
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 July 2020

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/20/3249972

Charlotte Cottage (Liversage), Charlotte Lane, Bradwell, Hope Valley, Derbyshire S33 9HH

- 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 Ben Armitt against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref: NP/DDD/0819/0918, dated 30 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2020
 - The development is described as a porch already been built, small decking area, shed.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the porch. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the small decking area and the shed and planning permission is granted for the small decking area and the shed at Charlotte Cottage (Liversage), Charlotte Lane, Bradwell, Hope Valley, Derbyshire S33 9HH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: NP/DDD/0819/0918, dated 30 September 2019, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted.

Procedural Matter

2. The development has already been carried out and, therefore, I have dealt with the appeal on a retrospective basis

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Bradwell Conservation Area, including the contribution of the appeal property.

Reasons

4. Charlotte Cottage is a 2 storey dwelling that is set out in a linear form. It directly fronts onto Charlotte Lane. The original dwelling is simple in its appearance and traditional in design. It is constructed of stone external walls and a stone slate roof, with oak timbered sash windows. Stone cills and lintels are also utilised. The porch structure is positioned on its side elevation and is accessed via steps, due to the ground levels. The decking lies at a lower ground area to the side of the property, whilst the shed is at a lower level still and is set back from the road by a loose stone parking area.

5. The site lies within the Bradwell Conservation Area. It is found towards the edge of the village where properties become more separated. The cottages in the conservation area are, for the most part, of a pleasing simple rural vernacular. They have generally limited significant external alterations that are visible from public vantage points. The cottage on the appeal site, without the porch, contributes favourably towards these attributes of character as regards its significance.
6. In the context of the simple form of the cottage, the porch is a considerable alteration. With its size, it projects noticeably out from the side elevation and extends upwards to just below the cill level of a first floor window. It has a raised appearance due to the levels and this further augments that it appears oversized. The levels also cause the roof ridge of the porch to be pronounced on the side of the property.
7. As the ground levels also increase up Charlotte Lane towards the site and with the gap there is with the next dwelling in this direction, the porch appears prominent in its setting. This results in a domineering appearance as the property is approached up the lane, which further detracts from the simpler form of the cottage.
8. The design is also out of character with the plainer appearance of the side elevation and the cottage. The wide ranging palate of materials emphasises its incongruous and bulky design, and that it is not simple in its form. The original cottage satisfactorily accommodates a similar range of materials because it is a larger building than the porch.
9. As such, the porch does not compliment the valued characteristics of the cottage and its contribution to the significance of the conservation area. Nor does the traditional style of detailing and the use of stone and reclaimed materials overcome the harm caused by its scale and design.
10. The appellant has referred me to other examples of porches in the village, including those with an oak frame. Porches that are akin to what is found on the appeal property are not, though, a prevailing characteristic, in particular compared to the generally simpler form of the traditional cottage type properties. As a consequence, they do not change my conclusion.
11. I am also not unsympathetic to the practicalities of constructing a porch due to the levels, the position of the doorway and usability. However, strong protection is afforded to the historic environment through the planning system and, for the reasons that I have set out, this does not favour the porch.
12. The Authority has also raised concerns about whether the submitted plans adequately portray the position of the porch. As the porch is already in place, though, this has a limited bearing on my decision.
13. I conclude that the porch fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area, including the contribution of the appeal property. As such, it does not comply with Policies GSP1, GSP3, L1 and L3 of the Peak District National Park Local Development Framework, Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011) (CS) and with Policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC8 and DMH7 of the Development Management Policies (2019) (DMP). These policies, as well as securing the National Park's purposes, collectively provide for the protection of the historic environment, including conservation

areas as heritage assets, and concern matters of design and protecting local character. The same applies as regards the supplementary planning guidance and documents that the Authority has referred to in its decision.

14. The Authority accept that the shed and the decking are not unacceptable. The shed is of typical timber construction and of a modest size, as well as being well set back from the site frontage. The decking is also discretely located. These parts of the development preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area, including the contribution of the appeal property. They comply with Policies GSP1, GSP3, L1 and L3 of the CS and with Policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC8 and DMH7 of the DMP. No conditions are necessary as regards the shed and the decking as they are already in situ.

Conclusion

15. I conclude that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the small decking area and the shed but dismissed insofar as it relates to the porch.

Darren Hendley

INSPECTOR