The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2020 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

Decision by Sarah Housden BA (Hons) BPl MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P1045/D/19/3238646
Old Barn, Riggs Lane, Marston Montgomery, Ashbourne, Derbyshire DE6 2FD

- 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 Grayham Crawford against the decision of Derbyshire Dales District Council.
- The application Ref: 19/00554/FUL, dated 14 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 August 2019.
- The development proposed is described on the decision notice as 'modifications to approved barn conversion with insertion of new door and flue pipe, erection of stables and garage/store.'

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. In the interests of clarity, I have used the description of development given in the Decision Notice.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The dwelling is a converted barn that is set back from the roadside, to the rear of a dwelling that fronts Riggs Lane. The dwelling is located within open countryside and set within open, attractive grounds. There is sporadic development along Riggs Lane with a number of agricultural and residential buildings visible within the street scene.

6. The proposed door would be located on the rear elevation of the barn and would provide access to the kitchen. The flue has already been moved and is in line with the other flue on the opposite side of the roof. The stables would be located within a separate parcel of land to the north west of the barn and would

be constructed from brown stained weatherboard with a felt roof. The stables would measure around 10.5 metres (m) wide by 3.6m deep with a height of around 3.5m. The garage/store would be located between the barn and the existing outbuilding. It would be constructed with shiplap wooden walls, with dark brown stain, and dark coloured metal deck roof.

7. The flue has been moved to a higher position on the roof and is in line with the other flue on the opposite side of the roof. Because the flue has only been moved a small distance and is not particularly prominent, on the rear elevation of the roof, the location of the flue does not harm the character or appearance of the dwelling.

8. The proposed stables would have the appearance of a rural building that would be seen within the context of the farms and other agricultural holdings within the area. The stables would be located within a separate field and would not encroach into the space around the barn. As such the proposed stables would not harm the character or appearance of the dwelling or its spacious setting which contributes to the rural character and appearance of the surrounding area.

9. The Conversion of Farm Buildings Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (SPD) notes that proposals for new doors to historically blank elevations would generally be resisted as they could compromise, and potentially harm, an inherent and distinctive characteristic of a farm building. The door would be on the rear elevation of the barn which faces the open countryside and would not be visible from the public domain.

10. Nevertheless, the rear wall appears to have historically been left undeveloped, other than where the previously unapproved door was built and then removed. As such, the inclusion of a door within this rear elevation of the building would introduce a domestic feature into a historically blank elevation which would be harmful to the modest character of the building which reflects its former agricultural use. Whilst a door was removed from the side elevation of the barn during the initial conversion and the proposal could be considered as a replacement for it, it is not considered that the need to provide an additional access to the kitchen is sufficient to outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling.

11. The proposed garage/store would be located in close proximity to the converted barn. The introduction of another outbuilding on the site would undermine the uncluttered and modest character and appearance of the barn. When viewed from Riggs Lane, it would reduce the space around the barn which would be harmful to its existing open and spacious setting. Overall, I consider that the proposed garage/store would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

12. Whilst I have found that the flue and proposed stables would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area, this does not outweigh the harm that would be caused by the proposed door and garage/store. Therefore, the proposed development would be contrary to policies S1, S4, S9, PD1, PD5 and HC8 of the Adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan (2017) (LP) in so far as they seek to secure high quality, locally distinctive and inclusive design and resist development which would harm the character of the local landscape as well as protecting the countryside from inappropriate development. The policies also require that where buildings have been

converted to residential use that the building itself should not require additional extensions or alterations to be suitable for residential use. The proposal would also conflict with the SPD which is a material consideration in the determination of the appeal.

Other matters

13. The appellant has referred to other development that has been approved around Marston Montgomery. The dwellings are all located a considerable distance from the site and consequently the setting of those dwellings would be different to the appeal site. Furthermore, those proposals are not comparable with the scheme before me. Notwithstanding this, each case must be assessed on its own merits and I have determined the appeal based on the proposal before me and the circumstances of the appeal site.

14. Had my findings in relation to the main issue in this case been more favourable, it would have been necessary to address the comments from third parties in more detail. However, as I am dismissing the appeal and since it will not affect the overall outcome, I make no further comments on these matters.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

G Sibley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I too agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Housden

INSPECTOR