

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2019

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 23 January 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/B9506/D/18/3214999

Oakfield Cottage, Bisterne Close, Burley, Ringwood, BH24 4AU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Keith Millen against the decision of the New Forest National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref 18/00658, dated 6 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 22 October 2018.
 - The development proposed is rendering of the external walls.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for rendering of the external walls at Oakfield Cottage, Bisterne Close, Burley, Ringwood, BH24 4AU in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 18/00658, dated 6 August 2018, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 01, 02, 03 & 04.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Burley Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies within the Burley Conservation Area. Under s72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 I have a duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Area.
 4. The local planning authority's Burley and Fritham with Eyeworth Conservation Area Character Appraisals document 2010 (CACA) identifies Bisterne Close as lying within a character area formed by large medieval enclosures, and later smaller enclosures that adjoin. The road contains housing that varies in appearance and the use of materials. There are brick houses, rendered houses, and houses with painted brick, and indeed the CACA refers to the prevalent building materials on the road as being brick that is sometimes painted or rendered. Some of the houses lie closer to the road than others, whilst others are set back in more wooded setting. In this diversity of appearance there is
-

general consistency in the spacious and rural setting of housing, and the domestic two storey scale of the houses. The significance of the Area as a heritage asset derives from this character and appearance

5. The appeal property dates from the late 19th Century or early 20th Century and is painted brick having been, I understand, painted in the 1960s. The proposal would see the rendering of the entire house. As noted above, the use of render is seen in the vicinity, and where it is seen this does not detract from the character of the area. Although the texture of brick would be lost at Oakfield Cottage, painted brick is not the sole defining character of Bisterne Close. Furthermore, I saw at my site visit that the greater contribution played by Oakfield Cottage to the Area is its detailed design and scale, with the steeply pitched roof, the gable ends, a symmetrical front façade, and strong fenestration pattern with timber sliding sash windows; those are all features of Oakfield Cottage specifically recognised in the CACA, and would not be affected by the rendering. The significance of Oakfield Cottage as a building of local interest, identified in the CACA, would not be harmed.
6. The local planning authority have raised a concern that the use of concrete render would trap moisture within the building and so have negative implications for the fabric and structure. The appellant states that the local planning authority was unaware the building has a cavity wall and is not solid construction, and so states the building would be able to 'breathe'. I have not been provided with any technical evidence to support the local planning authority's view and, on the information presented to me, it appears their view was not based on a specific inspection of the property's construction. Hence, on the basis of all I have read and seen, I am inclined to concur with the evidence of the appellant, who owns the building. This leads me to conclude that the render proposed to be used would not lead to any harmful effect upon the fabric and structure of the building.
7. I am therefore content that the proposed development preserves the character and appearance of the Burley Conservation Area. No harm is caused to the significance of the heritage asset. The development is thus consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and the objectives of Policies DP1, DP6, CP7 and CP8 of the New Forest National Park Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD (December 2010) which, amongst other matters, requires all development to be of a high quality of design and to use materials appropriate to the site and setting, and to seek the conservation of heritage assets.
8. Planning permission is therefore granted, and a condition added specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR