

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2020

**by R Walker BA Hons DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 02 October 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/W/20/3255190**

**Holly Cottage, 38 Low Road, Manthorpe NG31 8NQ**

- 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 Michael Teft against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
  - The application Ref S20/0357, dated 2 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2020.
  - The development proposed is erection of dwelling.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on heritage assets with particular reference to the Manthorpe Conservation Area (CA) and the setting of Holly Cottage, a grade II listed building.

### Reasons

3. Although functionally Grantham and Manthorpe are linked, there is a clear distinction in building styles between housing inside and outside of the CA. The size of Holly Cottage's garden, trees within it, the adjacent field track/footpath (footpath) and open gaps on the opposite side of the road also contribute to the distinction between the CA and other built form. Although not specifically referred to within the CA appraisal, the appeal site makes a small but important contribution to it.
4. The significance of the listed Holly Cottage derives from its architectural interest as an estate cottage, its symmetry as a pair and its historical association with the Belton House estate. Its garden helps, to a small degree, to reinforce the cottage's historical association with the estate and distinction from Grantham. As such, the garden contributes positively to the setting and significance of the listed building.
5. The footpath would continue to maintain a degree of separation and Grantham and Manthorpe would not physically coalesce. Retention of trees would also help. However, the proposal would erode the space between Holly Cottage and the housing in Grantham harming that distinction. This would be an undesirable incremental change that would result in harm to both the CA and setting of Holly Cottage.

6. In reaching this conclusion I have had regard to other appeal decisions and the location of other approved housing, including amongst others, immediately adjacent to No 37 Low Road (No 37). However, none share the same spatial characteristics as the appeal site with the built form of Grantham or considered the same issues as before me. I have, in any case, reached my own conclusions on the appeal proposal based on the evidence before me.
7. The proposal would provide some balance with the development adjacent to No 37. However, Holly Cottage's larger garden in contrast with the remaining garden at No 37, does not detract from the pair's character or appearance. I cannot therefore accept that this would be a benefit considering the harm I have identified from the erosion of the garden.
8. The appeal site is in a sustainable location, supported by the locational policies of the South Kesteven District Council Local Plan (Local Plan) and would make an effective use of the land. The Government's policy objective of significantly boosting the supply of housing would be assisted by the proposal, but by only 1 house. Having regard to the limited social and economic benefits associated with 1 dwelling, this attracts limited weight.
9. Heritage assets are irreplaceable and great weight should be given to their conservation. Therefore, as set out in paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), there are no public benefits that outweigh the less than substantial harm to the CA and listed building that would occur in this case.
10. The proposal would thus, conflict with the requirements of Policy EN6 of the Local Plan which seeks to protect and enhance heritage assets and their settings in keeping with the policies in the Framework. The proposal would also conflict with the requirements of section 16 of the Framework in respect of the historic environment.

### **Conclusion**

11. I have taken account of all the other matters raised, including the benefits of the proposal. However, none changes the balance of these findings and the harm I have identified to the CA and the setting of Holly Cottage.
12. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

*Robert Walker*

INSPECTOR