
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2020

by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/20/3245496

Rose Cottage, Main Street, Morton NG25 0UT

- 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 and Mrs Gardner against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01800/FUL, dated 1 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is an orangery.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Morton Conservation Area (MCA)

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached building to the south side of Main Street. According to the evidence it is a replacement dwelling, which is now substantially larger than the original, developed following the granting of a planning permission in 2001. Through the use of traditional proportions, materials, build quality and detailing the building makes a positive contribution to the MCA. Particularly the elevation to which the proposed development would relate which, whilst not being original and perhaps not exactly the same as what it replaced, remains one that displays simple cottage form and exudes a quaint rural charm in the street scene. This elevation is, by virtue of its location, prominent in the MCA.
4. The proposed extension would be on what is a sensitive elevation of the cottage for the reasons I have given and in my view its size and design would appear uncomfortable and obvious, obscuring the noticeably smaller proportions of the section of the building to which it would be attached. I agree with the Council therefore that the extension would not be sympathetic to the existing building and unacceptably detract from its character. As a result, and also taking into account how visible the extension would be in the public realm, the proposed development would give rise to harm to the MCA. Given its scale I would consider, in this particular case, that such harm would

be less than substantial and I am therefore required, as per paragraph 196 of the Framework¹, to balance such against the public benefits of the proposal.

5. Beyond providing larger internal space for the current occupiers I am not clear that there would be any benefits to the public arising out of the scheme based on what I have seen in the evidence. I am therefore minded to conclude that the harm would not be outweighed. As a consequence, the appeal scheme would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the MCA. This would accordingly mean conflict with Core Policies 9 and 14 of the Core Strategy² and DM6 and DM9 of the Local Plan³. Amongst other things and along with section 16 of the Framework, these policies seek to ensure that new development should achieve a high standard of design and the historic environment is protected from harm. They also set out that, in regard to extensions to dwellings specifically, a proposal should respect the design and detailing of the host dwelling.

Other Matters

6. There is mention in the Council's evidence that the appeal scheme would also include some new boundary fencing. I take this to mean the screen arch trellis as it is shown on the proposed plans. I have not seen any elevations of the proposed fence and as such would not be able to form a definitive view on its likely impact. However in a street scene of mostly verdant boundary treatment, low fences and brick walls I would have some concerns over how tall such an addition would be and thus how obvious an impact it would have on the MCA. In any case, and should a new boundary treatment be acceptable, my views on the proposed extension would be unaffected.
7. I note there is some support of the appeal scheme from both the Parish Council and local residents. This does not however absolve me as the decision maker in this case making an assessment of the likely impact of the proposed development and reaching a reasoned conclusion. As I have done.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons I have explained above, the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR

¹ The National Planning Policy Framework 2019

² Newark and Sherwood Local Development Framework Amended Core Strategy 2019

³ Newark and Sherwood Local Development Framework Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document 2013