
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 January 2020

by William Walton BA MSc Dip Env Law LLM CPE BVC MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/19/3240447

Barnlea, Foolow, Eyam, Derbyshire S32 5QR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Victoria Doig against the decision of the Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/DDD/0219/0116, dated 28 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor extension and internal remodelling.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss this appeal.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the affect that the proposed development would have upon the character and appearance of the dwelling.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an attractive residential dwelling comprising 2 separate 2-storey buildings connected by a single-storey link within the village of Foolow in Derbyshire. According to the National Park Authority (NPA) the 2 two-storey buildings were both previously agricultural barns whilst the appellant contends that one was previously a cottage and the other a cowshed. The roof ridges of the 2 two-storey buildings run parallel with each other. The gable end of one of these buildings faces Bradshaw Lane which passes the property's front garden.
4. The appeal property is one of several traditional stone-built linked-properties facing into an enclosed rectangular area on the northern side of the village. The entirety of the village is designated as a conservation area.
5. The development proposal comprises, first, the addition of a second storey in the void above the link to provide an additional bedroom and, second, the remodelling of the interior staircase. The new bedroom would have 2 new conservation rooflights installed into a pitched roof. The walls would be constructed of rubble limestone, the roof would be blue slate, the window frames would be timber and the guttering would be a mixture of traditional cast iron and plastic. A third conservation rooflight would be installed above the stairwell.
6. From my viewing during the site visit I cannot say whether the southern of the 2-storey buildings was originally a cottage or a barn or whether the northern

one was a cowshed or a barn. Nevertheless, I was able to determine that they were originally separate buildings and that the void above the orphaned single-storey link continues to provide an important element of visual separation between them.

7. The construction of the second storey element would fill the void between the two buildings making it extremely difficult to discern them as historically separate entities. The new development would be clearly visible to those passing the entrance to the drive on Bradshaw Lane. It would also be prominent when viewed from within the enclosed area to the rear of the property. This filling of the void would significantly diminish the historical integrity of both of the adjacent 2-storey buildings.
8. I also note that the ridge of the new structure would run at right angles to the gables of the 2 two-storey buildings. As is noted in the officer's report, the buildings have a strong linear heritage. This quality would be significantly disrupted by the new development which would have a rather awkward and contrived appearance, rendering it unduly prominent.
9. I note that the appellant contends that the NPA has misapplied its own policies. Since the village is within the National Park I disagree with the statement that Policy GSP1 is not relevant as it applies across the entire area within the jurisdiction of the NPA. In regard to Policy GSP3, whilst the officer does not cite this policy explicitly within the section of the committee report dealing with design, the analysis focuses on those areas covered by the policy. As regards DMC3, for the reasons set out in this decision I do not accept that the proposal does comply with the policy which seeks to ensure that the design of new development is appropriate with regards to the form, mass and orientation to existing buildings.
10. In regard to the contention that the proposal does not constitute a barn conversion, I have explained that I consider that the two 2-storey buildings were originally separate agricultural buildings and my decision has proceeded from this position. I note that the proposal does not extend the building footprint but this has not been relevant to my decision. Finally, in regard to the development plan, I have found that the proposal would conflict with Policy DMH7 which seeks to permit extensions where they will not detract from the character and appearance of the original building. In regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, I consider that paragraph 172 is aimed at protecting the landscape within National Parks from major development proposals such as sand and gravel extraction and would therefore agree that it is not relevant to the proposal subject to this appeal.
11. For the above reasons I conclude that the development proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property. It would therefore fail to comply with policies GSP1 and GSP3 of the Peak District National Park Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011 which seek, respectively, to secure the conservation and enhancement of the national park and to protect the character and appearance of buildings. It would also conflict with policies DMC3 and DMH7 of the Development Management Policies – Part 2 of the Local Plan for the Peak District National Park 2019 (DMP) which seek, respectively, to ensure that the siting, scale and mass of new buildings respects the principles laid out in supplementary planning documents, and ensure that extensions and alterations

should only be permitted where they do not detract from the character and appearance of the original building.

12. Finally, I find that the proposal would conflict with the advice concerning extensions laid down in the Peak District National Park Authority's Design Guide 2007 and in the Peak District National Park's Alterations and Extensions: Detailed Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2014. I consider that both these documents reflect the principles expressed in the development plan policies that I have cited above and are thus relevant to this decision.

Other Matters

13. I have had regard to the family circumstances of the appellant. I acknowledge that if the appeal were not allowed the family might have little choice other than to move which would be financially costly and very disruptive. I have also noted the letter of support for the proposal from one of the appellant's neighbours. I consider both of these matters to be relevant considerations in favour of the proposal, but they do not outweigh my findings concerning the harm that it would cause to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area and the subsequent conflict I have identified with the development plan.

Conclusions

14. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

William Walton

INSPECTOR

