



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2021

by M Shrigley BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/21/3279100

Bridge Barn, Castleton Road, Hathersage S32 1EH

- 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 Clare Taylor against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/DDD/1120/1126, dated 26 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey infill extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have considered the two reasons for refusal contested collectively as they both centre on design matters which can be dealt with in the round.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building.

Reasons

4. At my site visit I could see that the appeal building is a modest sized dwelling located within a rural setting. Its attractive stone brickwork with simple rustic door and window opening detailing are noticeable characteristics.
5. Peak District National Park Authority (PDNPA) have sought an assessment of how the design rationale of the scheme has considered impacts to the dwelling as a non-designated heritage asset. In doing so, PDNPA implies some existing knowledge of the building's significance. Indeed, local and national policy does support that approach where it is appropriate.
6. That said, there is no record of a request evidenced for further information during the planning application determination period leading to the appeal. The appellant also highlights the issue of subjectivity concerning whether the building, which has already been subject to conversion, should be treated as a non-designated asset.
7. Considering the content of the delegated report submitted there is no definitive evidence either way. In those circumstances I have focused my decision on the

- strength of the design of the scheme against the known background details provided by the appellant and the dwelling as it currently appears.
8. To that end, the submitted photographs of the appeal building prior to its conversion show that it previously had a small component of timber cladding to the front with an opening beneath and an enclosed stone gable end.
 9. The information provides me with important context of what the building looked like historically. The photographs clearly show that the present open sided section is a more recent change to the building's design. There is also the previous planning application referred to by the main parties underpinning the approved residential conversion.
 10. Based on the information available I have no cause to find that the principle of infilling the space, subject to appeal, for habitable use would be unacceptable. A sensitively designed infill scheme would not be inappropriate relative to the proportions of the dwelling. I also accept that a well-executed contrast in materials and a contemporary design can, in some instances, further enhance or compliment the appearance of older structures.
 11. Nonetheless, I am unconvinced that the appeal scheme would respect the character of the host building in its entirety. That is largely because the combination of first-floor glazing detailing on both the side gable as well as the south elevation on the submitted plan appears overly excessive and dominant. The style and design of the windows would not assimilate well with the proportions and position of other openings on the building, alongside its roof line, in combination with the proposed use of timber elsewhere and existing stone walls.
 12. There is nothing to suggest a more sensitive approach could not be utilised considering the historic photographs of the gable, which better integrates with the attractive attributes of the existing masonry including the rear elevation.
 13. Additionally, despite the presence of a small domestic gate the location of the new door proposed on the south elevation would appear too close to the existing door opening immediately adjacent. Present openings on the building have deliberate stone surround detailing and greater spacing between them. That change, alongside the other changes, would detract visually from the large arched main rear door opening feature.
 14. The appeal information does not persuade me that the scheme would offer sufficient enhancement or successfully integrate with the character of the property having regard to its most positive features without further amendment.
 15. I have considered scope for applying planning conditions to control the use of new external building materials to ensure quality and longevity; and to seek minor improvements. But reliance on that approach would not overcome my main concerns. Additionally, more substantial changes could lead to the consideration of a materially different scheme.
 16. Overall, I find that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the building. It conflicts with policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, and L3 of the Peak District National Park Local Development Framework, Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011); policies: DMC3, DMC5, and DMH7 of the Development Management Policies document,

Part 2 of the Local Plan for the Peak District National Park (2019); and the 'Design Guide' Supplementary Planning Document; which collectively encourage that local character and distinctiveness is respected, and that high-quality design is achieved. It also conflicts with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework which encourages similar principles.

Other Matters

17. I note there was public support for the scheme with the aim to further improve the appearance of the building, but those representations are not binding to my assessment or the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above the appeal does not succeed.

M Shrigley

INSPECTOR