



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2021

by Paul Martinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2003/W/21/3281225

6 Well Street, Messingham DN17 3RT

- 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 Gerrard Parkes against the decision of North Lincolnshire Council.
 - The application Ref PA/2021/727, dated 19 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is described in the application form as: 'Re-submission of PA/2021/96. Planning Permission to erect three dwellings'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council's reason for refusal refer to the existing building as an 'undesigned heritage asset'. For the avoidance of doubt, I have taken this to mean a non-designated heritage asset for the purposes of my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, including through the loss of a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises of what appears to be an early twentieth century villa set close to the road within a reasonably large plot extending to the sides and rear. The dwelling has a well-balanced front elevation and is of brick construction with arched brick detailing to window openings as well as a decorative arch and fanlight over the central front door. The dwelling is one of the taller and more prominent buildings in the street. Part of its gable and one of its distinctive chimneys is visible, set forward of that of its neighbour, when heading east towards the site along Well Street. Whilst the dwelling is clearly vacant and lies in a state of disrepair, its position, scale and detailed design makes a significant contribution to the streetscene here.
5. The Council considers the building to be a non-designated heritage asset. The appellant accepts this¹ and notes that the building has some architectural features typical of its time of construction, referencing some of those referred to above. Third party comments have provided me with historical photographs,

¹ Email from Keystone Architecture dated 15 June 2021 09:07.

whilst those comments refer to the building being one of the oldest in the village. This was consistent with my impressions on site.

6. Paragraph 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. Whilst the building is not listed nor does it appear on a local list, based on the evidence before me, and including the comments of the Council's historic environment officer, the building is certainly of sufficient historic interest to be considered a non-designated heritage asset.
7. Well Street in the vicinity of the appeal site comprises of a reasonably narrow stretch of road with footway to either side in a residential area. The prevailing character is comprised of a mix of housing styles and ages. Those fronting the street opposite the appeal site tend to be older detached or semi-detached properties and tend to front the road. The appeal site is bounded by a large two storey dwelling to the west which extends some distance back into its plot with a reasonably wide gable. A bungalow is located to the east. This is positioned at a higher level than the appeal site. Properties on this side of the road tend to be set back, at least slightly, behind front gardens, whilst most occupy the majority of the width of their plot.
8. It is proposed to demolish the appeal property and construct a new two storey terrace of three properties. Whilst this would replace a detached dwelling, the terraced arrangement would be similar to the adjoining properties opposite and would occupy much of the width of the plot as is characteristic of the area. Whilst there are rooms in the roof space, the proposal would appear as a two storey building and would be of a similar height to the existing dwelling. The gable width would reflect that of the adjacent dwelling.
9. The proposed building would be well proportioned and would incorporate features of the existing building into its façade, including the arched window detailing, fanlights and brickwork. Nevertheless, whilst the building would assimilate well into the mixed character of the streetscene, its design would inherently fail to embody the history or the traditional craftsmanship and detailing present in the existing building.
10. The proposal would result in the total loss of this building, a non-designated heritage asset that contributes significantly to the character and appearance of the streetscene. This would in itself result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.
11. The Council refers to an extant approval for a large extension to the existing dwelling at this site. I have not been provided with any plans of this, however the Committee Report describes this as a 'two-storey side extension, and two-storey and single-storey rear extensions' and sets out that the dwelling would be 'completely overhauled' except for the principal elevation. The Council's historic environment officer describes this as the preferred option to conserve the historic appearance and character of the site and streetscene. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the front elevation and most prominent elevation would be retained as part of this extant approval which demonstrates it is possible to redevelop the site without removing the building.
12. There would be benefits to the proposal in terms of the contribution of three dwellings to housing supply within an accessible location. Economic benefits

would also arise from the construction and occupation of the houses. The development that would replace the appeal property would reflect the character and appearance of the area and this is a moderating factor in the balance. However, this alongside the comparatively limited benefits, would not outweigh the significant harm to the character and appearance of the area arising from the total loss of the non-designated heritage asset.

13. The appellant has directed me to the provisions of The Framework with regard to effective and efficient use of land. However, for the reasons set out above I have found that the proposal would not represent an efficient or effective use of the land due to the harm arising to the prevailing character of the area.
14. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area through the unacceptable loss of a non-designated heritage asset. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy CS5 and Policy CS6 of the North Lincolnshire Core Strategy (the NCLS) which together seek high quality design that is appropriate for its location and is informed by its surrounding context and respects and enhances the local character and distinctiveness.
15. I have not found conflict with Policy CS7 of the NLCS which, in summary relates to matters of housing supply and density.

Other Matters

16. The appellant states that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply (5YHLS) of deliverable housing sites whilst the Council is silent on this matter. However the proposal would only make a small contribution to housing supply, (a net increase of two dwellings) and inherent in my reasoning is that, even if the Council could not demonstrate a 5YHLS, on the basis of the evidence before me, having regard to the likely adverse impacts, these would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given, having considered the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Martinson

INSPECTOR