



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2019

by J Hunter BA (Hons) Msc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/19/3226248

Netherwheel Farm, The Jarnett, Flagg SK17 9QS

- 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 Neil Redfern against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/DDD/1118/1035, dated 8 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the Peak District National Park.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached farm house located within the Peak District National Park. The property is accessed via an unmade road and sits within a cluster of buildings that includes several other dwellings and a range of agricultural sheds and barns.
4. The appeal property has a simple form with a limestone front elevation, shallow pitched roof and rendered gable and rear wall. The building demonstrates elements of local distinctiveness and building traditions in its configuration and appearance, particularly the simple linear form and palette of materials which are important attributes in the context of the National Park setting.
5. The proposal is to develop a two storey extension to the rear of the property, projecting around 7.7 m along the shared boundary. The extension would be linear in form with a shallow pitched roof and materials to match the existing building. Combined, the proposal and the existing extension would almost double the size of the host dwelling.
6. The projection of the proposed extension would be approximately half the length of the original building and exceed the width of the existing gable, thereby completely altering the simple linear floorplan to one that is effectively "L-shaped." The result would be a dominant feature that would unbalance the proportions of the host dwelling and by virtue be harmful to the character and

appearance of the property. This would conflict with the requirements Authority's Detailed Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document (SPG) 2014 which provides guidance on the design of extensions and Policy LH4 of the Peak District National Park Local Plan (PDLP) which seeks to, amongst other things, protect the character and appearance of original buildings and ensure that proposals do not dominate the original dwelling.

7. I accept that the appellant made alterations to the proposal during the application process in an attempt to comply with policy, including reducing the ridge height so that it would be lower than the original dwelling. I also note that the extension would occupy less than a third of the rear elevation and the gable width would be in keeping with that of the previously approved extension. Nevertheless, whilst there would be some subordinate elements that would accord with policy, these would not alter the overall harmful effects of the proposal.
8. The appeal site sits to the rear of an existing property and is largely obscured from public view by the landscape and existing built form. However, when approaching the site from the west, there would be a clear view of the extension which would project along almost the full length of the eastern boundary of the farmyard. The scale and bulk of the proposal would change the traditional configuration and layout of the yard, further enclosing the space and thereby having a significantly harmful effect on its character.
9. The proposal would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area, thereby failing to conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the National Park which is something to which I have given great weight. Accordingly, the development would conflict with PDLP Policy LH4 as described above, and Policies GSP1, GSP2 and GSP3 of the adopted Peak District National Park Development Framework, Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011 (DPD) which collectively, seek to protect and conserve the Peak District National Park and well as conflict with the SPG which supports them.

Other Matters

10. I note that the Authority's refusal reason also refers to "amenity issues upon the adjacent farmyard area". However, the Authority's reasoning in this respect is vague and lacks substance, particularly as they acknowledge that the nearest residential property is some 55 metres away from the appeal site and consequently the proposal would not give rise to any change in resident's living conditions. However, absence of harm in this respect does not alter my conclusion on the main issue.
11. The appellant references benefits arising from the proposed development including, the improved appearance of the site and the increased family living accommodation. Whilst I do sympathise with the appellant's desire to extend and improve the property such matters would not outweigh the harm that I have found.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons outlined above and taking into account all other matters I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Julie Hunter

INSPECTOR