



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 19 October 2021

by L Fleming BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2620/W/21/3272192

Church Cottage, The Street, Little Barningham NR11 7AG

- 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 N Wedgwood against the decision of North Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref PF/20/0855, dated 1 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings and replacement two storey dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021, the parties have had the opportunity to comment on its implications and I have taken account of the revised Framework in my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area bearing in mind it would be within the Mannington and Wolterton Conservation Area and within the setting of the grade II* Listed Church of St Andrew.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a dwelling and range of outbuildings within the Mannington and Wolterton Conservation Area (CA). It is next to the grade II* listed Church of St Andrew.
5. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires special regard to be given to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting and any features of architectural or historic interest it possesses. The same act also requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. Furthermore, paragraph 199 of the Framework states that when considering the impact of new development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Significance

1. The CA covers a large rural area centred around the Walpole estate, including both Mannington and Wolterton halls and gardens, the surrounding countryside and associated small villages and hamlets. Traditional architecture and local materials such as flint are prevalent with church towers noticeable features in a relatively open rural landscape.
2. The grade II*listed Church of St Andrew is of medieval origin with C19 restoration. Positioned on a mound on the edge of the built up part of the village, its tower is visible from some distance. Its tower is in three stages with an embattled parapet, gargoyle and bell openings. The church is mainly flint construction with a plain tiled roof and has a variety of decorative architectural details including plinths and buttresses.
3. Insofar as is relevant to this case, the significance of the CA derives from the influence and evolution of the Walpole estate, its spacious rural quality and the traditional architectural detailing of the buildings within it. Insofar as is relevant the significance of the grade II* listed Church of St Andrew derives from its ecclesiastical use, its elevated positioning and prominence in relation to the settlement and surrounding landscape and its fine architectural detailing.

Effect on the Mannington and Wolterton Conservation Area and grade II listed Church of St Andrew*

6. The proposed dwelling would be in roughly the same location as the existing dwelling to be replaced. It would be long and thin, part single and part two storey with an asymmetrical butterfly roof. Finished in mid-grey standing seam metal, the larger half of the roof would be lengthy and rise up from a valley towards the eastern boundary of the site.
7. I acknowledge the boundary thick vegetation would be retained and improved. However, the proposed roof would be partly visible above and through gaps in the boundary vegetation approaching the appeal site from The Street and through the access drive. I also acknowledge the attempt to point towards the church. However, the church is in a widely visible imposing position on the top of a hill, it does not need to be highlighted. I also note that the historical maps show a number of large rectangular buildings. However, none of those would have had a similar form to that proposed.
8. The proposed roof would have a modern utilitarian finish. From glimpsed views it would noticeably slope up towards the grade II* listed church. Through its sharp angular, elongated and expansive metal sheet finish, the proposed roof would appear as an alien feature within the CA and within the setting of the grade II* listed church. It would be in conflict with the traditional architectural detailing of the grade II* listed building and other traditional buildings nearby. This conflict would draw attention away from the grade II* listed church when approaching from The Street, harming the setting and significance of the listed building. Furthermore, it would harm the character and appearance of the area, failing to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA, harming its significance as a whole.
9. In reaching these conclusions I acknowledge planning permission was granted in 2015 for the demolition of the existing dwelling and outbuildings and

erection of two storey dwelling and garage¹ (the 2015 scheme). However, there are no details which allow me to assess whether or not that permission has lapsed or commenced. Consequently, I am unable to definitively conclude whether there is a greater than theoretical probability of that scheme being implemented.

10. However, even if the 2015 scheme was a valid fallback scheme, that scheme would comprise two simple mono pitched blocks linked by a single storey element arranged around a courtyard. Whereas the appeal proposal before me would amount to a very different, long, rectangular, butterfly-roofed block of development. Even though the proposal before me, would have an overall lesser footprint and bulk, the highest point of the proposed mid-grey standing seam metal roof would be towards the boundary with the church. This would be much closer to this boundary than the taller of the proposed blocks detailed in the 2015 scheme and taller than the smaller block. Thus, even if the 2015 scheme was a valid fallback scheme, I do not find that scheme more harmful than the proposal before me. Thus, the 2015 scheme does not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Planning and Heritage Balance

11. The combined harm I have identified to the significance of the designated heritage assets would be less than substantial. In which case paragraph 202 of the Framework requires it to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposals, including where appropriate, securing optimum viable use.
12. The proposals would provide a new modern dwelling, replacing the existing dwelling which is in poor condition. There would be economic benefits of construction and environmental benefits associated with redeveloping previously developed land. The existing buildings on the appeal site are of poor appearance and would be removed. I also note the comment that the 2015 scheme would have harmed trees and shrubs, whereas the appeal scheme would not. However, even if I were to accept all these as public benefits, they are relatively modest and are insufficient to outweigh the great weight I must attach to the harm I have identified to the designated heritage assets.
13. For the same reasons both appeal proposals would also conflict with the development plan, particularly Policies EN4 and EN8 of the North Norfolk Local Development Framework Core Strategy Incorporating Development Control Policies (2008) which amongst other matters seek to ensure that new development is designed to a high quality and the historic environment is protected and enhanced.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Fleming

INSPECTOR

¹ Council Reference PF/15/1035