



## Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 26 January 2021

**by Steven Lee BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 11 February 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/20/3262437**

**Summer Well, Kirton Road, Egmanton, Newark NG22 0HF**

- 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 Mrs F Wagstaff against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
  - The application Ref 20/01357/HOUSE, dated 21 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2020.
  - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and new vehicular access to provide off street parking.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and new vehicular access to provide off street parking at Summer Well, Kirton Road, Egmanton, Newark NG22 0HF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01357/HOUSE, dated 24 July 2020, subject to the conditions below.
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1346/2A, 1346/3, 1346/1.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
  - 4) No development shall take place until a written scheme of archaeological investigation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This scheme shall include the following:
    1. An assessment of significance and proposed mitigation strategy (i.e. preservation by record, preservation in situ or a mix of these elements).
    2. A methodology and timetable of site investigation and recording.
    3. Provision for site analysis.
    4. Provision for publication and dissemination of analysis and records.
    5. Provision for archive deposition.
    6. Nomination of a competent person/organisation to undertake the work.The scheme of archaeological investigation must only be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

- 5) The archaeological site work must be undertaken only in full accordance with the approved written scheme referred to in condition 4. The applicant shall notify the local planning authority of the intention to commence at least fourteen days before the start of archaeological work in order to facilitate adequate monitoring arrangements. No variation shall take place without prior consent of the local planning authority.
- 6) A report of the archaeologist's findings shall be submitted to the local planning authority and the Historic Environment Record Officer at Nottinghamshire County Council within 3 months of the works hereby approved being commenced unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

### **Main Issue**

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Egmanton Conservation Area (ECA) and the settings of the Grade I Listed St Mary's Church and Gaddick Hill Scheduled Monument (GHSM).

### **Reasons**

3. The appeal relates to a small unoccupied bungalow located within the ECA. It also sits within the setting of the GHSM. Although not referred to on the Council's decision notice, the Grade I Listed St Mary's Church tower is visible from the environs of the site. I have therefore considered the appeal based on the site also being within this listed building's setting.
4. I have had regard to the statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the ECA and the setting of the listed building. In line with paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) I have also given great weight to the conservation of designated heritage assets in the vicinity of the site.
5. The significance of the ECA lies in the age and historic importance of the two landmark features of the Gaddick Hill motte and bailey castle, St Mary's Church and the collection of historic farmsteads, which emphasise the importance of agriculture to the history of the village and provide good examples of the local vernacular. The open and informal layout of the built form coupled with the stream and open spaces also add to the character of the village. There are however examples of more modern housing interspersed with the historic form of the village. This includes the host property.
6. There is little doubt that the extension would not be a subordinate feature. However, the bungalow is of a relatively modern appearance that differs significantly from the traditional vernacular that typifies many buildings within the conservation area. It is of no particular architectural merit or historic importance and makes a neutral contribution to the significance of the ECA and the setting of other heritage assets. The existing form of the bungalow is not of such importance that it must be preserved for its own sake. The design of the extended building would differ to the neighbouring dwellings and those in the village which conform to the local vernacular. However, as this is already the case, the overall context of the site would not change.
7. The extension would make the dwelling a more prominent structure in the street scene than at present. While mainly to the rear, the additional height

and bulk would still be visible when approaching in either direction along Kirton Road. However, it would not be any taller than the neighbouring two-storey dwellings and would not extend closer to the road. The extended dwelling would not appear unduly large or intrusive in this context, either in terms of the immediate street scene, the ECA or the settings of the GHSM and Church. Neither the increase in height or footprint would materially affect how the Scheduled Monument or Church are appreciated from Kirton Road.

8. The extension would have a minimal impact on the articulated appearance of the bungalow when viewed front-on. However, this would give way to a taller and simpler dual pitched roof structure to the rear. Unlike the front elevation, this would terminate in a large glazed gable. Gables themselves are not unusual features in the village, albeit the extensive area of glazing would be a departure from more traditional forms. This would not be an unattractive or unsympathetic feature in its own context. Moreover, it would be discretely positioned to the rear of the dwelling where it would not be prominent in the street scene. As such, I see no harm resulting from this aspect of the design.
9. The simple dual pitched roof would also complement local character. While the relationship with the roof of the bungalow would be somewhat idiosyncratic, it would not in my view constitute a poor form of design, nor would it detract from the character of existing nearby dwellings. The introduction of a new vehicular access would also be in-keeping with other dwellings in the street.
10. The rear garden is relatively large and would remain a generous space after the extension were built. The extended dwelling would therefore sit comfortably in its plot. The increase in footprint would not extend beyond the rear building line of one neighbour and only marginally past the other. In this regard, the development would still be contained within its curtilage and the broad built envelope of the village. There is also nothing to suggest that the garden of this property is of particular importance to the significance or setting of any heritage asset. While it borders the Scheduled Monument it is, and would remain, a residential garden. A small loss of space well away from the boundary would have no impact on the setting of the heritage assets or the relationship between them and the site. The development would therefore have no impact on the historic plan-form of the village.
11. The design and increase in scale would not lead to any material harm to the street scene, nor would it alter the character of this part of the village. Importantly, it would cause no harm to the features of the village which give the ECA its significance, including the landmark heritage assets, the form and layout of the farmsteads or the qualities of the vernacular buildings. Neither would it have any effect on the informal layout of the village or important open spaces. The development would detract from the quality of the built environment, nor diminish its historic importance. In this context, the increase in scale over and above the existing building is not a decisive factor.
12. I therefore find the development to be an acceptable form of design that would have a neutral impact on the character, appearance and significance of the ECA and the settings of the GHSM and Church. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy (2019) policies CP9 and CP14 or Newark and Sherwood Allocations and Development Management Policies (2013) policies DM5, DM6 or DM9. These seek, amongst other things, to ensure development respects the character of an area and preserves the

character and appearance of designated heritage assets and their settings. There would also be no conflict with the Framework, particularly paragraph 127 which includes provision for development to be sympathetic to local character and history, or paragraph 193, the objectives of which are set out above.

### **Other Matters**

13. The Council raised no objections in relation to the impact of development on the living conditions of neighbours. I saw nothing that would lead me to a different conclusion. The concerns raised in relation to the information submitted by the appellant do not alter the effect of the development and thus do not alter my decision. Revised plans were also submitted to the Council to correct errors. I have referred to these in the conditions above.

### **Conditions**

14. I have considered the suggested conditions from the Council in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty.
15. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition requiring the materials to match the existing dwelling. There is the potential for archaeological finds on the site and thus I have imposed the Council's suggested conditions requiring the approval of a written scheme of investigation and stipulating the timing of notification and reporting. By necessity, agreement of the scheme is a pre-commencement condition to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details. The appellant has confirmed their acceptance of this condition.
16. I have not imposed the condition suggested by a neighbour requiring the access to be completed prior to the extension being implemented. I do not consider this condition is necessary. There is sufficient space to the front and rear of the building to facilitate construction without the access being fully completed in accordance with the approved plans. I am satisfied there would be no harm to the living conditions of neighbours or highway safety risks.

### **Conclusion**

17. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*S J Lee*

INSPECTOR