



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2022

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/W/21/3281340

Land adjoining 124 High Street, Collingham, Newark NG23 7NH

- 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 Dove against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02094/FUL, dated 16 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is new single detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Collingham Conservation Area (The CCA).

Reasons

3. The main dwelling is a detached two storey property in a predominately residential area located in a sizable plot set back from High Street, within the CCA. The appeal site is located on land adjacent to the property and is currently partly occupied by a dilapidated outbuilding. Two dwellings previously approved are currently under construction in the area between the appeal site and High Street. The access would be shared with these other new dwellings.
4. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
5. The CCA Appraisal (2006) states that High Street does not have a coherent character that dominates but it has a building line traditionally close to the street frontage. It also emphasises that backland development should be avoided. This pattern of development makes a positive contribution to the significance of the CA as a heritage asset.
6. The proposal would vary that layout and push a property beyond the building line generated by No124 that continues along High Street and would disrupt the pattern of development set out in the CCA, detracting from the CCA character and distinctiveness.

7. The two new dwellings are in keeping with the pattern of development, but this third dwelling in a line going backwards from High Street is, I find, disruptive to the overall pattern of development.
8. Overall, I find that the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the CCA, but the harm would be less than substantial, as defined by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). That level of harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, as stated in Paragraph 202 of the Framework.
9. The removal of the outbuilding would be a benefit from a visual amenity point of view, there would be the modest benefit of an additional housing unit to contribute to supply and the occupier would doubtless contribute to local services, but I find these limited benefits would not outweigh the harm to the CCA that has been identified.
10. For the above reasons the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Collingham Conservation Area and would be contrary to Core Policies 9 and 14 of the Adopted Core Strategy (2019) and Policies DM5 and DM9 of the Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document, which, amongst other matters, expect development to be appropriate for its context, and protect and enhance historic assets. In addition, the development would not meet the conservation aspects of the Framework.

Conclusion

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

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR