
Appeal Decisions

Hearing Held on 16 and 17 March 2021

Site visit made on 17 August 2021

by Jillian Rann BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 September 2021

Appeal A: APP/M9496/W/19/3234848

The Grange, Greaves Lane, Ashford In The Water DE45 1QH

- 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 Mark Twelves against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/DDD/1118/1051, dated 9 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'internal alterations and extension'.
-

Appeal B: APP/M9496/Y/19/3234846

The Grange, Greaves Lane, Ashford In The Water DE45 1QH

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mark Twelves against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/DDD/1118/1053, dated 9 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2019.
 - The works proposed are internal alterations and extension.
-

Decisions

1. **Appeal A** is dismissed.
2. **Appeal B** is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. Since the applications were refused, the Authority has adopted the Development Management Policies document (the DMP) in May 2019. The Authority has confirmed that the DMP now forms part of the development plan and that the Peak District National Park Local Plan adopted March 2001 (the 2001 Local Plan) is now superseded. I have considered the appeal accordingly. The relevant DMP policies, and those from the Authority's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (the Core Strategy), are referred to in the main parties' statements and the Statement of Common Ground. Both parties have therefore had the opportunity to comment on the matter.
4. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021. I have given the main parties the opportunity to comment on this and have considered the appeal on the basis of the revised Framework.

5. A revised floor plan drawing (number 202 Revision D) was submitted by the appellant during the appeal. It shows the existing lintel and nib to the doorway between the rear hall and the existing kitchen being retained, whereas the version which formed the basis of the Authority's decisions (number 202 Revision C) indicated the proposed removal of those features. On the basis that the revision is very minor and relates to the retention of a feature which already exists I have based my decisions on Revision D and am satisfied that no party would be prejudiced by my having done so.
6. The appeals relate to a grade II listed building in a conservation area. I am mindful of my statutory duties under sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) and have considered the appeal accordingly.
7. The site is in a National Park. An EIA Screening Opinion has been issued by the Authority, which concludes that an Environmental Statement is not necessary in this instance. On the basis of the proposal and details before me I have no reason to reach a different conclusion.

Main Issues

8. The main issues are whether the proposal would preserve the grade II listed building, The Grange, and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses and whether it would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Ashford-in-the-Water Conservation Area (AWCA).

Reasons

Special interest and significance

9. The Grange is a detached stone dwelling in the village of Ashford-in-the-Water. The home of a relatively wealthy farming family in the past, the dwelling has been extended and altered over time and includes sections dating from the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries. Its architectural detailing and elements of its plan form and circulation routes, including differences in floor levels within the building, remain as evidence of those phases of building and of its changing plan form and appearance over time.
10. Attached to the east of the house is a linear range of stone outbuildings which have been converted to domestic use as part of the dwelling, but historically served ancillary functions, including a cartshed on part of the ground floor and a granary above. Evidence of their historic functions remains in the external appearance and detailing of those buildings, including an external stone staircase, leading to the former granary, and a large cart opening in the northern elevation. Some domestic openings have been installed in their eastern gable and southern elevations. Nonetheless, the former outbuildings have maintained their strong linear form and high solid to void ratio to their external walls. They have thus preserved their simple, robust, functional appearance and form, and remain clearly legible as former ancillary outbuildings, distinct from the historic domestic parts of the building which have more extensive and larger openings.
11. Insofar as it relates to this appeal, the special interest of the listed building is derived from its historic interest as the home of a wealthy farming family within the village, from its phasing and the historic fabric and distinctive architectural

details from those various phases, and from the elements of its plan form and architectural detailing which remain as evidence of its evolution as a wealthy farmers residence with associated ancillary structures, reflecting the changing circumstances of its occupants.

12. The AWCA encompasses much of the village of Ashford-in-the-Water, including its historic core and roads which extend away from it. As well as mills and a marble works, whose workers were housed in the small cottages which line its road frontages, the village also had farming associations. Large, detached farmhouses surrounded by ancillary outbuildings remain as evidence of those associations. The historic cottages and larger dwellings are mainly two storeys and of stone construction, but vary in their size and situation. They provide variety and interest to the street scenes and remain as evidence of the village's historic growth and origins. Insofar as it relates to this appeal, the significance of the AWCA is drawn from those buildings which have retained their historic appearance and detailing as houses associated with the village's industry and agriculture. As the former dwelling of a wealthy farming family, with ancillary outbuildings attached and within its grounds, the appeal site makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the AWCA, and its significance.

Extension and alterations to the former cartshed and granary buildings

13. A single storey extension is proposed in the gap between the eastern end of the former cartshed and the small, detached outbuilding beyond it. The extension would also wrap around the southern elevation of the former cartshed at ground floor level. It would have a flat roof with a glazed lantern feature. Its northern elevation would be blank and finished in stonework. Its southern elevation, facing the garden, would have four sets of glazed double doors, with narrow stone pillars between them.
14. The large areas of glazing would clearly mark the extension as a modern addition. However, located at the end of the range of outbuildings, the extension would appear somewhat separate from what were, historically, the domestic parts of the former farmhouse, and it would be read against the backdrop of the former ancillary outbuildings. In that context, because of its large areas of glazing, the extension would not respect or maintain the high solid to void ratio which characterises the former outbuildings and which has been preserved despite their conversion to domestic use. As a result, the extension would appear as an unduly domestic and highly incongruous addition which would significantly erode the distinctive, functional character of the former outbuildings.
15. Furthermore, the extension's large footprint would wrap around the end of the former cartshed and extend for some distance alongside its southern elevation. Although the extension would be single storey and the upper floor of the former outbuilding would remain evident above, the extension's size and 'wraparound' form would subsume and disrupt the linear form of the range of outbuildings.
16. Part of the extension would be built on the site of a now-demolished outbuilding which, historically, attached the eastern end of the cartshed to the outbuilding to the east. However, the proposed extension would be larger than that former outbuilding and wrap around the southern elevation of the former cartshed. Its appearance and effect on the listed building would therefore not be comparable to that historic outbuilding, and the former presence of that

smaller structure does not alter my conclusions regarding the harm I have identified.

17. The other elevations of the extension would be blank and built in stonework to match the existing outbuildings. However, for the reasons given, the extension would introduce an incongruous domestic element which would erode the simple appearance and linear form of the range of outbuildings and the understanding of their historic relationship to, but differing function from, the domestic parts of the former farmhouse. It would therefore harm the appearance and legibility of the listed building.
18. The works would also include the removal of large sections of the southern and eastern walls of the former cartshed at ground floor level, creating an open plan living area which would continue into the proposed extension. Although they do not include historic openings, those sections of stonework contribute to the simple, functional appearance of the historic outbuildings. Parts of the walls would be retained in the corners of the existing building and it may be possible to re-use some of the stone in the construction of the proposed extension. Nevertheless, the works would result in the loss of that stonework from the external elevations of the historic outbuilding. Furthermore, because of their size, the openings would harm the legibility of the ground floor plan form of the former cartshed. As a result, they would erode the contribution that the walls and fabric make to the historic and architectural interest of the building.
19. A large section of the internal wall between the former cartshed and the pantry would also be removed, resulting in the loss of historic fabric from the ground floor walls of the granary, one of the oldest parts of the building. Even if some of the stone could be re-used in other parts of the proposed works, from the evidence before me, I cannot be certain that it would be possible to re-use all of it, or that its loss could thus be avoided.
20. Furthermore, even though parts of the walls would be retained to either side, and the opening would have a downstand beam, the size of the proposed opening would significantly erode the sense of separation between the cartshed and the ground floor of the outbuilding below the former granary, instead creating an area which would be read as a large, open plan space. The removal of the wall would therefore unacceptably erode the cellular plan form of those spaces, their legibility as separate areas within the former outbuildings and thus the understanding of their different, distinct functions as part of the wider farmstead. Although they were built as ancillary structures, because of the inextricable historic relationship between the former outbuildings and the farmhouse to which they are attached, the harm to their historic plan form and legibility would harm the special interest of the listed building.
21. I have been referred to examples of glazed extensions to historic buildings which have been permitted by the Authority, and to examples in photographs in the Authority's Design Guide and Alterations and Extensions: Detailed Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (the Alterations and Extensions SPD). However, although there was discussion of some of those examples at the hearing, I do not have full details of those other developments or the circumstances in which they were built. Therefore, I cannot be certain that they were directly comparable in all respects to those in the case before me. In any event, I have considered the appeals on their own merits.

22. It has been suggested that the works would represent a further phase in the evolution of the building. However, although the building has changed over time, for the reasons given I find that the particular works proposed in this case would harm, rather than preserve the building's special interest.
23. Because of its location to the rear of the main building and the screening provided by tree cover around parts of the site boundaries, views of the extension from surrounding roads and footpaths would be limited, although glimpses would be possible from parts of the neighbouring land and the track to the east of the site's garden. However, in any event, the character and appearance of conservation areas are not solely defined by the areas within them which are publicly visible. Notwithstanding the somewhat limited range of views, the harm to the appearance of The Grange, a significant listed building within the AWCA, would also result in harm to the appearance of the AWCA.

Removal of toilet walls on the ground floor below the former granary

24. The toilet adjacent to the existing kitchen was a later insertion into the ground floor of the outbuilding below the former granary. It was not part of the historic plan form of that former outbuilding and does not contribute to the legibility or understanding of that space and its function as part of a former ancillary structure to the farmhouse. The removal of those partition walls would not result in harm to the historic plan form or the loss of fabric of specific historic interest, and therefore would not harm the special interest of the listed building.

Works to the utility/store room

25. Based on the presence of a double-chamfered window opening in the northern wall of what is now the utility/store room, that room appears to be within one of the oldest parts of the building, dating from the 17th century.
26. Above the southern wall of the utility/store room, a timber beam is visible. The beam's wide chamfered detail indicates that it also dates from the 17th century. It is proposed to remove a relatively wide section of the wall below that beam to create an opening between the utility/store room and the adjacent southern hallway. The beam itself would be retained as part of the proposed works. However, whilst changes have been made to the form and layout of the building around that central section since the 17th century, from the evidence before me I cannot be certain of the exact nature or age of the partition wall which is proposed to be removed below the beam, or whether it is of historic significance. Therefore, insufficient information has been provided to allow the potential impact of removing a large section of that wall to be understood, as is required by paragraph 194 of the Framework.
27. In the northern wall of the utility/store room, on the other side of the chimney breast from the double-chamfered window opening referred to above, there is a further recess. It is proposed to enlarge that opening and knock it through to create a doorway between the eastern part of the utility/store room and what is currently the kitchen.
28. As the recess has splayed sides and is located at a similar height to the 17th century window on the other side of the fireplace, it has been suggested that it may also have been a window historically. However, there is nothing visible of the recess from within the kitchen on the other side of the wall and,

from the limited evidence before me, I cannot be certain as to its nature or its historic function or significance. Even if there was a window opening running through the wall in this position historically, the works to create the proposed doorway would involve the removal of historic fabric from above and below it. From the evidence before me, I do not have sufficient information to allow me to understand the significance of the opening or the potential impact of removing that fabric, as is required by paragraph 194 of the Framework.

29. The appellant suggested at the hearing that the proposed internal layout could be amended to omit the proposal to create a doorway in the northern wall. However, I must deal with the proposal which is before me, and this suggestion does not alter my conclusions above.

Enlargement of doorway between rear hall and existing kitchen

30. These works would remove a section of door jamb which has been inserted into part of the 17th century, double-chamfered window opening in the northern wall of the utility/store room. That section of door jamb is an unsympathetic later addition which obscures and erodes the appearance of the 17th century window opening at present. Therefore, and as the historic lintel and nib to the doorway would be retained, the works proposed to this doorway would represent an enhancement to the architectural interest of the building.

Insertion of partition wall in existing kitchen to create utility room and passage

31. The existing kitchen was created by infilling an area between the older parts of the building around it and the former granary structure. It is not one of the oldest parts of the building. Nevertheless, it appears to have been present by the mid-19th century, and its creation and the relocation of the kitchen to this room represent a phase in the historic evolution and rearrangement of the former farmhouse. It therefore has significance as part of the listed building's historic phasing and contributes to its historic and architectural interest.
32. The kitchen is a broadly square space with a central chimney breast on its western wall. The chimney breast has been altered and the fireplace removed to create an opening to accommodate a range cooker. However, its presence in the centre of that wall remains, preserving the historic plan form and sense of symmetry to the room's composition and proportions.
33. A partition wall is proposed within the existing kitchen to subdivide the space into a utility room and a corridor. As the partition wall would abut the side of the existing fireplace, it would disrupt the layout and symmetrical composition of the room. It would therefore cause harm to the proportions and plan form of the kitchen and the legibility of its form and function in the context of the historic evolution and phasing of the building. It would therefore fail to preserve the historic and architectural interest of the listed building.
34. I was advised that the works to install the partition would be reversible. However, its installation would be part of a wider reorganisation of the house, including the relocation of the kitchen and the creation of a utility room and corridor in its place. On that basis I find it unlikely that the partition would be removed, or its effects reversed, in reality. In any event, the partition would cause harm to the plan form, proportions and legibility of the building whilst it was present. Therefore, this does not alter my conclusions on the matter.

Enlargement of existing opening between kitchen and toilet

35. It is proposed to widen the southern opening in the east wall of the existing kitchen, which provides access to the toilet on the ground floor of the former granary building at present. Although the opening may be later than those in other parts of the house, its modest proportions are consistent with those older doorways and, in its current form, it preserves the sense of separation and distinction between the kitchen and the former outbuildings beyond.
36. The enlargement of the opening would result in the loss of historic fabric. Because of its width, the enlarged opening would also open up views between the hallway which is proposed within the existing kitchen and the rooms within the former outbuildings beyond. As a result, it would erode the sense of separation and distinction between what were, historically, the domestic parts of the former farmhouse and the former ancillary outbuildings, and thus the understanding of their differing historic functions. It would therefore harm the plan form and legibility of the listed building.

Replacement of external terrace

37. The external terrace was added in the late 1990s, after the building was listed. It is not of specific historic or architectural interest and the proposal to remove and reconfigure parts of it would not harm the special interest of the listed building.

Conclusion on the main issues

38. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposals would cause harm to the special interest of the listed building and harm to the appearance of the AWCA. Given the scale and nature of the proposals, the harm arising would be less than substantial. However, I give considerable importance and weight to that harm and to the presumption that preservation is desirable. The Framework requires any such harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
39. I have been advised that the property was in poor condition when it was purchased and that the current owners have undertaken significant repairs to it. I have no reason to doubt this. The proposed works would provide extended and reconfigured accommodation which would be of benefit to the current and future occupants of the dwelling, However, such benefits would be essentially private, rather than public in nature. Moreover, although I have had regard to comments made regarding the constraints of some aspects of the building's layout and circulation routes, it has not been demonstrated that the works proposed would be necessary to secure the property's continued residential use, or thus necessary to secure the optimal viable use of the building.
40. The removal of the door jamb from the 17th century window opening alongside the doorway between the rear hall and the existing kitchen would result in a modest enhancement to that part of the listed building and thus some public benefit. However, the public benefits arising in that regard would be modest and would not be sufficient to outweigh the great importance and weight I afford to the harm that would arise from the other works proposed.
41. Therefore, the public benefits put forward in support of the scheme would not outweigh the harm to the listed building and AWCA that I have identified.

42. The appellant has stated that it is their intention to remove ventilation ducts and reinstate a window opening in the eastern wall of the building. They also refer to proposals to repair and restore the detached outbuilding to the east of the former cartshed. However, those works are not part of the proposals before me and I do not have full details of what is intended in those regards. Therefore, I cannot be certain of the nature of those works or their likely effects on the special interest of the listed building, or afford them weight as public benefits.
43. Some aspects of the proposals would not cause harm to the listed building. However, the absence of harm is neutral, rather than a matter to be weighed in favour of the scheme.
44. The Framework makes it clear that the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted. Accordingly, although the appellant has indicated that historic fabric could be recorded before being removed, I have not taken this into account in considering the proposals or in reaching my conclusions above.
45. I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the grade II listed building, The Grange, and would harm the appearance of the AWCA. It would therefore conflict with Policies L3, GSP1, GSP2 and GSP3 of the Core Strategy and Policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC7, DMC8 and DMH7 of the DMP which seek to protect the characteristics of the National Park, including its buildings, and require proposals to preserve or enhance listed buildings and conservation areas, including with reference to the design of extensions. It would also conflict with the Authority's Design Guide and the Alterations and Extensions SPD, which provide further guidance in those regards, and it would fail to satisfy the requirements of the LBCA Act and the Framework.

Conclusion

Appeal A

46. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations which indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, I conclude that **Appeal A** should be dismissed.

Appeal B

47. For the reasons given, I conclude that **Appeal B** should be dismissed.

Jillian Rann
INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mark Twelves
Caroline McIntyre MRTPI
Kathryn Sather MCIFA

Simon Gedye RIBA

Appellant
Agent
Kathryn Sather & Associates, Heritage
Conservation Consultants
Architect, Studio Gedye Ltd

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Andrea Needham BA (Hons) DipURP

Sue Adam BSc (Hons) MA

Senior Planner, Peak District National Park
Authority

Conservation Officer, Peak District National
Park Authority

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED DURING THE HEARING

1. Suggested conditions regarding: the removal of vegetation within the bird nesting season; the retention of ceiling beams in the proposed kitchen and dining room; and the re-use of stone from walls to be demolished in the construction of the proposed extension.
2. Peak District National Park Authority Design Guide – full document and extracts.
3. Alterations and Extensions: Detailed Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document – full document and extracts.
4. Appellant's agreement to pre-commencement condition.