



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 14 September 2021

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/21/3275704

Pear Tree Farm, 34 Stubbins Lane, Chinley SK23 6AE

- 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 Krassowski against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/HPK/1220/1142, dated 30 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is to remove the existing front porch and replace this with a single storey front porch, new timber framed window to the front elevation and alterations to an existing rear window to form a door.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to remove the existing front porch and replace this with a single storey front porch, new timber framed window to the front elevation and alterations to an existing rear window to form a door at Pear Tree Farm, 34 Stubbins Lane, Chinley SK23 6AE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref NP/HPK/1220/1142, dated 30 November 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 100 and 200 Rev A.
 - 3) All new stonework, including lintols, cills and jambs shall be in natural gritstone, with all new walling faced, coursed and pointed to match the existing stonework.
 - 4) The new window and door frames to the existing dwelling shall be recessed and painted to match the existing windows and doors.
 - 5) All new rainwater goods shall be black to match the existing.

Procedural Matters

2. In accordance with the statutory duty set out in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Chinley Conservation Area (CA).
3. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) was published on 20 July 2021. This document does not however materially change the approach to the main issue arising from this householder appeal, when

compared to its predecessor, and therefore no further comments have been sought from the parties.

4. The Authority's delegated report does not raise concern with the new window and door that are proposed to be inserted into the existing dwelling and suggests that these would be permitted development. In any event, I find no reason to consider that there would be harm arising to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the CA from these elements of the proposal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed porch on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the CA.

Reasons

6. The appeal dwelling is formed from the original farmhouse, an attached former barn and a number of subsequent extensions, including the porch which is proposed to be removed as part of the appeal development. The site is located within the CA whose significance lies at least in part with the age and arrangement of period properties along the narrow Stubbins Lane. Although set at a higher ground level than Stubbins Lane and partially screened by established hedging on the front boundary, the appeal dwelling is nonetheless visible in some views from the public domain, and it makes a positive contribution to the CA.
7. Whilst the existing porch is not an original part of Pear Tree Farm, it is centrally positioned on the front elevation of the original farmhouse that faces Stubbins Lane, which affords a degree of symmetry in relation to that part of the dwelling. However, due in particular to other subsequent extensions that have taken place and the presence of the former barn, there is not an overriding symmetry to the overall front elevation in question, nor to the built footprint of the dwelling.
8. The proposed porch would adjoin the side elevation and catslide roof of the former barn. Its roof pitch would mirror that of the barn and it would have a lesser projection beyond the front elevation of the original farmhouse than the barn. It would also be partially screened from the public vantage points in which the appeal dwelling is most visible, due to the fact that the elevation of one of the more recent two storey side extensions projects forward of that of the original farmhouse.
9. The proposed porch would be of a modest size and would utilise external facing materials that would be appropriate for use on both the host dwelling and within the CA. As there is no clear symmetry to the front elevation of the appeal dwelling taken as a whole, and on consideration of the proposed positioning of the porch in relation to other existing parts of the dwelling and to the public domain in general, the proposed porch would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the CA.
10. The Design Guide 2007 and the Alterations & Extensions Detailed Design Guide Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) make reference to porches, including with respect to the use of internal solutions, the positioning of porches on elevations, their designs and in terms of windows and doors on their side elevations. However, in the circumstances of the appeal case, the proposed porch would not undermine the overarching objectives of these

documents to deliver design solutions that would be visually acceptable and appropriate.

11. For these reasons, I conclude that there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the CA as a result of the proposed development. The character and appearance of the CA would therefore be preserved. Consequently, the proposal would accord with Policies GSP1, GSP3 and L3 of the Core Strategy 2011 and Policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC8 and DMH7 of the Development Management Policies 2019, where they seek to protect character and appearance and designated heritage assets, including in terms of the National Park's legal purposes and duty. There would also be no conflict with the aims of the SPDs or The Framework in the same respects.

Conditions

12. It is necessary to impose conditions relating to the time period for carrying out the proposed development and the approved plans in the interests of providing certainty. Conditions relating to stonework and rainwater goods are necessary to ensure that the proposal is visually appropriate with respect to the host dwelling and within the CA.
13. The plans submitted do not suggest that the windows and the door of the proposed porch would be recessed, but it is not necessary for this to occur in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of this element. Nor is it necessary for the oak framed porch to be painted to match the existing windows and doors. To achieve an acceptable visual appearance, it is however required that the proposed new window and door to the existing dwelling be recessed to match the recess of the existing windows and doors and that they be painted to match.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR