

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2017

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M1005/Y/17/3168697
17 Long Row, Belper, Derbyshire, DE56 1DR

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Miss Justine Oliver against the decision of Amber Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref AVA/2016/1085, dated 15 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2016.
 - The work proposed is the replacement of the front door.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. I have noted that the application also includes a new door frame and have considered the appeal on this basis. Although the appellant has offered to make modifications to the door, I must consider the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building at 17 Long Row and the character and appearance of the Belper and Milford Conservation Area (CA) and the Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site (WHS).

Reasons

4. In considering proposals for planning permission, the duty imposed by section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special regard must be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Section 72 of the same Act requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas. Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that when considering the impact of new development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to its conservation. The paragraph goes on to say that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the
-

- heritage asset. Paragraph 134 requires that where the harm is less than substantial, it should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
5. Policies EN24, EN27 and EN29 of the Amber Valley Local Plan (LP) (2006) reflect the statutory duty and accord with the Framework in that respect, although they fail to acknowledge the need to weigh any less than substantial harm against the public benefits of the proposal as sought in the Framework.
 6. The appeal site lies within the Belper and Milford CA and the Derwent Valley Mills WHS. The significance of the CA and the WHS derives from the association with the industrial heritage of the area. The appeal dwelling is a mid-terrace, three storey cottage which forms part of a grade II listed terrace of cottages whose significance derives from their historical association with the area's industrial development, having been built for mill workers in the late C18th and from their architectural value as early industrial housing of some quality. Long Row was the subject of an award winning restoration scheme in the 1980's. The traditional detailing of most of the windows and some of the doors in the street contributes strongly to the significance of the listed buildings and to the character and appearance of the area.
 7. The previous door dated from the 1980's restoration. It was a timber door of five boards which spanned the full height of the door, painted in a dark green colour with weathered brass fittings. The replacement door and frame have already been fitted. It is a timber door of six boards set within a border around three of the edges. Fittings are of brass and the door and its frame have been painted in a green colour.
 8. At my visit I saw that some doors in the long terraces on both sides of the street have traditionally styled doors like the previous door at no 17. Although some have been replaced with modern variations of a different colour, style or ironmongery, these are not consistent with the detail of the more traditional doors and do not make a positive contribution to, and detract from, the detail of the listed buildings and the character and appearance of the area.
 9. The border around three sides of the new door gives the impression of a greater number of boards. The number and slimmer proportions of the boards do not reflect the smaller number and wider proportions of those of a more traditional door. Although I saw that the colour of the new door and frame is similar to that of some other doors in the street it does not match the darker colour of the windows in this dwelling or most of the other doors and windows in the street and its brighter colour and gloss finish stands out in contrast to the predominant colour elsewhere. Although the previous door also had brass fittings as do many others in the street, the shiny appearance of the replacement fittings does not enhance the overall appearance and I agree with the Council's Heritage Consultant that traditional black ironmongery would be more appropriate.
 10. I understand that the appellant wishes to provide greater thermal value and security for her property but I am not persuaded that there are no other options that could provide these benefits in a more sympathetic manner. Therefore, there are no public benefits arising from the proposal that would outweigh the identified harm as required in paragraph 134 of the Framework.

Conclusion

11. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal fails to preserve and enhance the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and the character and appearance of the CA and the WHS. It conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that justify determining the appeal otherwise. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector