



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2023

by D Cleary MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/22/3311437

Clifton Barn, Vicarage Road, South Clifton, Nottinghamshire NG23 7AQ

- 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 John Ford against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref: 22/01693/HOUSE, dated 29 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as the Erection of 'Garden' structures for the further enjoyment of the dwelling and re-siting of the Oil Tank.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the South Clifton Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within the South Clifton Conservation Area (SCCA) where there is a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area, and great weight should be given to the heritage assets conservation. I have no Conservation Area Appraisal to assist in my consideration of the significance of the heritage asset, however the Council's heritage advice identifies South Clifton as being *"a small rural village close to the River Trent. The High Street forms the southern end of the CA and is characterised by a tightknit arrangement of buildings within former croft plots running perpendicular to the road. The predominate building materials is red brick and pantile roof"*. Following observations on my site visit, I agree with this assessment of significance, but also found the tranquillity of the rural village being a matter which also adds to the significance of the asset.
4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling of recent construction and designed as a faux agricultural threshing barn. The dwelling has been well designed in this respect, and along with other recent development adjoining the site, has successfully integrated into the SCCA. On my site visit, I observed that there are clear views of the appeal site and adjoining properties across fields to the south, through gaps in the hedgerow and over a field gate along Coal Yard Lane. The rear façade of the appeal dwelling, along with adjoining

properties, creates a strong visual built edge to the SCCA and contributes positively to its overall character and appearance.

5. The proposals relate to the construction of numerous outbuildings and structures within the curtilage of the property. Planning permission has been granted for the majority these outbuildings¹ with the exception of pergola 1. The Council have raised no issue with the other structures in isolation or cumulatively and I have no reason to disagree.
6. The Council's main concern is with regard to pergola 1, which would be a matt grey aluminium framed structure, sited immediately adjacent to the rear elevation of the dwelling. I consider that the structure by reason of its siting and proposed materials would jarringly contrast with the original agricultural design approach of the dwelling and the simplistic appearance and materials of the rear elevation. While this pergola would be largely open it would nonetheless be a feature which would visually be at odds with the agricultural design of the rear elevation and in views from Coal Yard Lane the eye would be unacceptably drawn to its incongruity. For these reasons, I do not consider that the proposed pergola 1 would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the SCCA.
7. The other already approved structures would result in some domestication of the site and pergola 1 would add to the intensification of domestic structures. While the design and materials of pergola 2 have been accepted, I consider that this, and the other approved structures would be more discretely or appropriately sited within the curtilage, and away from the rear elevation of the dwelling. Individually or cumulatively, they are not therefore directly comparable and do not justify the harm that I have identified with regard to Pergola 1.
8. For the above reasons, I consider that the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the SCCA and would result in less than substantial harm to the heritage asset. Therefore, the proposals would be contrary to Policies CP9 and CP14 of the Amended Core Strategy, and also DM5, DM6, and DM9 of the Local Development Framework Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document which require development to be of good design, and that regard must be had to local context, including the distinctive character of Conservation Areas.

Other Matters

9. I have had regard to the comments raised by the appellant concerning pergola 1 providing much needed shading within the garden and also within the dwelling. Shading within the south facing garden could be provided through the implementation of the approved pergola 2, while I am not persuaded that pergola 1 is the only means to provide shading and light to the internal room. Furthermore, I also note the letter of support for the proposals from the Parish Council. However, these are matters to which I only attach limited weight. Thus, none of these other considerations, on their own or in combination amount to public benefits, in national planning policy terms, which would outweigh the less than substantial harm to the SCCA that I have identified.

¹ 22/00828/HOUSE

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, the development conflicts with the Development Plan when read as a whole, and there are no material considerations, including The National Planning Policy Framework which indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR