
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 August 2021

by C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/21/3273472

Moor Edge, New Road, Bamford S33 0AD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs P Grayson against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/HPK/0720/0636, dated 9 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 October 2020.
 - The application sought planning permission for the demolition of outbuildings and erection of a two storey extension and subterranean accommodation with link to existing house without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref NP/HPK/0819/0835, dated 3 April 2020.
 - 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 amended plans '001A', '021B', '022A' '023B', '024A', '025A', '031A', and specifications, subject to the following conditions or modifications.
 - The reason given for the condition is: to minimise the impact of the development on the surroundings and to safeguard the landscape character of the area and to ensure a satisfactory detailed design, which is in character with the local building tradition and the character of the National Park.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. During the course of the appeal the updated National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021) (the Framework) was published. The parties were provided with an opportunity to comment on its relevance to this appeal, and I have taken any subsequent comments received into account in my determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed revisions to the approved plans on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its setting.

Reasons

4. Moor Edge is a substantial, split-level detached property sitting in a large plot overlooking the valley below. The dwelling is of stone construction with

landscaped gardens to all sides. Access is taken from New Road along a track which passes redundant stable buildings. The proposal seeks to amend the approved development by increasing the overall height of the outbuilding, enlarging the underground storage area, amending the garage door to the gable end and windows to the front.

5. The Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) advises that in the countryside or on the edge of settlements, buildings should sit comfortably in the landscape. It goes on to state that the basic principles of designing in sympathy with the local tradition and ensuring a simple form and appropriate scale and detailing can be summarised as, amongst other things; a simple plan and roof shape; high solid to void ratio; and the types and number of openings should be kept to a minimum and arranged with care.
6. The windows in the front elevation of the outbuilding and the garage door in the gable would both be increased in width substantially. The principle of a garage is not in dispute, although these elements would be departures from the more traditional openings seen in the National Park which generally feature a much higher solid to void ratio. This would be compounded by the prominence in the local area of the host dwelling given its scale and position on the hillside. As such the low solid to void ratio to the front of the outbuilding and gable end caused by the modern appearance of the windows and garage door would be harmful to both the host dwelling and its setting, contrary to advice contained in the SPD.
7. The overall height of the proposed extension's ridge would increase by 600mm, while the eaves would also increase. While this would create more of a vertical emphasis of the outbuilding, it would fall well below the corresponding ridge and eaves heights of the host dwelling and appear subordinate in scale while also respecting the form of the host building. Moreover, the increase in area of the subterranean store would be minimal. This would expand into the area which the stables currently occupy which are proposed to be removed. Any increase in mass would not be readily visible from views within the site aside from the retaining wall and door. As such these elements of the proposal would not harm the main building or its setting.
8. I have had regard to the appellant's statement of case including comments that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, ecology or highway safety. These matters are not in dispute. I would also agree that the removal of the redundant stable buildings would bring some enhancement to the appearance of the host dwelling and the wider site. Be that as it may, a lack of harm in other respects would be neutral in the decision-making process and would not outweigh the harm I have identified.
9. With the above factors in mind, the proposed changes to the approved plans would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. As such the proposal would be contrary to policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3 and GSP4 of the Peak District National Park Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted October 2011) and policies DMC3, DMH7 and DMH8 of the Development Management Policies (adopted May 2019). These seek, among other things, to ensure that development respects, conserves and enhances valued characteristics of the site and buildings, including impact on the character and setting of these

buildings. The proposal would also be contrary to advice contained in the SPD and the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host building and its setting. As such it would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C McDonagh

INSPECTOR