
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 August 2019

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/19/3231212

The Coach House, Bank Vale Road, Hayfield SK22 2EZ

- 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 Mrs Brett against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/HPK/0219/0111, dated 5 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is Construction of Timber Framed Porch to Entrance on North Elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The development has already been undertaken and therefore I have determined this appeal on the basis that it is a retrospective proposal.
3. Since the Authority refused planning permission, it has adopted the Development Management Policies Part 2 of the Local Plan for the Peak District National Park 2019 (P2LP). As a result, the two Peak District National Park Local Plan 2001 policies referred to in the Authority's decision, LC4 and LH4, are no longer in force. A copy of Policy DMH7 of the P2LP has been provided by the Authority and I note that this fundamentally seeks to meet the same objectives as policies LC4 and LH4. I have therefore determined this appeal against policy DMH7 of the P2LP.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the dwelling.

Reasons

5. The dwelling is an impressive stone building which sits within a generous plot. It is simple in its general form and design, with a limited number of openings found on the elevation on which the porch has been constructed. Although close to the settlement of Hayfield, the site and the surrounding area has a predominantly rural feel. Overall, the stone building and its grounds contribute positively to the surrounding area and are typical of the type of development found in this area.

6. The porch covers an entrance door to the dwelling and a small ground floor window. One side of the structure is immediately adjacent to a larger ground floor window and to its sill and lintel. The ridge of the porch is close to, but below, the sill of a first floor window. The positioning in relation to the ground floor windows creates an awkward appearance which significantly diminishes these important design features. I consider that this has caused significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling.
7. Furthermore, the use of a substantial timber frame is not sympathetic to the design and appearance of the dwelling. The impact that results, and the impact of the development in general, is exacerbated by the scale of the porch, in particular its substantial width and bulk. I consider that these factors too have resulted in the porch causing significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling.
8. The appellant has drawn attention to the presence of a porch on a nearby dwelling which I was able to view from a public footpath during my site visit. Whilst there are some similarities between the two porches, I have not been made aware of the particular circumstances relating to the other porch. In any event, each case must be considered primarily on its own merits and, in my view, the presence of the other porch does not outweigh the harm that I have identified as having arisen.
9. I conclude therefore that the development has caused significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling. This is contrary to the design guidance of Policies GSP1 and GSP3 of the Peak District National Park Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011, Policy DMH7 of the P2LP, The Peak District National Park Authority Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document and The Peak District National Park Detailed Design Guide Alterations & Extensions Supplementary Planning Document, all of which seek to protect character and appearance.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR