



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2019

by Robert Hitchcock BSc DipCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A3010/W/19/3230834

64 Newcastle Avenue, Worksop, Nottinghamshire S80 1LA

- 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 P Singh against the decision of Bassetlaw District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00203/FUL, dated 13 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is two dormer windows to front and one dormer window to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development appearing on the Council's decision notice is different from that on the application form. Although the revised description was agreed by the appellant, I have removed reference to the retention of the development as this is not, in itself, development.
3. Planning permission was previously granted for front and rear dormer windows to this property thereby establishing the principle of development. That development was not completed in accordance with the approved plans and the remaining dispute between the parties is limited to the effect of the front dormer windows only.

Main Issue

4. Whether the front dormer windows preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Worksop Conservation Area (CA) and the setting of the Worksop Castle Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM).

Reasons

The Worksop Conservation Area

5. No.64 lies within the 'Millhouses' sub-area of the wider CA. The area is characterised by close knit linear red-brick terraces and semi-detached dwellings from the late C19 and early C20 built alongside larger plots of community and commercial buildings. These buildings retain a high degree of uniformity deriving from common scale, materials and architectural elements including bays, banding courses and mouldings, detailed brick arches, stone elements and cornice details. Whilst various alterations to the terrace have

taken place over the years, the buildings retain a high degree of uniformity. The significance of the CA arises from the identifiable historic and architectural character of the phases of development linked to local commerce and infrastructure provision.

6. The individual front dormers have a slight vertical emphasis in the forward elevation provided by a high eaves line and gable pike above the window head. The dormers extend almost to the ridge of the main roof slope but are set back from the eaves line to give a height that is generally comparable to other original dormers present within this part of the CA. However, the design incorporates a greater proportion of framing to glazing and greater overall width. This is apparent in the deeper surround and window framing in comparison to those original examples.
7. The combination of the height and additional width results in the dormers having a greater bulk. This is exacerbated by their close siting, resulting in little clear space visible between the two. Together the dormers result in a significant degree of visual massing on the roof slope. This is at odds with the general character and appearance of roof extensions in the locality.
8. The dormer windows to the front are readily visible within the Newcastle Avenue street scene and form part of a closing vista looking north along Norfolk Street. The eye is drawn to this through a combination of the combined scale but also due to the expanse of bright cladding and the poor vertical alignment with the openings in the elevation below. This arrangement contrasts significantly with the isolated positions and alignments of the other dormer extensions; and fails to reflect the slenderness and finer construction and detailing of the traditional forms. The lack of coherence with the original architectural style and scale results in a poor form of development that detracts from both the character and appearance of the building and the historic and architectural interests of the wider CA.
9. The appellant draws comparisons to the other wide dormer windows that were observable in the locality. However, these tend to be flat-roofed and isolated such that the described combination of factors identified above does not arise to the same extent. Indeed, it is possible that many of these pre-dated the designation of the CA as a heritage asset.
10. There are examples of non-traditional development forms and materials exist here which has eroded some of the quality of the original architecture in the immediate vicinity. The appellant suggests that this is the context in which the development should be assessed. However, the significance of the CA lies in the characteristic architecture reflecting the town's historic phases of development. Notwithstanding that the building is identified in the Worksop Conservation Area appraisal as having a neutral impact on the character, appearance and significance of the CA and presents some poorly designed roof additions, this does not relinquish the development from the duty imposed under s 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) or the relevant Local Plan policy tests.
11. For the reasons identified above, the development fails to preserve the character or appearance of the CA and results in a negative effect on the historic and architectural interest of the designated heritage asset. It is therefore in conflict with Policy DM8 of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document.

Worksop Castle Scheduled Ancient Monument

12. As to the impact on the setting of the SAM; the significance of this asset lies in its historic interest and potential archaeology. The SAM is some distance to the south and located in well-defined and self-contained grounds that result in a significant degree of visual disconnect between it and the surrounding area. The main aspect of its interpretation is that of the land-forming and the historic lay of the surrounding land. Neither this, nor any archaeological interest, is affected by the development. Furthermore, in the context of the enclosure and substantially urbanised setting of the SAM, the significance of the dormers with respect to the setting and significance of the SAM is negligible. The dormers have a neutral effect that would not prejudice either the significance of the asset or the experience of it.

Conclusion

13. Notwithstanding the conclusion with respect to the effect of the development on the Worksop Castle Scheduled Ancient Monument, this does not outweigh the harm identified to the character and appearance of the Worksop Conservation Area. I therefore conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

R Hitchcock

Inspector