



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2023

by K Allen MEng (Hons) MArch PGCert ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/W/22/3313375

Land at Ivydene, Main Street, Weston NG23 6ST

- 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 Gaskin against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00925/FUL, dated 11 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a 5 bed dwelling and garage block.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Appellant has confirmed that the company name 'Architecture' was included on the original application form in error and that the application was made as an individual. As such the company name has been omitted from the banner above.
3. The parties agree that the garage shown on the appeal drawings is acceptable.

Main Issue

4. Given the above, the main issue is the effect of the proposed dwelling on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to Chestnut Grange as a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located within the historic medieval core of the village, on land previously associated with the Rectory, now known as Chestnut Grange, and comprises disused scrubland with two dilapidated outbuildings. The ground levels are raised in comparison to the highway and are retained behind a brick wall. The area is predominantly residential, with properties of varying age, architectural style, massing, and density; however, they are broadly consistent in scale with only one or two storeys. The prevalence of vernacular cottages contributes significantly to the rural character. Chestnut Grange is an exception, located in a prominent, elevated position with a 3-storey height, dominating the surrounding smaller, subservient clusters of buildings.
6. Whilst the proposal would have a width comparable to Sunnyside Farmhouse, it would fill a significant proportion of the width of the plot. Although it would be set back significantly from the highway, the proposal would appear considerably taller than the surrounding vernacular cottages and low-level

development, due to its taller eaves and ridge heights and elevated position within the street scene. Consequently, the proposal would be at odds with the prevalent scale of development and rural character of the area and would dominate the surrounding vernacular cottages.

7. The appellant contends that while the proposal would be larger than the surrounding cottages, it would be comparable in size to Chestnut Grange and therefore in keeping with the character and appearance of the area. However, the Council considers that Chestnut Grange is a non-designated heritage asset, and that the similarity in size would be detrimental to its significance.
8. Whilst the appellant disputes that Chestnut Grange is a non-designated heritage asset, their own heritage impact statement indicates that the proposal would result in moderate to minor adverse impacts to the setting of undesignated historic buildings, including Chestnut Grange. Despite the nearby modern housing development and the extensive renovations, the square plan of the building is still clearly legible, further the development of the building over time can be read and provides interest and insight into the building's history.
9. Having regard to the evidence before me, and having viewed the site and surrounding area, I can agree with the Council with regard to the special architectural character of Chestnut Grange, how it has been developed over time, its dominance over its surroundings, and its historic relationship to the church. Furthermore, I have no reason to disagree with how the building has historically contributed to village life. Accordingly, I am satisfied that Chestnut Grange is of sufficient historic interest to be considered a non-designated heritage asset.
10. Whilst the appeal site is no longer within the curtilage of Chestnut Grange, it forms part of its' setting and continues to make a significant contribution to how the non-designated heritage asset is experienced. The existing low-level development and openness of the appeal site, allows Chestnut Grange to maintain dominance over its surroundings. Notwithstanding, the existing permission in principle¹, the proposal would introduce a substantial built form, comparable in size, in close proximity to Chestnut Grange, therefore competing for dominance and detracting from the non-designated heritage asset's significance.
11. The appeal site also forms part of the setting of the adjacent Grade II listed stable and pigeoncote associated with Sunnyside Farmhouse. In accordance with the statutory duty imposed by section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have had special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of the listed building in the determination of this appeal. The early 19th Century stable and pigeoncote derive significance from their architectural character and detailing as well as their historic use and rural setting. Given the intervening distances and lack of intervisibility, there would be no harm to the setting of the listed building.
12. Notwithstanding this, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would detrimentally affect the significance of the non-designated heritage asset, Chestnut Grange. It would be contrary to

¹ Council Application Reference 19/01924/PIP

Core Policies 9 and 14 of the Newark & Sherwood District Council Plan Review: Review of the Newark & Sherwood Local Development Framework Core Strategy & Allocations Amended Core Strategy (March 2019) (NSCS) and Policies DM5 and DM9 of the Newark & Sherwood Local Development Framework Allocations & Development Management Development Plan Document (July 2013) which collectively require development to conserve and enhance heritage assets while contributing to the rich local distinctiveness, through appropriate siting and design.

13. Similarly, the proposal would conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) chapters 12 and 16 which seek to ensure development is sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, and conserves and enhances the historic environment.

Other Matters

14. The parties agree that a district wide Housing Needs Survey has identified that the predominant need within the area is for houses with 4 or more bedrooms. Whilst the Framework seeks to boost the supply of housing and the proposal would contribute towards the identified need, the social and economic benefits of the proposal would be limited and would not outweigh the harm identified to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations, including the Framework that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

K Allen

INSPECTOR