



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2023

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02.02.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/23/3331638

Tamworth House, Palmer Road, Sutton on Trent, NG23 6PP

- 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 Mark Moody against the decision of Newark and Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00996/HOUSE, dated 12 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 7 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. These are, the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and on the character and appearance of the Sutton on Trent Conservation Area; and whether the proposal would be adequately protected from flooding.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a relatively large detached dwelling, which is situated within the built-up area of Sutton on Trent and within the CA. The property appears as two distinct parts, comprising a modern two storey section, which is attached to a converted single storey former barn. A single storey lean-to element projects forward of the front elevation on the two storey part of the dwelling. The site is hidden largely from view and the dwelling is barely visible from public viewpoints.
4. The CA encompasses a wide area and, as a result, it's character and appearance is varied in terms of built form, the age of buildings, architectural detail and open spaces. In the vicinity of the appeal property, the house types also vary and there is no distinctive character to the area at this point. However, I consider that the former barn does have some heritage significance due to its age and its previous agricultural use.
5. The proposal is to construct a single storey rear extension that would project out from the rear wall of the two storey part of the dwelling. It would have a hipped roof with a central lantern rooflight. In that respect, the design of the extension would contrast with the gabled roof and somewhat simple form of

the existing building. It would also depart from the linear form of the rear of the dwelling, which is part of its distinctive character.

6. Core Policy 9 of the Council's adopted Amended Core Strategy 2019 (CS) seeks (amongst other things) to ensure that the design of new development is of a high standard that complements the existing built environment. This is also reflected in Policies DM5 and DM6 of adopted Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document 2013 (DMDPD). Furthermore, Core Policy 14 of the CS seeks to preserve and enhance heritage assets within the District. I consider that these policies and guidance are consistent with the provisions of paragraph 135 and Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (The Framework).
7. In reaching my decision, I have given weight to the separation distance between the proposed extension and the former barn. I have also noted that the appellant points to the barn having previously been a different shape. However, the existing property, when considered as a whole has a relatively plain and simple character, which is largely due to its linear form at the rear.
8. The proposed extension would contrast sharply with this linear form and its design would appear distinctly at odds with the existing property. Accordingly, I conclude on this issue that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling and that it would also fail to preserve or enhance the CA. It would, therefore, conflict with the provisions of the Development Plan and associated guidance, as referred to above.
9. In my opinion the harm to the CA would be less than substantial and, therefore, I am required to consider whether the harm would be outweighed by any public benefits. Whilst the proposal would enhance living conditions for the appellant and other occupants, this would be a private rather than a public benefit and, therefore, it would not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Flood Risk

10. The Council points to the site being within Flood Zone 2 and to the absence of a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) to support the proposal. The appellant's appeal submission contains some detail on flood resilience measures covering floor level, electrical installations, drainage and other construction detail. It is also pointed out that the appellant is signed up to the Environment Agency's early warning system.
11. Whilst the proposals put forward by the appellant cannot be described as a full FRA, given the relatively minor nature of the development, I consider that the consequences of flooding because of the proposed extension, would be relatively small and that the matter could be dealt with by a condition had the proposal been acceptable in all other ways.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above in respect of character and appearance, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR