



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2021

by S Dean MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/21/3275653

Chapel House, Church Lane, Eakring, Newark, NG22 0DH

- 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 Joanna Semmelroth against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00208/HOUSE, dated 2 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is the "completion of insulation and rendering to the external walls of the house with the Green Home Grant. The front of the house and sides will be done and not the back of the house. The render will be the same colour as the existing walls. The house has no cavity walls due to its age."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In July 2021 the Government published its revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), representing its up-to-date planning policies and how they should be applied. As the fundamentals of the Framework in respect of the historic environment remain unchanged, I have not found it necessary to further seek the views of parties to this appeal and am satisfied that no prejudice has arisen as a result.
3. Following the submission of this appeal, the appellant states that they have insulated the property internally and now only wish the external rendering of the property to be considered in this appeal. The Procedural Guide to Planning Appeals – England states that the appeal process should not be used to evolve proposals and is clear that revisions intended to overcome reasons for refusal should normally be tested through a fresh application. I have limited details of the likely finish and appearance of the proposal omitting the insulation, and the Council has not had the opportunity to consider this updated proposal. In the interests of fairness, I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of that which was before the Council when it made its decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The site lies within the Eakring Conservation Area (CA), the significance of which lies in its medieval origins, layout, historic associations and historic buildings. Many of the buildings, new and old, are brick-built and of those,

almost all have finely detailed brickwork decoration and details. Although the appeal site post-dates much of the early history of the village, as an attractively detailed brick-built dwelling in a prominent location, made more so by its relatively unusual painted finish, it does nevertheless make a positive contribution to the significance of the CA as a heritage asset.

6. The likely loss of articulation of the details on the building, including the brickwork details around the roofline and the increased depth of the window and door reveals would cause a loss of visual interest to the building. In the face of a lack of specific detail around how the proposal would change the appearance of the building, and the likely overall reduction in the character of the building, I consider that the proposal would cause a less than substantial degree of harm to the significance of the CA as a heritage asset.
7. I agree that energy efficiency would be a public benefit as well as a private one, given the government approach in the Framework. However, given the prominence of the building and the likely loss of detailing, articulation and lack of information around the final appearance of the property with regard to window and door reveals, the gable end detailing and roofline, I find that the harm to the significance of the CA as a heritage asset would not be outweighed by those public benefits. In light of the great weight to be given to the heritage asset's conservation I also therefore conclude that the proposal fails to preserve the character or appearance of the CA.
8. The proposal would therefore harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Core Policies 9 and 14 of the Newark and Sherwood Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Allocations Amended Core Strategy (March 2019), and Policies DM5, DM6 and DM9 of the Newark and Sherwood Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document (2013). Combined with the Framework, these policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development is of appropriate design for the character and appearance of the area and protects and enhances the historic environment.

Other Matters

9. Whilst I note the personal circumstances of the appellant, it has not been demonstrated that this proposal is the only way to achieve the improvements sought, nor has sufficient detail been provided to allow me to reach any other conclusion than the one set out above with regard to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations which indicate that a decision be taken other than in accordance with it. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

S Dean

INSPECTOR