



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2019

by Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MEnvSc

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/19/3239468

Crawshaw Lodge, Hollow Meadows, Rodside, Sheffield S6 6GN

- 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 Antony Bevis against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/S/0519/0529, dated 16 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is conservatory on existing flat roof of original house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. Crawshaw Lodge is a gritstone building with a slate roof. It is constructed on a steep slope resulting in a 2 storey north elevation and a 3 storey south elevation with a protruding lower ground floor. The ground and first floors have a distinctive cruciform-plan with coped gables to each of the 4 sides of the property. It has been extended to the side at the lower ground level and it has symmetrical single storey porch features in the 2 recessed corners at ground floor level at either end of the north gable elevation. By virtue of its historic and architectural interest, it is a non-designated heritage asset.
4. The Lodge is in an isolated and elevated location in the countryside overlooking the A57 and with open moorland to the rear. It is accessed from Rodside Road to the south via an acutely angled track leading to the rear of the property and that also serves as a public right of way. Although partially screened by trees, the property is visible from the adjacent road and footpath. Furthermore, as a result of the prominent hillside location, it is visible from more distant locations elsewhere in the area.
5. The proposed single storey conservatory would be constructed over the flat roof of the lower ground floor, which also serves as a balcony to the front of the property. It would wrap around the south-facing ground floor gable end, spanning nearly the full width of the original property. It would have a solid hipped roof finishing just below the first floor window.
6. Notwithstanding that it would be glazed, by virtue of its size and design, it would nevertheless be a large and bulky feature. It would partially obscure the

original building and it would disrupt and diminish its distinctive cruciform appearance. Moreover, while the roof slope would match the host property roof, the hipped form would not relate well to the coped cross gable roof form of the Lodge. Consequently, the conservatory would be out of keeping with and detrimental to the distinctive character and appearance of the appeal property.

7. By virtue of its prominent location, extent of glazing and overly large size, the conservatory would be a dominant and conspicuous feature. It would be visually obtrusive and incongruous in the context of the surrounding traditional rural landscape. The nearby trees would provide some screening, but they are not permanent and they cannot be relied upon to hide the proposal from view. Furthermore, given the panoramic views looking south, future occupiers would be likely to seek to prune or fell trees that shaded the conservatory or that interrupted the view. Consequently, the proposal would not be assimilated into the surrounding landscape.
8. Therefore, the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would conflict with Policies GSP1, GSP3 and L1 of the Peak District National Park Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document Adopted October 2011 and Policies DMC3, DMC5 and DMH7 of the Development Management Policies Part 2 of the Local Plan for the Peak District National Park Adopted May 2019. These require, among other things, that development should be consistent with the National Park's legal purposes and duty, and that it should respect, conserve and enhance valued characteristics of buildings and the landscape. Furthermore, extensions should not detract from the character and appearance of, and they should not dominate, non-designated heritage assets.

Other Matters

9. Rainwater ingress through the flat roof has resulted in damage to the property, which recent repairs have failed to resolve. While I appreciate that the conservatory would remedy the problem, there is little before me to demonstrate that alternative solutions have either been explored or would be unsuccessful. Therefore, I am not persuaded that there are no alternatives that would not deliver the same benefit without the harm that I have found.
10. I note the suggestion that the conservatory would conserve energy by capturing heat for the host property. However, notwithstanding policy support for renewable forms of energy, in the absence of details of heat capture and transfer I cannot be certain that this would be a benefit of the scheme.
11. I appreciate that the appellant was advised to replace the building when he purchased it. However, advice received previously in a different policy context and unrelated to the appeal scheme is not a justification for the proposal.

Conclusion

12. I have concluded that the scheme would conflict with the development plan and there are no other considerations that outweigh the conflict. For this reason, the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Sarah Manchester

INSPECTOR