



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 June, 2025

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P3040/D/25/3363457

Marriots, Screveton Road, Car Colston, Nottinghamshire NG13 8JG

- 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 and Mrs Alan and Gail Kennedy against the decision of Rushcliffe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02088/FUL.
 - The application is for works to erect a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the Car Colston Conservation Area.

Procedural Matters

3. The development description above is taken from the original application form and differs from that as used by the Council but still accurately describes the development as proposed. As such I have related it here.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a non listed two storey house based around an original L' shaped core of two buildings that have seen several alterations and extensions over the years. The building stands at the north end of the nucleated village main street around Church Street/Screveton Road and is the first village building marking the entrance into the more enclosed main street. This is in contrast to the common land and countryside beyond. The building is identified as a positive building of special architectural or historic character within the Car Colston Conservation Area (CA) Townscape Appraisal.
5. There is evidence of several phases of extension to the property but earlier maps clearly illustrate that a building was present here from around 1835 that later evolved into two ranges sitting at right angles to each other from around 1883. More recent planning history has seen several extensions including an extension to the north which is currently well set back from the front elevation. It is this part of the existing house that would be modified and, although the building can be seen from the public footpath running along its northern

- boundary, it would be this element that would be most visible within the CA and on approach to the core of the village.
6. The proposal therefore seeks permission for a further extension to the north and east of the existing house that would create a living area and generous home office to the ground floor along with an extension to the north to enlarge an existing bedroom and create a large dressing room. There would be a hipped roof along the frontage with two very small windows at first floor level and a gable presenting to the rear echoing a type of cross wing design.
 7. The site is within the CA but is also within the setting of two Listed Buildings. As such, in considering this appeal I am required by Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to give 'Special Attention' to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Car Colston Conservation Area. I am also required by Section 66(i) of the same Act which requires me to give 'Special Regard' to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting. This site is within the setting of the Grade I Listed Church of St Mary and within the wider setting of the Grade II Listed Screveton Old Hall.
 8. The statutory duties within the Act are reflected in The Framework, which states that 'Great Weight' should be given to the heritage assets' conservation and also illustrates the positive contribution that heritage assets can make to the creation of sustainable and economically viable communities. This is also reflected in Policy 11 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (CS) and Policy 28 of the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (LP) which seeks to manage change in the historic environment and ensure good design.
 9. The significance of the CA is largely dictated by its historic evolution that has manifested itself in a delicate balance of landscape and built form, specifically around the dispersed settlement of the common areas of the village contrasted with the more nucleated and tight knit core of the village centre around Church Street. The CA exhibits a rich and distinctive form and contains evidential, aesthetic, historic and communal heritage values. Many of the village buildings are of simple gable forms with red brick and well proportioned fenestration and have a vernacular aesthetic value that contribute to as strong sense of place.
 10. Similarly, the Church of St Mary is a medieval church of landmark quality that is a key part of the village and its historic character. Its landmark quality contrasts with the surrounding tight knit built form as does its material which is of stone rather than the more common brick that is used in the majority of buildings. Screveton Old Hall is situated some distance to the north of the appeal site but the relationship is present largely due to the appeal site marking the first village building on approach to the church from this direction.
 11. Although undoubtably of some interest due to its age, the existing building to which this appeal is concerned presents a rather stark and incongruous elevation to the streetscene here that does not wholly reflect the more active frontages of other village buildings. Clearly the emphasis has been on presenting the majority of windows to the rear of this house and almost turning its back upon the village street and this has had the effect of creating a poorer frontage onto the main village road.

12. The proposal before me may not extend the existing building closer to the Screveton Road frontage but it would extend what is a rather bland, albeit clearly subservient, end extension further north resulting in a further enlargement of this already rather rambling collection of buildings without necessarily respecting the vernacular character of the area. Moreover, despite the presence of the existing boundary wall and the potential for future planting, the relative absence of good quality fenestration to the first floor of this extension facing the road would compound the existing bland elevation and lead to an erosion of the generally attractive character of the CA.
13. Moreover, the inclusion of the hipped roof to this end elevation would introduce a rather alien roof form into the CA which is not common at all. The cumulation of development would therefore add to the plethora of historic additions but would fail to make any appreciable improvement to either the understanding of the history of this building, nor to its aesthetic quality or to the approach into the village core.
14. In turn the building would be visible from both the main village street and the footpath to the north. From the approach along the street especially there are key views of the Grade I Listed Church and the proposal would erode the subservient qualities of this increasingly rambling and dominant village building when compared to the church and also to Screveton Old Hall. As such this proposal would not only result in less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the CA through its poor design but would also cause some more limited harm to the setting and approach to and from these important Listed Buildings.
15. Although I am confident that there are ways to achieve the accommodation required by the Appellants within this building through more sensitive design, the scheme before me does not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Car Colston CA and will not, in its current form, be able to meet the policy requirements of Policy 11 of the Rushcliffe CS or Policy 28 of the LP. In turn the proposal cannot demonstrate any tangible public benefits to outweigh this harm and would be in further conflict with the recommendations within The Framework itself.

Conclusion

16. Ultimately, this proposal would introduce a poor quality of development within the Car Colston Conservation Area and would cause harm to the setting of nearby Listed Buildings. As such, for the reasons given above, and taking into account of all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR