

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 August 2016

by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDurt MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 19 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/P1045/D/16/3151846

Nether Farm, Mill Lane, Sturston, Derbyshire DE6 1LN

- 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 Keith Whitmore against the decision of Derbyshire Dales District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00051/FUL, dated 27 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is 2 storey oak framed extension to gable end of existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Keith Whitmore against Derbyshire Dales District Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises part of Nether Farm and includes the two storey farmhouse, a two storey former barn and associated outbuildings. The farmhouse is believed to have been constructed in the mid 17th century, extended between the late 17th and early 18th century and refurbished in the 20th century. Though not listed or within a Conservation Area it retains a traditional appearance, is largely rectangular in form and constructed from red brick under a tiled roof. It has a high ratio of brickwork to window and door openings, including on the side gable affected by the proposal. This gives the farmhouse a very solid appearance and is consistent with the appearance of nearby buildings both on the appeal site and on the opposite side of Mill Lane.
 5. By contrast the proposed two storey side extension would be timber framed and clad in horizontal timber boarding under a tiled roof. It would contain a very large glazed opening in the side elevation which would comprise almost the entire gable. Unlike the front elevation of the farmhouse, there are no first floor windows proposed in the front elevation of the extension. The front and
-

rear of the extension would be set in very slightly from the front and rear elevation of the farmhouse giving the extension a slightly lower eaves and ridge height than the main roof of the farmhouse.

6. Though I note that the proposed extension is intended to read as a subservient and contemporary element to the original farmhouse and despite the use of timber elsewhere in the locality, I do not consider that either the proposed use of timber or the design of the extension is sympathetic to the character and appearance of the existing building. In particular the large amount of glazing proposed in the side gable is at odds with the otherwise solid appearance of the farmhouse and would serve to weaken its appearance. Additionally the lack of first floor window openings in the front elevation of the proposed extension would add to it appearing out of keeping with the farmhouse. Finally the very limited set backs proposed and the prominent position of the extension mean that the proposal would have a significant harmful impact on the appearance of the front and side elevation of the farmhouse.
7. In reaching my decision I have had regard to the fact that the existing rear orangery is predominantly glazed and of a timber frame construction. However it is single storey, smaller in scale and much less prominent than the proposed extension. Additionally I note the concern raised having regard to sourcing matching bricks and reproducing the same bond, the poor condition of brickwork in the side gable and the lack of adequate natural daylight to rooms at this end of the farmhouse. However I am not convinced that more appropriate materials could not be sourced or that the brickwork on the gable could not be repaired to prevent water ingress. The side gable is west facing with both rooms at this end of the farmhouse having good sized windows in both the west and south elevations. Consequently I do not consider it likely that they would suffer from a significant lack of natural daylight.
8. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the proposal would adversely affect the character and appearance of the existing building. It is therefore contrary to policies H2 and SF5 of the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan and to relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development preserves or enhances the quality and local distinctiveness of its surroundings and extensions to dwellings would not result in a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Beverley Wilders

INSPECTOR