

o: Design/Conservation Date: 10th February 2023

From: Northern Team Tel: 01264 368184

PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION

Please complete and return to the case officer by 3 March 2023

If no response is received by this date it will be taken that you have no comments to make.

Case Officer: Claudia Hurlock

Application No: 23/00353/FULLN

Proposal: Erection of internal gates and perimeter fencing, and removal of 3 trees

Location: Winton House , Farley Street, Nether Wallop, NETHER WALLOP

TPO: Yes/No

Conservation Area: Yes/No Listed Building Yes/No

Development Type: All other Minor developments

Case Officer Comments:

Response on application as submitted

No Objection No Comment Objection X

(subject to conditions) (specify planning reasons for refusal)

Conditions/Reasons for refusal:

Other comments:

Winton House is listed at GII. Its adjacent coach house is also listed in its own right at GII.

The site has a boundary wall which would appear to be contemporary to the house (i.e.

pre-date 1948) and would therefore be considered to be curtilage listed. The site lies within the conservation area. There are various other listed and historic buildings in the

vicinity.

The application proposes erection of 3m tall fencing around the perimeter of the open area

of the park surrounding the mansion and stables with associated gates. There is also a

separate section of fencing proposed around a new carparking area.

A separate application (23/00286/FULLN) has been submitted for a set of gates to be

installed at the entrance from Five Bells Lane and adjacent to the Wallop Brook Bridge. As

both sets of gates appear to be attached to the fencing proposed in the current application, it is not clear why the applications have been submitted separately.

Comments have been provided setting out concerns about the proposed gates (appended

to this response). It is considered there would be a cumulative impact arising from both the

proposed gates, and the works shown in this application.

The appearance of the proposed fencing and new mesh gates is not clearly demonstrated

in the application. Drawing ref. 22023-2/A(90)02 is indicative in style, and does not give a

clear impression of what the gates would look like. There are no sections. No

manufacturer's specifications have been provided. No drawings showing the proposed fencing have been provided, apart from the partial sections shown on either side of the gates. It is presumed there are likely to need to be vertical posts at intervals to prevent the fence from sagging or falling over – but there is no information about what these might look like, or how frequent they would be. The fence appears to be just mesh, with no further support at the top or base. This does not seem very robust, and it is questioned whether this is accurate.

Based on what can be understood from the drawings it would seem the fence would comprise a dense mesh. There is concern that this mesh is likely to be so dense that it may preclude meaningful views through. It seems likely that the fence would be visually prominent in all parts of the park.

The fence is stark, unattractive and modern in appearance. It is not the type of barrier which would be expected to be seen in the context of a small country house, or its grounds. The sharp angles of its route through the grounds are un-natural, and not traditional means of marking out boundaries in this rural context. They would draw attention to the hardness of the barrier and fail to blend it into the landscape. It is considered the proposed fence would be wholly inappropriate to the park or the setting of

Winton House and its stables, and would cause harm to their significance.

The application does not appear to set out why the fence needs to be designed in the manner it has, why it needs to be located where it is, or why it needs to be as tall as it is.

The application does not clearly justify the proposed fence. Therefore it is unlikely it has been shown there is a clear public benefit to weigh against the harm.

The supporting information makes some descriptive commentary on the park and the features (e.g. trees, Wallop Brook &c) contained within it, but does not set out what significance this has, or how it links to landscape movements contemporary to the house

being built – as such the heritage statement does not fully assess contribution the park

makes to the special interest of the mansion and stables through their setting. As the park

is included within the conservation area, its historic layout also needs to be considered on

its own merits. It is not clear, therefore, that the proposed scheme has been informed by a

full understanding of the special interest of the heritage assets.

It seems likely that the layout of the parkland, and the siting of the house, has taken advantage of the pre-existing Wallop Brook to emulate fashionable landscape

designs

used at grander country estates. The brook has, for example, probably been used in the same manner as the serpentine lakes of Brownian landscapes, with the land falling away

from the wall of the garden terrace forming a tapis vert down to the brook. The stream has

clearly been an intentional part of the design of the park and the setting of the house. It is

also possible woodland planting to further make a feature of the brook has taken place.

There is concern, therefore, about the proposed fence which would cut off the brook from

the house, both visually and physically. It is considered this would cause significant harm

to the landscaping of the park and the understanding of the design of the setting of the

mansion. No clear case is made for the fence, however, even were one to be made, the

appearance of the fence would still be a significant issue.

The proposed gate, like the fence, is not appropriate to the character or appearance of the

site. It is stark and utilitarian in nature and unattractive as a result. It is unclear why this

design has been chosen for the gates positioned close to the house, when imitation Victorian gates are shown elsewhere (they are not successful, as is set out in the response to 23/00286/FULLN, but are more relevant to the site than the gates shown on

drawing 22023-2/A(90)02.

It is not clear, from drawing ref. 22023-2/P(--)-102 whether sections of fencing are proposed immediately to the north-west front of the house and between the house and the

stables. There are thick black lines shown here, but they are not annotated. These are

especially sensitive visual locations.

Drawing ref. 22023-2/P(90.4)001 shows a large area of new car-parking with associated

hard-standing being introduced immediately adjacent to the main driveway close to the

bridge over the bridge over the Wallop Brook. It is not clear whether this forms part of the

application, as it is not included in the description of works, and not referenced anywhere

else in the application aside from drawing ref. 22023-2/P(--)-102. This car-parking would be

likely to be very prominent in the main approach to the mansion. It would not be sympathetic to the verdant character of the parkland landscaping, and it is considered it

would be harmful to the heritage assets. There is no reference to this proposed carpark in

the heritage statement. The application does not assess the historic character of this part of the park or its contribution to the setting of the park, nor does it set out why it has been proposed to site the carpark here, and whether minimising harm to the heritage assets has formed part of the considerations.

This new section of car-parking is shown to be enclosed within a nonagonal fence. This is in addition to the perimeter fence. It is not clear why this fence is required and there is no explanation for it in the supporting information. The existing car-parking closer to the house is not proposed to be fenced-off, nor is the hardstanding around the mansion and stable block. There does not appear to be any clear need to enclose this new carpark. The concerns about the appearance of the proposed fencing have been set out above. The issues would be heightened in terms of this area of fencing. With respect to the concerns about visual permeability, due to the relatively small area enclosed, and the shape created, it is likely the fencing would be too close together for the holes in the mesh to allow any meaningful views through. The shape created by the fencing is arbitrary – it takes no reference from forms in the historic park, its form simply following the lines of the proposed new parking area. It will look incongruous and unattractive, and emphasise the proposed new carpark.

It is considered the combined effect of the new parking area and the fencing would have a considerable harmful effect on the appearance of the park and settings of the listed buildings. It is not clear what the additional rectangle included within this fenced area (including three brown rectangles) is meant to indicate. There is concern it might be some form of structure, like a bike store).

The park is included in the conservation area boundary. Though much of the fencing proposed would not be visible outside of the property it is still considered, in this instance, that it would have an impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area, and would be harmful to its special interest through this. The site is intended to be accessed by multiple people, including employees, clients, and clients' families as well as tradespeople and supplies. As such the grounds are semi-public in terms of their contribution to the conservation area. For the reasons set out above, it is considered the proposed fencing and gates would be an unattractive and inappropriate addition to

the part, and it is considered through this they would cause harm to the significance of the conservation area. In terms of the level of harm, this would be less-than-substantial, but, for the immediate area of the park, it would be at the very higher end of this bracket.