



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2020

by Anne Jordan BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 02 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/W/20/3245622

Home Farm, Church Lane, Rowsley, Matlock, DE4 2EA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr K Trickett against Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref 0819/0931, is dated 28 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is an agricultural building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an agricultural building at Home Farm, Church Lane, Rowsley, Matlock, DE4 2EA, in accordance with application Ref 0819/0931, dated 28 August 2019 and the plans submitted with it, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, Block Plan and Elevations Plan labelled "Proposed agricultural building at Home Farm, Rowsley" except in respect of the roof materials shown on the Elevations Plan.
 - 3) Prior to the commencement of development details of the roofing material for the proposed development shall be submitted to and agreed by the local planning authority.
 - 4) No demolition/development shall take place until a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions - and:
 - i) the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording;
 - ii) the programme for post investigation assessment;
 - iii) the provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording;
 - iv) the provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation;
 - v) the provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation;

- vi) the nomination of a competent person or persons/organization to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.

No works shall take place other than in accordance with the archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation.

Within a period of 12 weeks from completion of the development, the archaeological site investigation and post investigation analysis and reporting shall have been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation, and the provision to be made for publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition shall have been secured.

Procedural Matter

- 2. The description of development refers to an agricultural building. The submitted plans show that the building is in fact an extension to an existing structure and is described as such within the application.

Main Issue

- 3. The main issue for the appeal is whether the proposal would preserve the special interest of the Grade II listed Holly House and The Beeches and any special archaeological interest at the site.

Reasons

- 4. S16(2) and S66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. S72(1) of the Act requires special attention to be had to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of that area. GSP3 and L3 of the Peak District National Park Core Strategy and Policy DMC3 of the Development Management Policies 2019 reflect the statutory duty set out in the Act.
- 5. The appeal site lies adjacent to a pair of listed buildings, Holly House and The Beeches, which are both grade II listed. The properties also lie within the Rowsley Conservation Area. The pair originally made up one Manor House, dating from the late 17th or early 19th Century, are referred to in the listing as "Farmhouse North West of Williams Deacon Bank". The properties are separated from Home Farm to the north by a range of outbuildings which are also curtilage listed. Historic records indicate that 2 smaller buildings, now demolished, also formed part of the group and originally sat within land now forming part of the appeal site. A stone boundary wall, also curtilage listed, runs to the west of Home Farm. I have referred to them collectively below as the Holly House Farm group.
- 6. The application is not supported by any assessment of the significance of the building. I noted on site that the buildings would originally have formed a farm complex and been separated from Home Farm to the north by open fields. However, the listed buildings are no longer in agricultural use, with the original manor house now subdivided, and the range of remaining buildings to the north now partly in business use. The buildings provide an attractive and relatively well preserved example of an historic agricultural group. The origins

of the buildings are apparent in the domestic character of the manor house and the arrangement and detailing of the associated structures, but the extent of the original holding is no longer clearly apparent. Due to the position of the group within the village, and the extent to which the original space around them has been eroded, the group is no longer predominantly agricultural in character and the space around it does not contribute markedly to their significance as heritage assets.

7. Home Farm is made up of a main farmhouse and loosely grouped collection of farm buildings of varying ages. The modern barn, which is proposed for extension, and the concreted hardstanding adjoining it, indicate the extent of Home Farm and are clearly visible to the rear of the listed group. In this regard the proximity of the adjoining working farm, and the functional appearance of some of its buildings already forms part of the existing setting to the listed group.
8. The proposal comprises an extension to an existing open sided modern barn, which would occupy the area currently laid to hardstanding which lies adjacent to the Holly House Farm group. This would bring the modern farm building close to the range of listed outbuildings to the south. However, subject to the use of appropriate materials, particularly for the roof, the appearance of the extension would mirror that of the existing building, and as it would sit comfortably within the yard of the existing farm, would not appear obtrusive. In views into the site and across the Home Farm yard towards the listed range the Holly House Farm Group would remain clearly distinguishable and so its character would not be impacted by the resulting reduction in space between the two groups of buildings.
9. The Council have drawn my attention to guidance¹ relating to the conservation and enhancement of historic farmsteads. However, Holly House Farm is no longer clearly perceived as a farm complex and the appearance of Home Farm would not be significantly altered. I also note the Council's concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on the listed wall. I saw on site that the wall ran along the side of the existing building, and that the plans indicated that the barn extension would be constructed in a similar way, retaining the wall in situ, with the wall remaining clearly visible in front of the proposed extension in views into the site from the public highway to the east. I therefore do not consider that the proposal would cause harm in this regard. Neither, given the very limited visual impact of the scheme, would the proposal harm the significance of the Rowsley Conservation Area.
10. Given that the original extent of the Holly House Farm group extended into the Home Farm curtilage, and in the absence of an initial assessment of heritage significance, I note the concerns of the Council regarding the potential for harm to heritage significance through harm to archaeological remains. However, I noted on site that most, if not all of the site is already covered in a concrete base, used for agricultural purposes. I am therefore satisfied that there is little potential for the loss of remains at or near the surface and see no reason why archaeological interests could not be protected by means of an appropriate condition in this case.
11. I therefore find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which seeks to preserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate

¹ PEAK DISTRICT FARMSTEADS & LANDSCAPE PROJECT

to their significance. Of the policies put to me by the Council I consider policies GSP3 and L3 of the Peak District National Park Core Strategy and Policy DMC3 of the Development Management Policies 2019, to be most relevant. Together, amongst other things, these seek to protect, conserve and enhance the setting of heritage assets and so have similar aims to the Framework. I also find no conflict with policy DME1, which seeks to ensure that new agricultural development is well related to the existing built fabric and surrounding landscape.

12. The proposal would not harm the significance of The Beeches or Holly House. Neither would it harm the significance of Rowsley Conservation Area. Accordingly, having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed. I have considered the proposed conditions in light of the advice in Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to conditions relating to approved plans and the period of implementation, a condition requiring details of the proposed roof materials is necessary to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the development. Furthermore, given the potential for archaeological remains in the vicinity of the site a condition requiring a written scheme of investigation is necessary.
13. The Council have also suggested a condition requiring the removal of the building when it is no longer required for agricultural purposes. However, as the building is effectively an extension of an existing structure, it would not be reasonable or effective for only part of a building to be removed in such circumstances.

Anne Jordan

INSPECTOR