



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2021

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/20/3259084

75 Gainsborough Road, Winthorpe, Newark NG24 2NR

- 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 Ms Dominique Dudley against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00870/FUL, dated 27 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is a householder application for loft conversion, raising a lower part of the roof to match existing higher roof, replacement of porch to match existing house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description above is taken from the Council's Decision Notice which describes the development more accurately than the Application Form. It was also used in the appeal form by the appellant. Therefore, I am satisfied that neither party has been prejudiced by the change.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the Winthorpe Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a detached property sat at a higher site level than the main highway, accessed by a number of steps. It appears from the evidence provided that the property was once the Gardeners Cottage to Winthorpe Hall.
5. The proposals seek to increase the ridge height of a lower section of the roof to enable a loft conversion. This would have an 'M' shaped roof pitch to match the small gable aesthetics. In addition, it is proposed to replace the exiting porch with a slightly larger version that would be in keeping with the existing property.
6. The Winthorpe Conservation Area has an unusually high number of high-status houses, including two country houses and a landscaped parkland, a distinctive Victorian church and several examples of vernacular architecture.

7. Whilst the proposals would not be easily visible within the street scene, I have to assess the proposals in terms of their effect on the Conservation Area, and not just what is visible from the public highway.
8. The cottage has a history as part of the Winthorpe Hall estate, and as such, makes a significant contribution to the Winthorpe Conservation Area and the Conservation Area Appraisal identifies it as a building of local interest.
9. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.
10. I find that the raising of the ridge to facilitate internal works would significantly alter the character of the dwelling. The dwelling is of simple proportions, more in keeping with the original purpose of the dwelling. It may not lend itself to the needs of a more modern way of life, but I find that is part of the charm of the building. I find the introduction of a ridge height increase, the amended roof profile and introduction of a dormer would, in my mind alter the design and traditional proportions of the cottage and cause harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, despite the fact that a large proportion of the works could not be seen from a public vantage point.
11. With regard to the porch, the replacement of the porch with a structure that is more in keeping with the cottage I find would be an acceptable alteration to the building as a whole, but this does not overcome the harm to the Conservation Area that I have previously identified.
12. Whilst I have identified harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area. In accordance with Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), less than substantial harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
13. Overall, I have been provided with limited information to show the public benefits would arise directly from the appeal proposal. The harm that I have found is not, therefore, outweighed by the public benefits that the scheme may bring.
14. Therefore, I find the proposal is in conflict with Core Policy 14 of the Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy (2019) and Policies DM5 and DM9 of the Allocations & Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) which, amongst other matters, expect development to preserve and enhance the special character of Conservation Areas and reflect this in their design and form.

Conclusion

15. Therefore, for the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR