



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 August 2021

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/W/21/3275739

Bennett Barn Farm, Sandy Lane, Chinley, High Peak, Derbyshire SK23 6AW

- 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 Mrs Caroline Monsini against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/HPK/0420/0329, dated 31 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 30th November 2020.
 - The development proposed is change of use and extension of existing domestic garage and hobbies room to form holiday let.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. It is apparent from the evidence provided that the porch extension has been erected and the bi-fold doors have been installed into the front opening since the application was determined.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are the suitability of the building for use as a holiday let in line with local policy and the effect of the extension on the character of the existing building.

Reasons

Suitability

4. Policy RT2 of the Peak District National Park Core Strategy (2011) (the CS) states that, amongst other matters, change of use proposals for self-catering accommodation must be linked to a traditional building of historic or vernacular merit and new build holiday accommodation will not be permitted apart from a new hotel in Bakewell.
5. According to the Statement of Case, the building has had an extant approval for a considerable amount of time, so whilst it may have a little age from a construction point of view, I would consider the garage to be a new building.
6. Therefore, I cannot consider the building to be 'traditional' in the sense of the wording of Policy RT2 of the CS and the proposals are effectively a new build.
7. I find there is nothing in the vernacular merit of the building. It was designed as a garage with space above and reflects that in the design. In making the changes in terms of the replacement for the garage door and the addition of

the porch, I consider that it still has the fundamental feel and design of the basic setup of a garage with space above, rather than holiday accommodation.

8. As such, I find that the proposals conflict with Policy RT2 of the CS as a new build looking to change the use to holiday accommodation conflicting with Paragraph (C) and is neither a historic building and is not of any vernacular merit therefore conflicting with paragraph (A) of the policy.

Character

9. The original design of the application proposals was for a garage with space above and it reflects that, despite the later addition of the bi-fold doors.
10. From the evidence provided it seems that there is the potential for enforcement issues, but that is for the Council to deal with and not a part of this appeal.
11. Nonetheless, the porch has been erected, and I find that it subtracts from the design expectations of a garage-style building.
12. Paragraph 7.13 of the Peak District National Park Authority Design Guide states that *'porches must be appropriate to the property and well designed. They rarely look right on small cottages.....They detract from the basic simplicity of such buildings'*
13. Whilst in this instance the host building was built as a garage, there is a desire from the appellant to use the building as living accommodation. If the Council consider that a porch 'can rarely look right on a small cottage', then there is little chance that a porch will look acceptable on a building that was designed and built as a garage. The porch extension looks incongruous attached to the side of the structure in that manner and detracts from the character of the traditional building.
14. I find the proposals are contrary to the guidance set out in the Peak District National Park Design Guide, as well as Policy GSP3 of the CS and Policy DMC3 of the Peak District National Park Development Management Policies (2019) which collectively, amongst other matters, expect proposals to pay attention to the impact of the development on the character of buildings and the degree in which buildings and their design reflect or complement the styles and traditions of the locality.

Other Matters

15. I have noted the comments regarding the personal circumstances of the appellant. In this instance I have identified harm from the proposals and cannot disregard that due to the onset of the COVID pandemic and how it has affected their business.
16. The appellant has referenced the nearby tourist accommodation (Dewsnaps Farm) as an example of acceptable development. I have not been supplied any details of this enterprise, nor do I know the context in which it was developed and operates. In any event I am bound to look at the current scheme on its own merits and I have identified harm in this instance.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR