



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2021

by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/W/20/3263216

Bowstone Gate Farm, Mudhurst Lane, Disley, Cheshire SK12 2AW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a grant of planning permission subject to conditions.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Jo Twemlow against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/CEC/0620/0478, dated 25 May 2020, was approved on 24 August 2020 and planning permission was granted subject to conditions.
 - The development permitted is new roof gablets and windows. New roof to outbuilding.
 - The condition in dispute is No 2 which states that: The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the submitted plans, received by the Authority 3 June 2020 and subject to the following conditions or modifications;
 - i) Notwithstanding what is shown on the above submitted plans, no permission is hereby granted for the raising of the first floor window openings and the addition of roof gablets which are both hereby omitted from the approved scheme.
 - The reason given for the condition is: For clarity and for the avoidance of doubt and in respect of 2i) to avoid harm to the valued character and appearance of this traditional house and non-designated heritage asset.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. The appellant is seeking to vary condition 2 of the planning permission Ref NP/CEC/0620/0478 to allow the implementation of the window alterations and addition of roof gablets precluded as part of a grant of planning permission for development to Bowstone Gate Farm.
3. Based on the evidence, the main issue is whether the condition is necessary and reasonable having regard to the landscape and scenic beauty of the Peak District National Park and the host property as a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

4. Bowstone Gate Farm is identified on the Park Authority's Historic Buildings and Monuments Records as a farmstead from the Georgian to Victorian period. The Authority considers the building to be an early example of an historic farmstead dating from at least the late 19th Century and a non-designated heritage asset.

5. The appeal site is in an elevated, prominent, and isolated location at the end of a road with public footpaths located broadly to the west and south. It is a historic farmstead with adjacent single storey sheds in a high-quality landscape where the farmstead makes a major contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape.
6. Bowstone Gate Farm has a simple ridged roof with side gable walls and low eaves. It is a strong, solid, and well-proportioned structure that has a horizontal emphasis which readily harmonises with the landscape.
7. The introduction of gablets would break the eaves line and would erode the simple form and horizontal emphasis of the building. I appreciate that the porch to the front is a large feature of the elevation. However, I do not consider that the introduction of the gablets would balance the size of the porch, rather the gablets would detract from the simple form of the roof structure and add vertical emphasis to the building.
8. Overall, and irrespective of the small scale of the proposal, the proposed gablets would not conserve or enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the National Park, to which the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) gives great weight.
9. Further, in accordance with paragraph 197 of the Framework, I have taken into account the effect of the development on the significance of Bowstone Gate Farm as a non-designated heritage asset. I find that, on balance, the gablets would be detrimental to the character of the building and hence its significance.
10. I appreciate that a more comprehensive view would be possible from the upper windows were they to be repositioned. Even so, there is no evidence that the current position of the windows results in living conditions that are prejudicial to its occupants.
11. I have had regard to examples of other similar gablet details on properties in the vicinity of the site and I saw some of these during my site visit. The character of Bowstone Gate Farm is a function of its original use, location, and simple design. Therefore, the design of other properties on the approach to the appeal site do not set a precedent for such detailing on the appeal building.
12. Overall, I conclude that the condition restricting the implementation of the window alterations and roof gablets is necessary and reasonable having regard to the landscape and scenic beauty of the Peak District National Park and the host property as a non-designated heritage asset. The proposal would conflict with Policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L1 and L3 of the Peak District National Park Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document adopted October 2011 and Policies DMC3 and DMC5 of the Development Management Policies Part 2 of the Local Plan. These require, among other things, that development should conserve and enhance the character and quality of the local landscape and countryside and the special qualities of the National Park and ensure that alterations do not detract from the character and appearance of the original building or non-designated heritage asset.
13. The proposal would also conflict with the Peak District National Park Detailed Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document alterations and extensions where it states that it is poor conservation practice to alter the shape of

existing openings. For the reasons given, there would also be conflict with the Framework.

Other Matters

14. I appreciate that the appellant sought pre-application advice about the possibility of introducing gablets. However, this advice was not conclusive and does not affect my consideration of the main issue.
15. I note the colour palette proposed for the window detail. The colour of the paint to the windows is not a determinative factor in the consideration of this appeal.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR