



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2024

by A Hartley LLB (Hons) Solicitor MBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/24/3347978

Plum Tree Cottage, Sunnyside, Farnsfield, Nottinghamshire NG22 8EG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Kujdesi Martini against the decision of Newark and Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00343/HOUSE.
 - The development proposed is for a first floor extension and alterations to existing cottage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal is within the Farnsfield Conservation Area (FCA). Section 72 of the 1990 Act applies. Accordingly, I have had special regard to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the FCA.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been updated since the appeal representations were made. However, as the revisions do not affect the matters under consideration in this appeal, (other than paragraph references) it was not considered necessary to seek further comment.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character or appearance of the FCA.

Reasons

5. The FCA covers an area encompassing part of the village of Farnsfield. It was designated for its medieval origins and development in the 18th and 19th centuries, its significance being derived from its buildings. These are arranged in linear formation east to west, including detached houses, terraced cottages, public houses and agricultural buildings. They are constructed in orange-reddish brick, some rendered, with slate and pantile roofs. Many of the buildings in the Georgian period are characterised by symmetrical proportions, sash windows and neo-classical detailing.

6. Given the above I find that the significance of the FCA, in so far as it relates to this appeal, to be primarily associated with the architectural and historic interest of its buildings and this directly contributes to its special interest for the reasons given.
7. The appeal property is shown on late 19th century mapping in 1885 and reflects the local vernacular construction. It is visible from the public highway and from a public footpath to the rear and thus contributes positively to the significance of the character and appearance of the FCA through its architectural detail and historic construction.
8. The appeal proposal includes UPVC windows in existing openings and a first floor extension. These elements already have planning permission¹. The appeal proposal also includes external insulation and render that would protrude approximately 90mm from the building. The external insulation would stop at the string course detail on the gable end, leaving the coping detailing and chimney stack as painted brick. Although it would not cover the detailing, it would create an awkward junction due to the depth of projection from the building. The window surrounds would also become deeper, eroding the vernacular character and proportions of the building, elements that contribute positively to the character and appearance of the FCA.
9. My attention has been drawn to a planning permission² at 2 Sunnyside that permitted external render. The situation was materially different to the appeal proposal as in that case the property already had a thick render of modern appearance with no visible eaves detailing apparent. The proposal also included the replacement of the concrete pantiles with clay pantiles. I have therefore attached very limited weight to this in reaching my decision on this appeal.
10. Overall I find that the character and appearance of the FCA would not be preserved or enhanced and the proposal would fail to comply with policies CS9 and CS14 of the Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy (2019), policies DM5, DM6 and DM 9 of the Newark and Sherwood Local Development Framework Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document (2013), the Farnsfield Neighbourhood Development Plan (2017) and the Newark and Sherwood Householder Development SPD (2014), in so far as relevant.

Heritage Balance

11. I find that the identified harm to the character and appearance of the FCA would by virtue of its nature and extent amount to a level of harm that in terms of the Framework would be less than substantial, but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight.
12. In accord with paragraph 212 of the Framework, in considering the effect of the proposal on the character or appearance of the FCA, I have attached great weight to the conservation of the designated heritage asset.
13. As I find that the level of harm to the designated heritage asset would be less than substantial in terms of the Framework, in accordance with paragraph 215 of the Framework, I must weigh the identified harm against any public benefits of the proposal.

¹ 24/01199/HOUSE dated 10 September 2024

² 18/00665/FUL

14. The proposal to apply external insulation and render is intended to provide greater energy efficiency. According to paragraph 167 of the Framework greater energy efficiency is a public benefit of significant weight. Having regard to paragraph 215 of the Framework, I find that the level of public benefit in relation to energy efficiency in this case is limited and even when affording it significant weight it would not outweigh the identified harm to the FCA. My attention has also been drawn to the proposed paint colour, white/cream. Whilst this may be considered an improvement in appearance, painting the property could be achieved without planning permission. I have therefore given very limited weight to this potential public benefit and find that it does not outweigh the identified harm caused by the proposal to the FCA. I therefore conclude that the appeal proposal would cause unjustified harm to the FCA.

Other Matters

15. An interested party has raised concerns about the potential loss of light to the bathroom and landing at Cosy Cottage Sunnyside. From the information before me, due to the affected living spaces comprising secondary rooms, I am satisfied the proposal would not give rise to an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of Cosy Cottage by reason of loss of light.
16. An interested party has raised concerns about drainage. From the information before me, I am satisfied that as the relevant statutory consultees have no objection, the proposal would not give rise to an unacceptable effect on drainage systems.

Conclusion

17. For the above reasons, having regard to all representations made, I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and with the provisions of the Framework in relation to heritage assets. There are no material considerations that would justify a decision other than one in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Hartley

INSPECTOR