



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2022

by A Edgington BSc (Hons) MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/22/3290412

The Old Police House, Great North Road, South Muskham NG23 6EA

- 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 Gary Fendley against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01978/HOUSE, dated 13 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is Proposed extensions, front entrance porch and new boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. With regard to the proposed extension and boundary wall the appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Proposed extensions, front entrance porch and new boundary wall at The Old Police House, Great North Road, South Muskham NG23 6EA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01978/HOUSE, dated 13 September 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings: Dwg. GF-01, Dwg. GF-02, Dwg. GF-03, GF-04, Dwg. GF-05 (excluding the front entrance porch), Dwg. GF-06 (excluding the front entrance porch), Dwg. GF-07 (excluding the front entrance porch), Dwg. GF-08.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted includes the side extension and boundary wall only.
2. With regard to the front entrance porch the appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

3. The application form includes a detached outbuilding in its description but the evidence before me indicates that this would be permitted development and as such there is no need for me to consider it in my reasoning. I have also omitted it from the banner.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the development would be detrimental to the significance of the Old Police House.

Reasons

5. The Old Police House (House) is a modest two storey L-shaped brick dwelling with a forward gable, brick chimneys and a tiled pitched roof. It is located on a corner plot on the edge of South Muskham and the simple typology of its frontage is visible from the Great North Road. To the rear there is a large conservatory which runs along the entire elevation, and an attached flat roofed single storey side extension which projects beyond the host dwelling's rear elevation and which contains a kitchen extension, utility and double garage.
6. The original House is a distinctive police house of a type designed by a local County Council architect in the inter-war years, and built throughout the county. The Council has identified it as a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) using the criteria set out in its NDHA Draft Criteria document.
7. Planning Practice Guidance sets out that *plan-making bodies should make clear and up to date information on non-designated heritage assets accessible to the public to provide greater clarity and certainty for developers and decision-makers. This includes information on the criteria used to select non-designated heritage assets and information about the location of existing assets.* The Council's draft criteria document sets out such criteria. Although the document is not yet adopted and the Council does not appear to hold a schedule of locally listed buildings, I see no reason to disagree that the House is a NDHA and as such this is a material consideration in my reasoning.
8. I conclude that the House's significance arises from its former use as a rural police house which has social and community value, as well as its historic association with a prominent local architect. There is also significance to be derived from its largely unaltered simple form and use of traditional materials.
9. The House's unassuming and largely unaltered typology can be seen on its front and southern flank elevation. To the rear the original elevation is somewhat obscured by the conservatory and garage extensions, and the northern flank elevation is set back beyond and above the current single storey extensions.
10. The proposed side extension would add a first floor to the single storey kitchen extension, extending to the kitchen's full depth. This would result in a fairly bulky projection beyond the host dwelling's original rear elevation. The proposals would also include the replacement of the conservatory with a built extension with lantern lights and full height doors.
11. The side extension's ridge line would be lower than that of the House, and its front elevation would be set back from the House's principal elevation. The modest plan form, typology and scale of the original House would still be visible, particularly when seen from the east and from the south. The side gabled extension would have a similar form to the House, and it would diminish appreciation of the original police house to only a minor extent.
12. I can appreciate the Council's argument that the side extension would appear somewhat oversized, and it would also alter the scale of the House when

- viewed as a whole. However, the House's northern elevation is already compromised by the very large single storey extension and makes a far lesser contribution to the House's heritage significance than the principal front and southern flank elevation.
13. Moreover, the House sits in a generous corner plot and the increased bulk and scale of the side extension would not jar with or appear oversized in relation to neighbouring built form.
 14. Concern has also been raised in relation to the size of a window on the northern flank wall of the side extension. Again, whilst to some degree I agree with the Council, the window would not be seen in the direct context of the host dwelling and would clearly be related to the newer extension. As such, I am satisfied that the side extension would not cause particular harm to the House's significance.
 15. No concerns have been raised in relation to the brick boundary wall and there is nothing before me to lead me to conclude otherwise.
 16. The proposed oak entrance porch would be a reference to a different building style and would also add unnecessary ornamentation to the House's underlying simplicity and functional design. As the porch would be attached to the House's principal elevation, I conclude that this would detract from its significance. I appreciate that a smaller porch could be built as permitted development, but it remains that permission is needed for a porch of this size.
 17. Paragraph 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework states in regard to development affecting NDHAs, *that a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset*. In this instance I conclude that the extension would not cause sufficient harm to the House's significance to warrant refusal of permission for those works. Conversely, the porch would appear highly incongruous and the harm to the House's significance would warrant the dismissal of this element of the appeal.
 18. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the side extension and the boundary wall would not be detrimental to the significance of the House. They would not be contrary to Policy CP9 which states that new development should be of appropriate form and context, or Policy CP14 which states that balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. Nor would those proposals be contrary to Policy DM6 which requires extensions to reflect local distinctiveness and the setting of heritage assets, or Policy DM9 which requires particular attention to be paid to reflecting local distinctive styles of development.
 19. The front entrance porch would introduce an incongruous feature on the largely unaltered principal elevation. I conclude that this would be detrimental to the House's significance and would also be contrary to the requirements of Policies CP9, CP14, DM6 and DM9 as set out above.
 20. I have reached different conclusions in respect of different elements of the development. However, as the elements are severable, I have concluded that it would be appropriate to issue a split decision

Conditions

21. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to time, and adherence to the approved drawings for the avoidance of doubt. I have also imposed a condition relating to the use of the same materials as used in the host dwelling to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

22. The appeal is allowed with regard to the site extension and the brick boundary wall. The appeal is dismissed with regard to the porch.

A Edgington

INSPECTOR