



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2019

by Karen Taylor MSC URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Tuesday, 20 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/W/19/3221678

Land adjacent to Beech House, Coombs Road, Bakewell DE45 1AR

- 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 Eric Marsh against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/DDD/1118/1030, dated 6 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a timber shed and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Issue

2. Following the determination of the planning application the Authority adopted its Development Management Policies: Part 2 of the Local Plan for the Peak District National Park May 2019, which together with the Peak District National Park Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011, now forms the development plan for the area. The Authority has drawn my attention to those policies it considers are of relevance which I have taken into account in coming to my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Bakewell Conservation Area (BCA), having regard to its location within the National Park.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is situated within the BCA and is an undeveloped piece of land which adjoins Beech House. It can be accessed from a gate from the front garden of this property but is separated and enclosed by stone boundary walls. The immediate area is characterised by a mix of residential properties of high-quality design and constructed of stone.
5. The proposed shed would be constructed of boarded timber and be of substantial footprint and height sited to the south east corner of the land. This land is currently free from any built form and boundary walls form a separation preventing any domestic relationship to the existing dwelling at Beech House. Therefore, the proposed development would be seen in isolation on the land,

- appearing at odds with its surroundings and would not appear as a subservient ancillary outbuilding to the adjacent property. This combined with the inappropriate timber boarded materials, roof height and design of the shed would exacerbate the situation and result in significant harm to the visual qualities of the area, particularly as buildings are constructed in stone.
6. The appeal site can be seen from the designated footpath which runs along the side of Beech House and to the rear of the appeal site and the proposed development would be visible from vantage points along Coombs Road. Although there are a number of trees around the boundary and these provide partial screening of the land, this would not be the case throughout the year and the existing boundary wall would only provide limited screening due to the eaves and ridge height. Thus, the proposed development would be clearly visible when viewed along Coombs Road and from the footpath and due to its size, height and materials would appear as an incongruous building when viewed from within the street scene causing harm to the setting of the immediate and wider area.
 7. I am not convinced from the evidence I have before me, that the proposed development would be used for a temporary basis for storage of items as described by the appellant. These would need to be stored elsewhere and no alternative has been provided, as such it would not be reasonable to impose such a condition. In terms of a condition which would restrict occupancy of the shed to Beech House, then to transfer it to 'Plot A', I consider this would be unreasonable and would not meet the 'six tests'. However, as I have found that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the BCA, I have given this limited weight in the decision.
 8. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the BCA and the valued landscape of the National Park. It would be contrary to Policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3 and L1 of the Peak District National Park Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011, and Policies DMC3, DMC5 and DMC8 of the Development Management Policies: Part 2 of the Local Plan for the Peak District National Park May 2019. The broad aims of these policies are to seek, conserve and enhance the valued landscape character within the National Park and that development will not be permitted if it would result in any harm to, or loss of, the significance, character and appearance of a heritage asset; in taking account of the form, layout of the area including views and vistas, scale, height, form and massing of the development and existing buildings to which it relates and the nature and quality of materials.

Other Matters

9. I acknowledge the appellants' desire to store a range of domestic items that are located elsewhere, use of the shed for family reasons and has limited space to do so within the garden of Beech House. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have found.
10. I have been referred to other outbuildings within the vicinity of the site, however I do not have the full details circumstances of those and that led to these proposals being accepted and so cannot be sure that they represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal, including in respect of scale, location, use and development plan policy. In any case, those I saw were constructed mainly

of stone and were located within the domestic curtilage of properties and are therefore clearly distinguishable from the appeal scheme.

11. There is no dispute between the Authority and the appellant in regard to the extant planning permission for a dwelling to be erected at the site. Although this would result in the land having built form and some change to the character and appearance of the area, I do not consider this to be a fallback position to allow the proposed development. There is no planning permission in place that includes the positioning of a shed on the land that the appeal site forms and permitted development rights were removed as part of the granted extant permission, which would limit any such construction. Consequently, the fallback position advanced does not outweigh my findings.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Karen Taylor

INSPECTOR