it. In this way the marquee adversely affects the appreciation of the grazed pasture area of the gardens as well as important views from the rear of the house.
14. The scheme is for a temporary permission, and the appellant has suggested that the permission could be restricted to two years. While this would not reduce the level of harm arising from the scheme, it does mean that this harm would be time limited for only a relatively short period. Although the appellant has suggested that the marquee could be removed during winter months, this would only very modestly reduce the time in which the marquee is present to no real gain.
15. The appellant accepts that less than substantial harm, at the lower end of the scale, occurs to both heritage assets as a result of the marquee's utilitarian appearance. Given the above, the scale of the development and as it only replaces more recent elements of the garden, I concur that it would result in lower degree of less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets. Nevertheless, although the harm would be less than substantial, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is clear that great weight should still be given to any asset's conservation. Paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
16. It is clear from the submissions before me that the use of the marquee is important for the appellant's business plan in seeking to return to profit over this year and 2026. The marquee supports Warbrook House in providing employment, contributing to the tourist economy and ultimately support for the local rural economy. It is likely as well that the continued viability of Warbrook House would ensure its long-term maintenance and conservation and would also allow some level of wider appreciation of the heritage assets by event guests. Events at the marquee would also provide some social benefits.
17. Collectively these matters are public benefits. As the scheme would help support the site's viability while a more contextually appropriate, and permanent, solution is

brought forward, I am particularly mindful of the strong support given by Paragraph 85 of the Framework. Collectively, I therefore afford these public benefits very significant weight. In the circumstances of this case, this outweighs the temporary and reversible harm to the designated heritage assets I have identified above.

18. The proposal would not preserve the significance of the identified heritage assets, resulting in less than substantial harm. However, the identified public benefits outweigh this and, as such, the proposal complies with Policies NBE8, NBE1, and ED3 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2032 and Policy GEN1(v) of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement 1996-2006. These collectively seek developments to be of an appropriate design that conserves or enhances heritage assets and as well support economic development in the countryside. It also complies with the Framework, including Sections 12 and 16 and the paragraphs outlined above.

Other Matters

19. From the submissions before me it is clear that a degree of unacceptable noise would be experienced at neighbouring properties if noise mitigation was not implemented. I note the appellant's noise report has set out general mitigation measures that include both physical and operational changes. I am content that, subject to the provision of sufficient details, such measures would be appropriate to protect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Conditions

20. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the parties and the advice on planning conditions set out by the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. In the interest of clarity and enforceability, I have made some changes to the wording.
21. For certainty, I have set out the length of time for which this temporary permission runs. This has been reduced in line with the appellant's suggestions, so that it is granted only for the time necessary to achieve the purposes of this permission and, in order to reduce the level of harm. A condition is also necessary, for certainty and enforceability, requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
22. Conditions are necessary requiring additional information regarding noise mitigation and ensuring its provision so as to protect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. A condition controlling external lighting is also required to protect biodiversity on and around the appeal site.

Conclusion

23. There are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Samuel Watson

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be removed and the land restored to its former condition on or before 2 years, starting from the date of this decision, in accordance with a scheme of removal/restoration works that shall be submitted to the Council at least 6 months before the expiration of this permission.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be fully implemented in accordance with the following plans/documents: 243509-PUR-00-00-DR-A-1000 rev. C, 243509-PUR-00-00-DR-A-2001 rev. C1, 243509-PUR-00-00-DR-A-2002 Rev. C1, 243509-PUR-00-ZZ-DR-A-2010 Rev. C1, 243509-PUR-00-ZZ-DR-A-2011 Rev. C1, Tree Constraints Plan, Arboricultural Impact Assessment Rev. B, Outline Heritage Impact Assessment, Arboricultural and Planning Integration Report, Noise Impact Assessment
- 3) Notwithstanding the noise information contained in the supporting documents, the temporary marquee hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the following information is submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Council:
 - a) Noise Management Plan detailing procedures to manage noise created by organised events and actions put in place to avoid noise disturbance to nearby sensitive residential receptors, including designated noise manager, employee training documentation (including external areas and doors management, taxi management details, guests departures), complaints management (logging, investigation, response timeframes) and community liaison.
 - b) Details of acoustic lining for the marquee, including technical specifications and timeframes for installation
 - c) Sound limiter device specifications, calibration information and operational panel details and location.
 - d) Speaker system configuration details, including design, position, orientation
 - e) Specific noise levels for background music during organised events after 23:00
 - f) Self-closing door mechanisms details.
 - g) Designated smoking area details, including location and sizeThe above information shall set out timeframes for implementation and be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
- 4) Following the implementation of noise mitigation measures listed in condition 3 above, the following details shall be submitted to the Council for the setting of the limiter levels before the use of the marquee is resumed:
 - a) Sensitive receptor locations/boundary positions used for sound recording equipment.
 - b) Volume levels of amplified music played in the marquee (representative of noise levels at organised events) which were used for the sound recording equipment readings.
 - c) Noise mitigation measurements.
 - d) Proposed setting of limiter level.The Council shall be notified in writing concerning the intended resuming dates for events with all approved noise mitigation measures being in place. The setting of the limiter level hereby agreed shall not be altered without prior written

agreement from the Council through the submission of a further discharge of condition application.

- 5) All amplified music and entertainment within the marquee shall cease by 23:00hrs
- 6) Prior to their first use, details of any night-time external illumination shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The information shall demonstrate measures to prevent unnecessary night-time illumination of the external areas of site and minimise/avoid light spillage beyond what is necessary for the temporary use hereby approved. The night-time external lighting scheme shall be implemented in strict accordance with the details approved.