

**Application Number:** 20/11440 Listed Building Alteration

**Site:** 47-49 HIGH STREET, FORDINGBRIDGE SP6 1AS

**Development:** Extension and alterations to an existing shop and 5 bedroom flat to form a shop at ground floor level and 4x flats (1x 1-bed, 2x 2-bed, 1x 3-bed), with associated external alterations (Application for Listed Building Consent)

**Applicant:** ADS Surveys Ltd

**Agent:** Atlas Planning Group

**Target Date:** 06/04/2021

**Case Officer:** Jim Bennett

**Extension Date:** 13/05/2021

---

## 1 SUMMARY OF THE MAIN ISSUES

The key issue is:

1. Impact on the fabric and appearance of the Listed Building

This application is considered by Committee as the recommendation is contrary to the reasons for refusal offered by Fordingbridge Town Council.

## 2 SITE DESCRIPTION

The site lies within the built up area of Fordingbridge and is within the Fordingbridge Conservation Area. The Site Number 47-49 High Street is a grade II listed, two storey building with shop to the ground floor. The building dates from the early 18th century, and was altered in the 19th century, along with a two-storey flat roof extension to the rear. The listed building is situated prominently within the Fordingbridge Conservation Area on the High Street, within the Primary Retail Frontage. The ground floor of the premises was formerly occupied by Martins for retail purposes and the first and second floors occupied as a self-contained 5 bedroom flat.

## 3 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The application is made for listed building consent to convert approximately 40% of the ground floor to residential, the remainder of the ground floor retained for retail purposes. Extensions and alterations are also proposed to provide a total of 4 no. flats on the site. The extension would be a two storey structure, projecting south of the existing building, of contemporary form and materials. A pitched roof would be added to the existing two storey, flat roofed structure to the rear.

#### 4 PLANNING HISTORY

Proposal	Decision Date	Decision Description	Status
20/11439 - Extension and alterations to an existing shop and 5 bedroom flat to form a shop at ground floor level and 4x flats (1x 1-bed, 2x 2-bed, 1x 3-bed), with associated external alterations (Planning Application)	See item 2a		
05/83638 - Flood defences	17/05/2005	Granted	Decided

#### 5 PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE

##### Local Plan 2016-2036 Part 1: Planning Strategy

Policy ENV3 - Design quality and local distinctiveness

##### Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management 2014

DM1: Heritage and Conservation

##### Relevant Advice

NPPF Chap 12: Achieving well designed places

NPPF Chap 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

##### Plan Policy Designations and Constraints

Fordingbridge Conservation Area

Listed Building Grade: Grade II 552.16.045

##### Supplementary Planning Guidance And Documents

Fordingbridge Conservation Area Appraisal

SPD - Fordingbridge Town Design Statement

#### 6 PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS

**Fordingbridge Town Council** - Recommend refusal under PAR4 because of the loss of retail space, the effect on neighbouring properties, the issues with car parking and the concerns raised by the conservation officer.

#### 7 COUNCILLOR COMMENTS

No comments received

#### 8 CONSULTEE COMMENTS

Comments have been received from the following consultees:

**Environmental Design Team (Conservation)** - The proposed works to the ground floor would be a benefit to the significance of the listed building as it would reinstate a sense of division, more common in historic buildings, and would help to divide up the space. No objections to the proposed works at first and second floor level.

Concern is raised over an additional roof light on the front elevation when there is already an existing roof light and the simple roof slope would start to appear cluttered. No details have been provided to demonstrate whether the roof light can be installed without the loss of historic fabric. There is a lack of detail on services proposed and their route through the building, there are no details on proposed ducts, vents, flue, fire proofing measures and sound attenuation requirements. It is important that these do not impact upon the fabric or significance of the listed building. Repair schedules and method statements for the fabric and structure of the listed building are also required.

The proposal for the additional walls on the ground and first floor are not considered to have a harmful impact upon the significance of the listed building in terms of loss to historic fabric and there would be a reinstatement of a plan form, which has been lost. However, the proposed units of accommodation as well as the shop unit would result in a more intensive use for the listed building. More bathrooms and kitchens are proposed, which results in more services. Fire regulations and sound attenuation would be required. It is therefore important to understand whether the proposal to sub-divide the listed building, in relation to the number of residential units, is the optimum viable use for the heritage asset as laid out in the NPPF.

The proposal for a pitched roof to replace the existing flat roof is acceptable. A pitched roof is a more traditional design and would help to soften the appearance of the flat roof. The design and form of the windows are clearly modern in appearance. However, these still need to be traditionally designed and detailed. The top light opening windows are unacceptable and we would need to see joinery details to comment further on the windows and doors.

The proposed rear extension to create Apartment 4 would be two storeys in height and located to the rear of the listed building. The listed building has already been extended and any further extensions are not supported. The listed building would appear over-extended to the rear and overwhelmed by extensions. The rear extension for Apartment 4 would be awkwardly located, appearing incongruous.

It is considered that the proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset. The NPPF advises that such harm is to be weighed against the public benefits of a proposal, including securing its optimum viable use. However, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The character and appearance of the conservation area would not be preserved or enhanced. The proposal would therefore conflict with the Act, the NPPF and local planning policies.

**Historic England** - The level of supporting information provided with this application falls short of that which is required to assess proposals or reach a determination. Information is particularly lacking in relation to the grade II building interior, its significance and the potential impact of proposals on this. Paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected by development proposals. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of proposals on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage asset assessed using appropriate expertise. Determination of the application should be delayed, and the applicant given the opportunity to provide the necessary supporting information. We consider that the issues and safeguards outlined in our advice need to be addressed in order for the application to meet the requirement of paragraphs 189 of the NPPF. Plan and NPPF.

## 9 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

None

## 10 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

### Impact on the fabric and appearance of the Listed Building

The impact of the proposal on the fabric and appearance of the listed building need to be considered under the provisions of Policies ENV3 and DM1. There is a duty imposed by Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requiring decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Section 72(1) also requires special regard to be paid to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. The National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF) makes clear that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

While the level of retail floor space lost would be contrary to retail policies, the proposed works to the ground floor would be a benefit to the significance of the listed building as it would reinstate a sense of division, more common in historic buildings, and would help to divide up the space. There are no alterations to the plan form within the historic part of the listed building at first and second floor levels and the subdivision of the modern rear extension would not have an impact upon the significance of the listed building.

Concern is raised by the Conservation Team over an additional roof light on the front elevation when there is already an existing roof light and the simple roof slope would start to appear cluttered. An option of having the roof light to the rear should be explored as an alternative solution, subject to historic fabric not being lost. No details have been provided to demonstrate whether the roof light can be installed without the loss of historic fabric. Further concerns are raised by the Conservation Team and Historic England over the lack of detail on joinery, repairs and services proposed for the building.

The proposed rear extension to create Apartment 4 would be two storeys in height and located to the rear of the listed building, running along the boundary to Number 51. It would be linked to the listed building by the existing single storey rear element, and due to its proposed location in relation to other rear extensions, there would be walkway leading alongside the staff room/WC extension, and then at an approximate right angle to the side of Apartment 4. The listed building has already been extended in the past with sizeable extensions to the rear. It is considered that the proposal to further extend by way of a two-storey extension would dominate the listed building. The listed building has already been significantly extended and any further extensions are not supported by the Conservation Team, as this would appear over-extended to the rear, incongruous and overwhelm the principle building. Furthermore the proposed level of accommodation, in addition to the shop unit would result in a more intensive use for the listed building and result in an over-developed form of development.

As a result, it is considered that the proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset. The NPPF advises that such harm is to be weighed against the public benefits of a proposal, including securing its optimum viable use. However, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The character and appearance of the conservation area would not be preserved or enhanced. The proposal would therefore conflict with the Act, the NPPF and local planning policies.

The proposed development would be overdeveloped and dominated by a large and incongruous addition to the rear of the listed building, causing less than substantial harm to the fabric and appearance of the listed building, by virtue of its design, mass, siting and appearance. Furthermore, insufficient information has been submitted to establish the level of intervention required to the fabric of the listed building. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to the provisions of Policy DM1 of the Local Plan Part 2 (Sites and Development Management DPD) 2014, Policy ENV3 of the NFDC Local Plan Part 1 2016-2036 and Paragraph 192 of the NPPF.

### Other Matters

With regard to the reasons for refusal specified by Fordingbridge Town Council, the Local Planning Authority cannot legitimately refuse an application for listed building consent on the basis of the loss of retail space, the effect on neighbouring properties and concerns over car parking. A listed building application can only assess the impacts of the proposal on the fabric and appearance of the listed building, the other matters raised are considered under the associated planning application under ref. 20/11439, also on this agenda.

## **11 CONCLUSION**

While benefits may be delivered by the form of development proposed in terms of housing provision and bringing a vacant building back into use, it is considered that those benefits are outweighed by the less than substantial harm caused to the fabric and appearance of the listed building. The National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF) makes clear that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Accordingly the proposed listed building consent is recommended for refusal.

## **12 RECOMMENDATION**

### **REFUSE LISTED BUILDING CONSENT**

#### **Reason(s) for Refusal:**

1. The proposed development would result in a large, overdominant and incongruous addition to the rear of the building, causing less than substantial harm to the fabric and appearance of the listed building, by virtue of its design, mass, siting and appearance. Furthermore, insufficient information has been submitted to establish the level of intervention required to the fabric of the listed building. Consequently the proposal would be contrary to the provisions of Policy DM1 of the Local Plan Part 2 (Sites and Development Management DPD) 2014, Policy ENV3 of the NFDC Local Plan Part 1 2016-2036 and Paragraph 192 of the NPPF.

#### **Further Information:**

Jim Bennett  
Telephone: 023 8028 5443



# New Forest DISTRICT COUNCIL

Tel: 023 8028 5000  
www.newforest.gov.uk

Claire Upton-Brown  
Chief Planning Officer  
Planning  
New Forest District Council  
Appletree Court  
Lyndhurst  
SO43 7PA

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

May 2021

47-49 HIGH STREET  
FORDINGBRIDGE SP6 1AS

20/11440

Scale 1:1250

N.B. If printing this plan from the internet, it will not be to scale.

