



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 13 January 2021

By M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/W/20/3246674

Meadow Farm, Crowdecote, Buxton, Derbyshire SK17 0DB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant consent, agreement or approval to details required by a condition of a planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Stephen Campeau against the decision of the Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/DIS/1119/1202, dated 3 November 2019, sought approval of details pursuant to condition No 7 of a planning permission Ref NP/DDD/0218/0096, granted on 1 May 2018.
 - The application was refused by notice dated 9 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Conversion and change of use to ancillary dwelling of redundant traditional stone shippon'.
 - The details for which approval is sought are: Details of the windows and doors to be incorporated into the development.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and the approval of the details is refused, namely details of the windows and doors to be incorporated into the building submitted in pursuance of condition 7 attached to planning permission Ref. NP/DDD/0218/0096 dated 1 May 2018.

Preliminary Matters

2. The development has been screened in accordance with the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations 2017. It has been concluded that the development would not be of a scale and nature likely to result in a significant environmental impact and EIA is therefore not required.
3. The appeal form indicated that the appeal was against non-determination of the application seeking to discharge Condition 7. Whilst the evidence before me suggests that the Council did not give notice of its decision within the statutory period, the appellant has confirmed that they did not serve a Deemed Discharge Notice (DDN) to the Council under Article 29 of the Development Management Procedure Order (DMPO), therefore there can be no deemed consent. The Council has also confirmed that, notwithstanding the date on the Council's refusal notice of 9 January 2020, there was a delay in despatching the decision until 15 January 2020. The evidence before me confirms that the appellant received the decision on 20 January 2020 and therefore before their appeal was lodged on 10 February 2020. On that basis, I have assessed the appeal on the basis that it is an appeal against a refusal to approve details

required by a condition of a planning permission and not as an appeal against non-determination.

4. The Council has drawn my attention to several development plan policies. Whilst these policies are not referred to in Condition 7, they are material to my assessment given they form part of the adopted development plan for the area and are relevant to the consideration of matters under the main issue relating to character and appearance.

Background and Main Issue

5. The Council granted planning permission for the conversion of a barn to an ancillary dwelling subject to several conditions. Condition 7 requires amongst other things detailed drawings at a scale 1:20, including sections and details of the final finish of the windows and doors. The reason given for the condition was in the interests of the character and appearance of the development.
6. The main issue therefore is whether or not the details of the doors and windows meet the requirements of condition 7 having regard to the reason it was imposed, the development plan and national policy.

Reasons

7. The appeal building relates to an attractive two-storey barn at Meadow Farm. The simplicity of the building in terms of its form, the modest proportions of its window and door openings, and the facing materials incorporated give it distinct traditional qualities which strongly allude to its historical agrarian origins. I am not aware that the building is on any local list. Whether this is the case or not, the Council is of the view the building has some heritage value and suggests it should be considered a non-designated heritage asset. I agree that the distinct architectural merits of the building are of a degree of significance that merit this description.
8. The conversion and change of use of the building includes utilising the existing window and door openings. In that regard the development has the potential to have a positive impact on the preservation of the building. However, preserving the integrity of historical buildings comes down to fine details. Therefore, sympathetic window and door detailing is integral to ensuring that the building's distinctive traditional qualities are not compromised. As the Council have suggested, historic farm buildings such as the appeal building would more often incorporate painted timber or cast-iron window frames. Doors would usually be of a stable type or fully boarded up vertical planks, often with metal strap hinges and simple metal latch handles.
9. I acknowledge that the windows and doors would not be of uPVC construction. However, even if the composite material used for the flush casement window frames and the doors would not be highly perceptible in distant views, I am not persuaded that a lack of visual prominence should on its own be determinative. The building is also appreciated for its splendour when close up. The photographs of composite windows provided show black hinge elements to the external surface which together with the composite materials and the 'Painswick Grey' colour scheme would be overly modern. The glazed panel, door handle and letter box that are shown on the brochure detail provided would have an overtly contemporary and domestic appearance and would not hark back to the origins of the building. Consequently, the composition and

- appearance of the windows and doors would erode the traditional characteristics of the building and would undermine its integrity.
10. The appellant contends that the Council did not previously identify the building as a non-designated heritage, rather that it had been referred to as a 'valued vernacular building'. Either way, the latter description and the inclusion of a condition requiring 1:20 scale drawings, sections and the final finish indicates that the Council had attached importance to building and the finer details of its conversion. The suggestion that door handles or any other fenestration on the door could be subject to further discussions presents a further difficulty given such details are not before me and therefore cannot be discharged.
 11. With regards to the suggestion that modern materials have been used on other barn conversions in the area, my attention has not been drawn to any specific examples. In any case, I am not persuaded that an incremental erosion of the character and appearance of traditional buildings within the locality would justify inappropriate materials and detailing being used on the appeal building.
 12. I acknowledge that the proposed modern materials may have qualities which mean that they could perform better than more traditional materials such as timber in terms of their energy efficiency rating and likely future maintenance requirements. Even so, such benefits would not outweigh the significant harm that would result to the character and appearance of the building and the significance of this non-designated heritage asset.
 13. I conclude that the details of windows and doors provided would have a significantly harmful impact on the character and appearance of the building. In that regard the details would conflict with the purpose of Condition 7 and the character and conservation aims in GSP3 (Development Management Principles) and L3 (Cultural heritage assets or archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance) of the Peak District National Park Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011), Policies DMC3 (Siting, design, layout and landscaping), DMC5 (Assessing the impact of development on heritage assets and their settings) and DMC10 (Conversion of heritage assets) of the Peak District National Park Development Management Policies (2019) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR