



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 2 November 2021

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/21/3280691

Snelslow Farm, Hernstone Lane, Peak Forest SK17 8EJ

- 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 Paul Denton against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/HPK/0321/0291, dated 10 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing garage to be replaced with 2 storey linked side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Neither party expresses a view regarding any effect on the Peak Forest and Old Dam Conservation Area (Conservation Area). Nonetheless, I have had special regard to the statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, especially as the proposal involves external alterations to the building.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing building, having regard also to its conservation area location, and also the effect on the openness of the Peak District National Park within which it falls.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises of a large, detached farmhouse building. It has a broadly rectangular form and is constructed with rubble limestone as the facing material. The site is situated towards the periphery of Peak Forest, with open countryside that rises towards the east.
5. The Authority consider the main farmhouse building to be a non-designated heritage asset. Its significance derives from its traditional architecture, where its materials and appearance reflect its agricultural origins, and from its relationship with the landscape. The proposed link extension would be larger than the garage/store that it would replace. The projection past the original rear of the house would however be minimal, but its height and two storey form would be similar to that of the main building. I appreciate that the proposal has been designed to appear separate from the existing built

structures, but its overall size and massing would result in it appearing overly dominant on the existing farmhouse building.

6. The proposal would make use of the same stone as the main farmhouse and the existing structure that it would replace. It would also utilise timber boarding to the upper sections of the walls. I note the appellant's rationale on this is to reduce the elevational mass of the proposal and for it to be read as a subservient addition to the existing building. Nevertheless, the timber boarding would not be in keeping with the rubble limestone walling that is typical of the area. Although such material variations may have been used when extending other farmhouse buildings, in this context it would detract from the traditional character of the existing building. The frameless glazed link element of the proposal, whilst also differing from the design of the existing building, would be of a limited footprint, have a single storey height and be discreetly sited. As such, I do not consider it would be harmful.
7. I appreciate the front and rear elevations have limited openings and, in this respect, they reflect the simple form of the host dwelling. The proposed building would however incorporate large bi-folding doors on the highly visible eastern elevation. Although this would maximise views, it would detract from the agricultural character and traditional appearance of the existing building, and in turn, diminish its contribution to the wider rural setting.
8. I conclude therefore that the proposal would not conserve or enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the Peak District National Park. As such, the proposal would conflict with Policies GSP1 and GSP3 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document and Policies DMH7 and DMC3 of the Development Management Policies. Together these policies seek to secure the statutory purposes of the National Park and protect, and where possible, enhance the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape. The proposal would also conflict with the Peak District National Park Authority's Design Guide and the aims of Paragraph 176 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. Although reference has been made to the Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document, I have not been provided with a copy of this document.
9. As I have mentioned, the appeal site is within the Peak Forest and Old Dam Conservation Area. I have been provided with little information on the Conservation Area, but from my site observations, its significance lies in the historic settlement pattern with scattered development in a rural setting. The proposal, which would harm the traditional architectural form of the appeal building, would also adversely affect both the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Although this would be less than substantial, this still attracts considerable weight against the proposal. There are no public benefits that would outweigh this harm.
10. The appellant has referenced previous approvals that have remained unimplemented and stated that the current scheme would better provide for the family needs of the appellant than those consents. I attach some weight to this matter, but it would be insufficient against the substantial weight I attach to the harm I have found in relation to the proposals' effect on the National Park and, moreover, the building itself and its conservation area location.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR