



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2019

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/19/3227894

Bramblegate, Tideswell Lane, Eyam S32 5RD

- 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 S Rowland against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/DDD/0119/0060, dated 18 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing single storey flat roof extension, to be replaced with two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the whether the proposed development would conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the Peak District National Park and would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the host dwelling and its setting within the Eyam Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. Bramblegate is a substantial two-storey detached dwelling set within a large plot and within the Eyam Conservation Area (CA) and Peak District National Park. My attention has been drawn to a previously dismissed appeal¹ on the site. The previous Inspector noted that the CA is characterised by well ordered buildings set within an attractive streetscape and landscape and I agree with that assessment.
4. Two statutory purposes for National Parks are set out in the Environment Act 1995: firstly, to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area; and secondly, to promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the Park by the public. In pursuing these aims, a National Park Authority has a duty to seek to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities within the National Park. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) adds that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks.

¹ APP/M9496/D/18/3204415

5. I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area in accordance with Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).
6. When compared with the previously dismissed scheme, I note the proposal before me includes a reduction in depth to the extension, a marginal reduction in ridge height, the retention of the existing conservatory at its current width and alterations to the window fenestration. However, as with the previous proposal, the extension would measure approximately three quarters of the width of the host dwelling. Consequently, the two-storey extension would compete visually with the host dwelling. This is contrary to advice in the Peak District National Park Detailed Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document for Alterations and Extensions (SPD) which states that extensions should be sympathetic, subservient to the original building and limited in size and advises against making side extensions too long.
7. The appellant contends the SPD cannot envisage site specific circumstances and has also referred to aspects of Bramblegate's proportions and fenestration that differ from the local vernacular. However, the dwelling's attractive two storey main facades are its predominant characteristic and are well proportioned with materials including stonework, a gable sided slate roof, timber framed windows and stone cills and headers. Whilst the host dwelling is of an individual design these traditional features are still representative of some of the characteristics of dwellings seen elsewhere in the CA and combine to ensure the dwelling makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.
8. The previous additions to the dwelling do little to enhance the character and appearance of the dwelling or the CA, however, their single storey nature ensures the original two-storey dwelling retains its dominance. In contrast, even accounting for the reduced ridge height and the narrower gable to the side elevation, the excessive width means that the extension would not appear subservient and would unbalance the appearance of the dwelling to its east and west facing elevations.
9. The extension would be appreciable from surrounding land and properties for example from the road and some of the properties on New Close, and adjoining properties on Windmill Lane. I acknowledge that there would be limited opportunity to appreciate the proposed extension from public vantage points owing to various factors including the distance of views and intervening buildings and vegetation. In terms of the impact on the wider landscape, the natural beauty of the National Park would be conserved. However, in terms of the intimacy and pattern of built form in the CA, the development would be perceptible particularly from the private views identified and the character and appearance of the CA would therefore not be preserved. Acknowledging the material considerations identified above, there would be less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the CA.
10. To conclude, and for the reasons set out, the development would be contrary to policies GSP3 (Development Management Principles) and L1 (Landscape Character and Valued Characteristics) of the Peak District National Park Core Strategy (2011) and policies LC4 (Design, layout and landscaping) and LH4 (Extensions and alterations to dwellings) of the Peak District National Park

Local Plan (2001), and the SPD; all of which promote good design that responds well to its surroundings.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has drawn my attention to the Council's decision notice which lists policies LC4 and LH4 as being policies of the Core Strategy rather than retained Local Plan policies. Whilst this is true, the policy numbers are clearly referenced in the decision. I have been provided with a copy of these saved policies and they are a material consideration in assessing the proposals before me. The omission within the Council's decision notice of the relevant document from which these particular policies are taken has therefore not hindered my assessment of the proposals and I attach full weight to these policies.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

12. The National Planning Policy Framework sets out that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated asset such as a CA, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Where a development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
13. I have identified less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA, to which I attach great weight in accordance with the requirements of the Framework. As identified above, any public benefits to the CA through the removal of the existing single storey extensions would be limited given their scale and inconspicuous nature within the wider CA. This is particularly the case when compared with the scale of the appeal proposal.
14. Accordingly, the limited public benefits do not outweigh the less than substantial harm and policy conflict identified and the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR