



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/21/3276874

Daisy Bank, Shawfield Road, Newtown, Longnor SK17 0NE

- 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 P Mottram against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/SM/0221/0138, dated 2 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extension of dwelling including replacement outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations and extension of the dwelling including replacement outbuilding at Daisy Bank Newtown, Longnor SK17 0NE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref NP/SM/0221/0138, dated 2 February 2021, 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: 1313/03 Rev A and 1313/07 Rev A.
 - 3) All new stonework shall be in natural random gritstone, laid, coursed and pointed to match the stonework on the existing dwelling.
 - 4) The flue pipe on the approved outbuilding shall be painted matt black at the time of erection and shall be permanently so maintained.
 - 5) Prior to the approved development first being brought in to use, all new timberwork shall be finished in a muted, recessive colour, details of which shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the National Park Authority.
 - 6) The roof verges on the approved outbuilding shall be flush cement pointed, with no barge boards or projecting rafters.

Procedural Matter

2. 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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling has been extended on two occasions previously, with planning applications having been made in 2002 and 2013. The original part of the appeal dwelling is however of a significant age and character. Consequently, the property is referred to by the Authority as being a non-designated heritage asset, although no evidence pertaining to the process through which the asset was identified as such has been provided with the appeal. Irrespective of this, it is undeniable that the original part of the dwelling is a period property of some considerable character.
5. To its rear, the vast majority of the original dwelling has been covered by the extensions that have taken place. The ground level also rises substantially to the rear. Collectively, these factors mean that the character and appearance of the original dwelling has not been retained to its rear elevation, and in any event, this elevation is of limited visual impact due to the topography. The proposed extension to the dwelling would not be visible from the other side of the appeal site, closest to its vehicular entrance, due to the presence of the previous extensions. The side elevation of the original dwelling closest to the proposed extension would be physically unaffected by the proposal.
6. The front elevation of the original building has already been altered by the presence of the two-storey side extension that has taken place. In comparison, the proposed extension would be single storey and would be set well back from the front elevation. Whilst it would be visible within some views taken of the original front elevation and it would have a much higher glass to wall ratio, it would not detract from the character and appearance of, nor dominate, the original dwelling due to its positioning and limited overall size.
7. Reference has been made to the cumulative impact that the proposal would have in conjunction with the previously constructed extensions. Whilst the footprint of the original building appears to have been greatly exceeded by subsequent extensions to it, the impact in this respect has already arisen. The presence and impact of those extensions would be unaffected by the outcome of this appeal. The proposed extension would represent only a modest further extension and for the reasons outlined it would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property. Considered cumulatively with the previous extensions, the proposed extension would therefore be acceptable.
8. The Authority does not raise concern with the proposed replacement outbuilding, and I concur that this would result in an enhancement in comparison to the visual impact of the existing outbuildings. Although it is suggested that the eaves height of this proposed building should be reduced to reflect that of the appeal dwelling and that the design of the windows and doors on the side elevation should be amended to be a two-light opening, the outbuilding would stand visually distinct from the dwelling and would be visually read as different entity. Such amendments are not therefore necessary.

9. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling even if, as the Council suggest, the property should be considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. The proposal would therefore accord with Policies GSP3 and L3 of the Core Strategy 2011 and Policies DMC3, DMC5 and DMH7 of the Development Management Policies 2019, where they seek to protect character and appearance and non-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 Extensions & Alterations Detailed Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document in the same respects.

Conditions

10. Conditions relating to the time period to implement the permission and to the approved plans are necessary to provide certainty. Conditions with respect to the colour of the flue pipe, details of timberwork colour and roof verges are required to ensure that the development has an acceptable visual finish. It is also necessary to impose a condition to ensure that the stonework used on both the extension and outbuilding is laid, coursed and pointed to match that of the existing dwelling, again in the interests of securing an appropriate visual appearance.
11. It is not necessary to impose conditions relating to the eaves height of the proposed outbuilding or the design of its doors, for the reasons I have set out above.

Conclusion

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

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR