
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2020

by K Ford MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/19/3236664

Coach House, Leys Lane, Slaley, Bonsall DE4 2BB

- 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 David Bradley against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/DDD/0918/0867, dated 21 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 4 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of a double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area bearing in mind the loss of a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a single storey limestone building with Staffordshire-blue roof tiles, opposite which are 2 traditional buildings converted to residential use, The Coach House and Croft Cottage. The buildings form part of an historic farmstead group and the outbuilding is identified as a non-designated heritage asset because of its historical association with the now demolished nearby Slaley Hall. The outbuilding makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. Next to the outbuilding is a more modern, detached garage. The proposal is to demolish the existing stone outbuilding and erect a double garage in its place.
4. The outbuilding is not statutory listed or located in a Conservation Area and its historic ties to Slaley Hall are no longer clearly evident following the demolition of the Hall and replacement building repositioned and re-orientated away from the building group. However, the remaining buildings have retained much of their original appearance and the outbuilding retains features of its historic use. It therefore has some historic value.
5. The replacement garage may be of simple design and would be constructed in appropriate materials, in line with the design guidance of the National Park Authority. However, whilst it would be of similar height to the existing building the proposed size of the structure to enable the accommodation of 2 cars would mean that the garage would not be insignificant in size.

6. The overall scale and massing created by the proposed square structure would be prominent and out of proportion in the context of more modest surrounding buildings in the immediate vicinity. Replacing the proposed single garage door with 2 doors, as suggested by the appellant would do little to mitigate the impact. The location of the garage adjacent to the existing garage would compound the impact, meaning that parking provision would not appear subordinate to the parent building, irrespective of the historic pattern of development on the site.
7. The appellant has identified that the existing building could be demolished without planning permission. Be that as it may, even if the existing building was demolished, the proposed garage would harm the character and appearance of the area by virtue of its scale and massing.
8. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and therefore would conflict with Policies GSP1, GSP3 and L3 of the Peak District Core Strategy and Policies DMC3, DMH8 and DMC5 of the Peak District Development Management Policies. Collectively, the relevant parts of these policies require appropriate regard to be given to the siting, scale, form and massing of new development so that, amongst other things, new outbuildings conserve and enhance the valued characteristics of the site, including non-designated heritage assets.
9. The proposal would harm the existing building and its heritage value. Paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework says the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing an application that directly or indirectly affects non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

10. The proposed development would provide additional parking at the site which is a personal gain. There is also some public support for the development in the context of limited parking opportunities in the area. Against this, there would be significant adverse impacts on the character and appearance of the area, including to a non-designated heritage asset. The harm does not outweigh the benefits of the scheme.
11. I note that a similar scheme was granted planning permission in 2002. However, this was at a different time and I have limited details of the context for that decision. My assessment is based on the up to date evidence before me.
12. For the reasons identified, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Ford

INSPECTOR