



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2025

by N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/24/3355261

15 Station Road, Sutton-On-Trent, Nottinghamshire NG23 6QF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Goodwin against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01107/HOUSE.
 - The development proposed is single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant has submitted revised plans as part of this appeal which removes the rooflights within the lean-to roof slope of the extension. Given that these elements are minor then I do not find my acceptance of the revised plans to be prejudicial to any party. I have therefore taken this into account in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, including whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Sutton on Trent Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a semi-detached property which is constructed in red brick, white render, with a pitched slate roof. The dwelling is set back from Station Road which is located to the north giving the dwelling a deep front garden. The access and driveway from Station Road is located at the front of the front garden.
5. The proposed development seeks planning permission for a single storey front extension which would incorporate the existing porch and remove the bay window, reusing the central window of the bay in the east facing side elevation of the extension. It would have a lean-to roof, and the front elevation would have a window and two glazed doors. The materials for the extension would be brick with a slate tile roof.
6. The site lies within the CA. As such, I have a duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance

of the CA. I have also had regard to paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

7. The CA was designated for its retention of predominantly 18th and 19th century buildings constructed in red brick walling, some rendered, with pitched pantile or slate roofs. The buildings are typically 2-storeys, detached and either set back or arranged perpendicular to the main roads. The overriding impression of the CA is the vernacular construction of buildings with modest polite architectural influence in the design and detailing.
8. The appeal property and its adjoining neighbour at No 17 are set back from the road and have a simple linear form with projecting bay windows at ground floor level. Whilst set back, the properties are still in a visually prominent location in the CA and highly visible to the direct north along Station Road. The presence of other prominent buildings located closer to Station Road such as those either side of the appeal property and No 17 along with trees/shrubs does not alter this as the appeal property is still clearly visible within the street scene particularly to the direct north. The buildings are indicative of the vernacular construction and polite architectural influence of the 19th century and thus make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.
9. The proposed extension would extend forward 2.85 metres and would be 6.3 metres wide which creates a significantly sized front extension compared to the existing porch which is considerably smaller. The removal of the bay window would result in the loss of a positive architectural feature in the CA which is a common feature along some of the 19th century properties along Station Road. The scale of the proposed extension would subsume the modest character of the building detracting from its historic linear plan form and would appear at odds with the adjoining neighbouring property. It would be a very prominent addition and whilst I appreciate that the roof lights have been removed from the scheme, the addition of glazed doors despite allowing daylight to enter are still considered an unsympathetic addition to the principal elevation of the property which would exacerbate its visual prominence.
10. As set out, the host property does benefit from a porch to the front, but this is a much smaller scale addition than a full width extension. Even though the extension would project the same distance and be of similar materials with a relatively low height, its width would be significantly greater extending almost the entire frontage of the dwelling. It would be a more dominating addition and despite the use of red brick being used locally, when combined with the overall scale, the use of red bricks would create a striking contrast which would create a visually distracting feature. The appellant has suggested conditioning materials but given the location in the CA, I find it appropriate to ensure such details are not left to condition and in any event, this would not outweigh the other harm I have identified when considering the design of the scheme as a whole.
11. I have had due regard to the footprint of the proposed extension in comparison to the existing dwelling, but this would not alter my findings as the extension would still be a dominant form of development to the principal elevation. The appellant claims that the proposed development would otherwise fall under permitted development rights if it were located to the rear of the property. However, that is

not the scheme before me, and I have assessed this scheme based on its own merits. Similarly, I acknowledge that the appellant is willing to make an amendment to incorporate the bay window into the front extension and so retain this feature, which is claimed to have not been accepted by the Council. This scheme is not before me, and I must determine the appeal based on the plans provided.

12. My attention has been drawn to other prominent buildings within the CA and two single storey extensions with modern glazed doors which was granted by the Council at 20 Hemplands Lane which I was able to see as part of my site visit. However, such buildings do not share the same location/context and the schemes themselves are indeed different. I do not therefore find them to be directly comparable to the appeal before me. Further, I have determined this scheme based on its own merits.
13. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It would therefore fail to preserve the character or appearance of the CA. This would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset.
14. Paragraph 215 of the Framework explains that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. The benefits associated with the scheme are entirely to the benefit of the occupiers by increasing living accommodation at their property. I appreciate that there may be some minor economic benefit during construction but the extent to which this would be beneficial is limited by the small-scale nature of the proposals. Accordingly, I find that there are insufficient wider public benefits to offset the identified harm to the CA to which I have attached great weight given the requirements of the Framework.
15. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Core Policy 9 and 14 of the Amended Core Strategy, 2019, Policies DM5, DM6 and DM9 of the Newark & Sherwood Allocations & Development Management Development Plan Document, 2013 which together, amongst other matters, explains that development proposals should take account of the distinctive character and setting of individual Conservation Areas including open spaces and natural features and reflect this in their layout, design, form, scale, mass, use of materials and detailing. For the same reasons, the proposed development would also be contrary to the Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document, 2014, Sections 12 and 16 of the Framework and Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
16. I am aware of other policies as set out such as making effective use of land, but the proposed development would still need to comply with the above policies which this scheme does not.

Other Matters

17. The host building is not a listed building and is a distance from others in the area. The property may also not be within a sensitive ecological area, at risk of flooding or be in the countryside or Green Belt. I also appreciate the appellant's intentions

to create more space at this property and note a number of matters not in dispute, but this would not alter my findings in relation to the above main issue. There may have been a lack of objection to the scheme, but this does not mean that the development would not be harmful.

18. I am aware of the appellant's frustrations regarding the application process but again this would not alter my findings in relation to the above main issue.

Conclusion

19. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no material considerations, either individually or in combination including the provisions of the Framework, that would outweigh the identified harm and associated plan conflict. I conclude that the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR