
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2016

by Claire Searson MSc PGDip BSc (Hons) MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 16th November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/W/16/3156534

Crossland Sides, Reynards Lane, Hartington, Derbyshire, SK17 0AN

- 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 Ralph Bassett against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/DDD/1115/1105, dated 10 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 12 February 2016.
 - The development proposed is "*replacement of agricultural building (retrospective)*."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the description of the development from the Council's decision notice as this is more precise than the description given in the appellant's original application form.
3. The proposed development has been partially erected on site in the form of an inner block work structure. For clarity, I have determined the application based upon the submitted plans showing the completed development proposals, reference 0840-3 and dated 22.10.2015.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the Peak District National Park.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located within the open countryside in an upland area of the White Peak, within the Peak District National Park. Within the site there is a traditional 2-storey stone barn with stone slate roof, as well as an area of hardstanding to the rear. The appeal building has been partially constructed and is located to the northern corner of the site, set at right angles to the barn. There are dry stone boundary walls adjacent to the proposed development. Adjacent to the site is also a separate 2-storey barn, again built of stone with a slate roof.
 6. The surrounding landscape is predominantly open, characterised by undulating fields, many of which are used for grazing, bounded by dry stone walls. The existing buildings within and adjacent to the site, excluding the partially
-

- constructed appeal building, are reflective of the local vernacular buildings which are a common feature within the rural landscape of the National Park.
7. Underpinning Development Plan Policy within the Peak District National Park Core Strategy 2011 (CS) and the Local Plan 2001 (LP) is a duty to have regard to the statutory purposes of the national park.¹ These are to conserve and enhance natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of such areas. CS Policy GSP1 seeks to secure the statutory purposes of the National Park and gives priority to its conservation and enhancement. Policies GSP2, GSP3, and L1 also reinforce this in seeking good design and protection of landscape character. LP Policy LC13 is supportive of agricultural development subject to detailed design criteria and LC4 is a more general policy in respect of design.
 8. While the adopted Development Plan for the National Park pre-dates the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), I consider that the CS and LP are consistent with the Framework which attaches great weight to the purpose of conserving or enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the National Park (paragraph 115).
 9. The proposed building would be modest with a footprint of around 7.4 x 6.6metres and would comprise of part limestone brick walls and part vertical dark stained wooden 'Yorkshire Boarding.' The roof would have a 30 degree pitch covered in corrugated cement or pre-formed coated metal sheeting.
 10. I find that the building would give rise to a development of a suburban character, more akin to a domestic garage building. Specifically, the proposed building, when completed, would be of a bulky and squat appearance due to its proportions and shallow roof pitch. The use of 'Yorkshire Boarding' and concrete or metal roofing materials would be atypical of the locality and overall, the building would be in stark contrast to the vernacular farm buildings within and adjacent to the site, causing harm.
 11. Despite the location of the building behind dry stone walls, which would be repaired, the development would be highly visible when travelling south along Reynards Lane, a single track country road. Due to the open nature of the landscape, the building would also be highly visible from a number of public footpaths which run in proximity to the site. The incongruity of the design would be experienced from these vantage points, drawing the eye and overall, the development would cause harm within the wider agricultural landscape setting of the National Park.
 12. I note that the development would be located on the site of a former derelict building, however this was demolished around 3 years ago and therefore it is not possible for me to make any assessment of the appellant's claims that the proposed development would represent a visual enhancement over the previous structure.
 13. I acknowledge that in its current part-built form, the block work shell detracts from the visual quality of the traditional buildings on the site and the wider landscape. However, this forms part of the overall structure proposed and I have found that the completed design would cause harm.
 14. The Council has also questioned the agricultural need for the proposed development and I find that evidence in this regard is limited in terms of the

¹ Section 11A(2) of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949

availability of building space across the appellant's agricultural holding as well as in respect of specific details of how all of the existing buildings on the appeal site are used. Specified benefits of the development in respect of animal welfare and the need to maximise available space for these purposes in a suitable location are generalised which limits the weight to which I can attach to these.

15. The fundamental purpose of requiring such justification is to prevent unnecessary rural buildings thus safeguarding landscape character and the statutory purposes of the National Park. Accordingly, even if such a need was demonstrated, I do not consider that this would outweigh the harm I have identified through the failure of the development to conserve or enhance the National Park, to which I must attach great weight.
16. I therefore conclude that the development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the landscape within the Peak District National Park. This would be in clear conflict with the statutory purposes of the National Park, and as reflected within CS Policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3 and L1 as well as LP Policies LC4 and LC13 as well as paragraph 115 of the Framework.

Other Matters

17. There is no evidence in respect of the appellant's claims that a larger steel framed barn would be viewed favourably by the Council. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits based on the information before me.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons above, taking into account all other matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

C Searson
INSPECTOR