

**Application Number:** 23/10586 Listed Building Alteration  
**Site:** NEVIS, NELSON PLACE, LYMINGTON SO41 3RT  
**Development:** Rear extension (Application for Listed Building Consent)  
**Applicant:** Mr & Mrs Phillips  
**Agent:** Morgan Building Design  
**Target Date:** 02/08/2023  
**Case Officer:** Julie Parry  
**Officer Recommendation:** Refuse  
**Reason for Referral to Committee:** Town Council contrary view

---

## 1 SUMMARY OF THE MAIN ISSUES

The key issues are:

- 1) Impact on the historic significance and character of the listed building.
- 2) Impact on historic fabric.

## 2 SITE DESCRIPTION

Nevis is a two-bay double-pile 18th century Grade II listed town house located on Nelson Place within the Lymington Conservation Area. The form of the main building and the ancillary buildings to the west appear to have been unaltered since the mid-19th century. To the rear, the building has two full height projecting bays. These bays are well proportioned, and the original rear elevation has greater architectural interest above typical 18th century town houses in this part of Lymington. There are a number of listed buildings along this road, including the adjoining neighbour, Nelson House.

The semi-detached dwelling sits within the front north-eastern corner of the plot and benefits from attached garages to the side which front the highway. The rear garden is relatively large and extends beyond the garage block.

Map regression shows that the garden wall on the eastern boundary was historically a “crinkle-crankle” wall until the early 20th century, but this appears to have been replaced with a straight garden wall.

In 2015, consent was granted for the current garden room extension which projects to the rear of the western bay and includes a roof lantern which sits to the front of a first floor window located on the rear elevation.

## 3 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposal is to extend the existing timber extension across the width of the property. This would re-use some of the existing materials and continue in the same moulding detail as the existing extension. The proposed addition would incorporate the garden wall by underpinning the wall and building above with the

same style of brickwork finished with a parapet at the top. The roof would incorporate a roof lantern to match that used on the existing extension.

A previous application for a similar proposal was recently refused. The changes from this previous application are that the proposed extension now incorporates the side boundary wall instead of a separate parapet wall, which results in the centralising of the roof lantern and doors.

#### 4 PLANNING HISTORY

Proposal	Decision Date	Decision Description	Status
23/10320 Single-storey rear extension	15/05/2023	Refused	Decided
23/10321 Single-storey rear extension (Application for Listed Building consent)	15/05/2023	Refused	Decided
15/11702 Single-storey rear extension	28/01/2016	Granted Subject to Conditions	Decided
15/11703 Single-storey timber framed glazed extension with roof lantern (Application for Listed Building Consent)	28/01/2016	Granted Subject to Conditions	Decided
92/NFDC/50943/LBC Addition of dummy external shutters to north elevation	13/01/1993	Refused	Decided
92/NFDC/50944/LBC Repaint north elevation/display window silhouette of Nelson	03/12/1992	Granted	Decided
90/NFDC/45157 Erection of a conservatory	12/07/1990	Refused	Decided
90/NFDC/45158/LBC Erection of a conservatory	10/07/1990	Granted	Decided
XX/LYB/12415 Additional room in roof and extensions.	15/05/1970	Refused	Decided
XX/LYB/01281 Conversion of existing store into two garages.	13/12/1952	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

##### **Supplementary Planning Guidance And Documents**

SPD - Lymington Local Distinctiveness

##### **Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990**

S.66 General duty as respects listed buildings in exercise of planning functions.

S.72 General duty as respects conservation areas in exercise of planning functions

## **6 PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS**

**Lymington & Pennington Town Council:** Recommend Permission but would accept a delegated decision

## **7 COUNCILLOR COMMENTS**

Cllr England supports the application for the following reasons:-

- The application mirrors the previous permission for a single-storey rear extension
- the proposal provides symmetry to the rear elevation
- the rear is not visible
- no impacts on the street scene

## **8 CONSULTEE COMMENTS**

### Conservation Officer

Objects. As proposed, the development by reason of its scale, detailing and proportions would detract from the rear elevation of the historic building, which is considered to be of high architectural and aesthetic interest. The development would result in less than substantial harm. As per Paragraph 199 of the NPPF, great weight should be given to an asset's conservation, irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm or less than substantial harm. The application should be refused.

## **9 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

No representations received.

## **10 PLANNING ASSESSMENT**

### Principle of Development

The main considerations when assessing this application are the impact on the historic fabric of the Listed Building, along with any effect on its significance, character and layout. The National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (NPPF) makes clear that when considering the impact of proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Local Plan Part 2 Policy DM1 provides that development proposals and other initiatives should conserve and seek to enhance the historic environment and heritage assets, with particular regard to local character, setting, management and the historic significance and context of heritage assets.

### Design, site layout and impact on the historic significance and character

On the rear elevation, the property has two full height projecting bays which are well proportioned and of high architectural and aesthetic interest. The existing extension, with its relatively high, bulky roof form and roof lantern, has resulted in some change to the historic building's rear elevation. Currently, with the existing gap between this extension and the boundary wall, there is a view of one full bay on the rear elevation and the evolution of the property can be easily read. The gap remaining to the side of the extension is important and allows the original form, evolution and understanding of the building to remain.

The proposed extension, as a result of its size and depth, would be an unduly large and dominant addition that would be detrimental to an appreciation of the original historic rear façade. By creating an almost continuous built form across the rear of the two properties, the extension would have a detrimental impact on the character and significance of the host listed building.

Whilst the proposed extension would match the existing and provide a symmetrical built form across the plot, the proposed design would have little regard for the simple rear façade of the original building and would remove any remaining legibility of the historic bays at ground floor level when viewed from the rear. The additional roof lantern would further impose on views of the original rear façade.

In terms of the effect on historic fabric, there would be no change to the existing French doors leading from the bay into the new floorspace. Furthermore, conditions could be added to any approval for the exact details of the materials to be used, along with the method of connection to the existing historic fabric, to be submitted and approved prior to the work being carried out.

## **12 CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE**

The combined effect of the new and existing extension, taken together, would have an overwhelming and dominant impact on the simple, plain rear façade of the historic building which retains significant architectural and aesthetic interest.

As proposed, the development, by reason of its scale, detailing and proportions would detract from the rear elevation of the historic building which is considered to be of high architectural and aesthetic interest. As such, the development would result in less than substantial harm. As per Paragraph 199 of the NPPF, great weight should be given to an asset's conservation, irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm or less than substantial harm.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advises that such harm is to be weighed against the public benefits of a proposal. However, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Apart from economic benefits from employment during construction, there are no clear public benefits arising from the proposal, only personal ones. Whilst guidance does recognise that benefits do not have to be visible or accessible to the public (such as works to a listed building to secure its future), in this case the works proposed are not required to sustain its future and would harmfully erode the heritage asset's significance. The proposal would therefore conflict with the Act, policies within the National Planning Policy Framework and local planning policies. Accordingly, the application is recommended for refusal.

## **13 RECOMMENDATION**

### **REFUSE LISTED BUILDING CONSENT**


**Reason(s) for Refusal:**

1. The proposed single-storey extension, as a result of its size, design, proportions and position, adjacent to an existing extension to the rear of the building, would result in the loss of the important design form at the rear of the property, detracting from the historic bay features and eroding the character and significance of the listed building. The new and existing extension, taken together, would appear as an unduly large and dominant addition to the rear façade of the historic building, which retains significant architectural and aesthetic interest. This would cause less than substantial harm to the overall character and significance of the listed building, but without public benefits to outweigh that harm. The development would therefore be contrary to Policy ENV3 of the Local Plan Part 1, Policy DM1 of the Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management Plan, and Chapters 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Further Information:**

Julie Parry

Telephone: 023 8028 5436



# New Forest DISTRICT COUNCIL

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

David Norris  
Service Manager  
Development Management  
New Forest District Council  
Appletree Court  
Lyndhurst  
SO43 7PA

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 2023

Nevis  
Nelson Place  
Lymington  
23/10586

Scale 1:500

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