
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2017

by David Cross BA (Hons), PGDip, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/D/17/3181575
6 Cross Street, Nettleham, Lincoln LN2 2PB

- 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 Rod Foster against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref 136096, dated 10 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 2 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is to remove existing pvc conservatory and replace with brick and pantile dining room/sunroom extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council requested that I view the appeal site from the neighbouring property of 2 Cross Street. However, at my site visit I was unable to gain access. Nevertheless, I was able to view that property from the rear garden of the appeal site as well as from the public realm. I am satisfied, therefore, that I have sufficient information to proceed with the appeal.
3. The appellant has suggested an amended design in respect of the relationship between the proposed extension and the catslide roof. However it is my firm view, in the interests of fairness, that this appeal must be determined on the basis of the plan that was submitted with the planning application and which has been subject to consultation and not the amended design submitted with the appeal. To do otherwise could prejudice unacceptably the interests of interested people and/or consultees who have not been consulted on the amended proposals and who may have observations to make. I have therefore determined this appeal on the basis of the plan submitted with the application.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, with due regard to the location of the site in the Nettleham Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located within the Nettleham Conservation Area (CA) and I note that the CA Appraisal includes the host dwelling and its immediate

neighbour in a list of the important buildings which contribute most strongly to the character of the CA. I saw that the rear of the appeal site is readily visible in views from the public realm to the rear, even allowing for screening from trees and hedges. This included views from The Green which is a designated area of Local Green Space and one of the main focal points of the CA. The CA Appraisal notes that The Green and features including the buildings around it give an overall effect of village charm, which contributes to the importance of the CA as a designated heritage asset.

6. Within this context the proposed extension would appear as an awkward and incongruous addition to the host cottage. The glazed gable would be an angular and obtrusive addition to the cottage and would detract from the form and scale of its traditional character. The extension would also be of a significant size, projecting further to the rear than the existing conservatory and the ridge of the roof would project above the sill of a first floor window.
7. Furthermore, the extension would partially wrap around a catslide roof and would obscure part of the roof slope. This would sit uncomfortably in relation to the catslide roof which is a prominent and attractive feature of the host building. Whilst I acknowledge that the catslide roof is part of a relatively recent extension, this feature is a good example of vernacular architecture which integrates successfully with the cottage and the CA. The awkward arrangement of the proposal in relation to the roof would detract from the benefits arising from the sensitive design of the previous extension.
8. I saw that the adjoining dwelling of 2 Cross Street has a flat roofed extension and an outbuilding to the rear which are of an obviously modern design. I also saw that the extension intruded into views of some elements of the rear of No 2, including a catslide roof and first floor window. I am also mindful of the evidence provided by the appellant in relation to the comparative height and scale of the proposal. However, the rear of No 2 is not in as prominent a location as the appeal site as it is partially shielded in views from the wider area by an adjacent building. The buildings to the rear of No 2 are also of a flat roof design in contrast to the glazed gable of the proposal. Whilst I have some sympathy with the points made by the appellant in relation to the scale of the additions to No 2, I consider that the arrangement and design of the extensions at that property are materially different from the appeal proposal. This matter does not therefore lead me to a different conclusion in relation to the harm arising from the proposed extension.
9. In support of the appeal, my attention has also been drawn to a number of other properties in the village with varying roof designs. However, I do not have full details of the circumstances of these other sites and so cannot be sure that they represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal. Furthermore, the angular appearance of examples which have a glazed gable adds weight to my concerns in relation to the incongruous appearance of the proposal within the context of the appeal site.
10. I acknowledge that the removal of the modern conservatory would be a benefit, as would the use of traditional materials which complement the host dwelling. However, the proposal would be a more obtrusive replacement due to the projection to the rear, the height to the ridge of the roof and the glazed gable. I have also had regard to the benefits identified by the appellant in relation to the space within the dining room of the dwelling. However whilst

the harm to the significance of the CA is less than substantial, I consider that the public and other benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the identified harm.

11. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would be of a design which would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the host property and of the CA. The proposal would conflict with Policies LP25 and LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2017 in respect of the effect on the historic environment and matters of design. The proposal would also conflict with Policies E-4 and D-6 of the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan 2015 which, amongst other things, seek to preserve or enhance the character of the CA and reinforce the local character of the village.
12. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all material planning considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR