
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2022

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A3010/D/21/3289761

120 High Road, Carlton In Lindrick, Worksop, Nottinghamshire S81 9DT

- 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 Maria Skehan against the decision of Bassetlaw District Council.
 - The application Ref: 21/01265/HSE, dated 29 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is render to the front elevation of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for render to the front elevation of the property at 120 High Road, Carlton In Lindrick, Worksop, Nottinghamshire S81 9DT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 21/01265/HSE, dated 29 July 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 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: Site Location Plan Scale 1:1250, Front Elevation of property showing extent of proposed render area Scale 1:100.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in a scraped and beige or light beige colour finish in accordance with the monocouche render product information document titled weberpral M.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the banner heading above and in my decision paragraph is based on that which is set out on the Council's decision notice. The planning application form did not contain a description. The Council's description also more accurately reflects the act of development than the version that is on the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Carlton In Lindrick Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises a relatively modern detached red brick 2 storey house that also has a 2 storey gable on its front elevation that is finished in artificial stone. The frontage of the property contains a substantial stone wall that is considerably more traditional in its appearance. The property lies in a row of properties of similar design. This includes the use of artificial stone, albeit there are some minor differences in the colour used. The traditional stone wall extends in front of all of these properties and is an attractive feature.
5. The site lies in the Carlton in Lindrick Conservation Area. Many of its older buildings are constructed of local limestone, as is noted by the associated Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Plan (2011) (CAAMP). The use of this material extends to the wall that runs along the frontages of these properties. This feature is of historic interest and it appreciably contributes to the significance of the conservation area.
6. The same cannot however be said of the appeal property itself. Whilst it has incorporated artificial stone as a faux to the use of traditional materials, this clearly has a different appearance from limestone, both in terms of its colour and finish. This is most evident from when the site is view from the streetscene where the contrast between the artificial stone on the front gable and the traditional limestone wall is apparent.
7. The proposed render on the front gable would be in a scraped finish. This would give some texture and it would not be an unacceptable way to present the render as it would avoid a smooth finish that would not be in keeping with the rougher finish of stone or brickwork. The colour would be beige or light beige. It would not be a colour that would appear overtly different in these surroundings with the stonework. The existing artificial stone on the appeal property is itself of a yellow appearance, whilst on some of the other properties in this row it is more beige-like.
8. The variation in the appearance of the appeal property from the rest of this row would thus be of a minor nature. The proposed render would not make it unduly prominent and no more visible than it already is. It is also not evident why these properties should maintain the same appearance as regards the conservation area. They already differ considerably from the historic buildings, including with their use of artificial stone.
9. With regard to the historically rendered properties, the Bluebell Inn lies beyond this row of houses to the south. It is identified as a positive building by the CAAMP. It has a predominantly white washed finish and this distinguishes it from its surroundings. It would be separated from the proposal by a number of other properties and would only be seen with it in distant views. The proposal would not detract from this property's contribution to the significance.
10. Closer to the appeal property is 124 High Road, which the CAAMP also identifies as a positive building. It is an imposing stone property that lies in spacious grounds. It is set back and faces southwards towards the side of the neighbour to the appeal property. This results in fairly limited intervisibility, and the proposal would also not detract from its significance.

11. The stone wall to the front would still be viewed as a clearly different structure, as it is at present. Longer range views of the wall and the proposal would be at an angle and from the north, trees in the front of the neighbouring property would limit visibility in this direction. With regard to further historic buildings on Greenway, these are on a different road to the rear of the site and are appreciated in that context in relation to the conservation area, rather than with the appeal property.
12. I conclude that the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. As such, it would accord with the statutory duty that is set out under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) and the similar intentions of both Policy DM8 of the Council's Local Development Framework Core Strategy & Development Management Policies DPD (2011) and the CAAMP.
13. The proposal would also accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) where it concerns conserving and enhancing the historic environment, including the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and when considering potential impacts on a designated asset.

Other Matters

14. The Council's reason for refusal also refers to Section 66(1) of the Act. However, there are no specific details of the alleged harm as regards listed buildings. The consultation response to the planning application from the Council's Conservation Officer refers to 2 such buildings on Greenway. They are grade II listed. I am not persuaded that the appeal property falls within their setting, given their separation and as there is intervening land. Even if it did, they clearly derive their significance from their relationship to Greenway which they face onto and front, and so it would preserve the setting of these listed buildings.
15. As I have not found harm to designated heritage assets, I do not have cause to carry out a balancing exercise with public benefits for the purposes of the Framework.

Conditions

16. In addition to the timescale for implementation, I have imposed a condition concerning the approved plans for the purposes of certainty. I have also imposed a condition confirming details of the proposed render product, as set out in the submitted document which provides these details. This is for the reason of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all matters that have been raised, the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions.

Darren Hendley

INSPECTOR