



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2021

by David Jones BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/21/3283171

Brookfield, Brookfield Lane, Bakewell DE45 1AN

- 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 Duncan Taylor against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/DDD/0521/0593, dated 26 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is two-storey and single-storey extensions to side. Single storey extension to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the two-storey and single-storey extensions to side and single storey extension to rear at Brookfield, Brookfield Lane, Bakewell, DE45 1AN, in accordance with application, Ref NP/DDD/0521/0593, dated 26 May 2021, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Peak District National Park.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an attractive detached dwelling constructed in gritstone with a slate tile roof, situated in a secluded location relatively well screened from external view. The property has existing single storey additions to the rear and both side elevations, as well as a large detached garage within its curtilage. A walking, cycling and horse riding trail called the Monsal Trail also runs directly behind the rear boundary of the property.
4. The proposed development would see a two storey side extension erected on the north elevation, located forward of an existing single storey addition. A further flat roofed single storey side extension forming an infill porch would be built in between these two structures. Separately a small flat roofed single storey extension would be built on the rear elevation.
5. The two storey side extension proposed already benefits from planning permission (Ref NP/DDD/0620/0541) which was granted on the 30 September 2020. As this permission remains extant and as there have been no changes proposed to the previous scheme, the Authority does not take issue with this part of the development and considers it acceptable. As such the matters in

- dispute are confined to the additional single storey side and rear extensions proposed.
6. The proposed single storey side extension would be a modest flat roofed infill porch, which would sit in between the existing pitched roofed side extension and the proposed two storey side extension. Consequently, given its location it would be virtually hidden from any views. Indeed, the infill porch would only become noticeable when accessing it via the narrow gap that would run between the north elevation and the property boundary.
 7. Whilst I acknowledge that its flat roof would not be of traditional appearance or reflect the existing pitched roof design on the original property, as the development would sit comfortably in between the two extensions either side, and as it would not be visible from external vantage points, I do not consider that it would result in any harm being caused to the character and appearance of either the host property or the surrounding area.
 8. The proposed single storey rear extension with sky light would also represent a fairly modest form of development, however the Authority are of the view that this would alter the 'L' shaped form of the dwelling. The proposed development would of course alter the property, nevertheless this alteration would be extremely modest and would not result in any significant change in its form. Therefore, I find that it would not result in any loss of character or harm being caused to the host dwelling.
 9. I also consider that the single storey rear extension would be a discreet addition that would not impact upon the existing features and fenestration on the property. Furthermore, I do not consider that it would detract from the rear elevations character and appearance nor would it prevent the existing two storey projection being read in its own right. To the contrary, I find that the modest extension would be read as a recent addition to the property that would not dominate or detract from the existing host property.
 10. Although the south facing elevation of the proposed rear extension would be virtually entirely made up of glazing, given its modest size I do not consider that the development would result in any undue harm being caused to the host property, or a blurring of any distinction between the original dwelling and the existing glazed single storey projecting extension.
 11. Additionally, the elevation concerned faces onto the property's own private amenity space and driveway and would have no impact on the wider street scene. Indeed, the single storey rear extension as a whole would be barely visible from any public vantage point. During my site visit I viewed the property from the Monsal Trail to the rear, and despite the trees not being in leaf, the property remained relatively well screened and any views of the proposed single storey rear extension would be fleeting and intermittent.
 12. Paragraph 176 of the National Planning Policy Framework also requires me to give great weight to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, and that developments within National Parks are sensitively designed in order to avoid or minimise adverse impacts. For the reasons set out above, I do not consider that the proposed development would result in any adverse impacts on the special qualities of the National Park.

13. As a result, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of either the host dwelling or the Peak District National Park. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3 and DS1 of the Peak District National Park Core Strategy Development Plan (adopted October 2011) and Policies DMC3, and DMH 7 of the Peak District National Park Development Management Policies (adopted May 2019) which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that developments are of an appropriate scale and form and does not detract from the character and appearance of the original building.

Conditions

14. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Authority and have amended them slightly in some cases for clarity. In particular, the Authority's suggested condition regarding submitted plans referred to 'Location plan drawing number 02', however I had not been furnished with this plan. I did however have sight of drawing 'Block Plan v.03' which clearly identifies the site and the development concerned, and as a result I have included this as one of the approved plans.
15. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition concerning the approved plans for the purposes of clarity. To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development, conditions are required in relation to its external materials and construction techniques. A condition is also required to ensure that the proposed photo voltaic panels are flush to the flat roof so to negate their visual impact on the wider area. Finally, a condition is also required to secure the implementation of climate change measures in accordance with the requirements of Policy CC1 of the Peak District National Park Core Strategy Development Plan.

Conclusion

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

David Jones

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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: Drawing Ref Block Plan v.03 (Block Plan); Drawing Ref Prop Site Plan v.04 (Proposed Site and Roof Plan); Drawing Ref Proposed v.08 (Proposed Plans and Elevations)
- 3) All stonework shall be in natural stone, face laid and pointed to match the existing stonework on the property.
- 4) The pedestrian door on the north elevation shall be provided with a natural gritstone lintel.
- 5) The pedestrian door on the north elevation shall be stained or painted in a grey colour so to match the existing doors and window frames on the property and shall be permanently so maintained.
- 6) The patio doors on the south elevation of the extension shall be constructed from aluminium frames and finished in a grey colour to match the existing door and window frames on the property and shall be permanently so maintained.
- 7) The rainwater goods shall be black. The gutters shall be fixed directly to the stonework with brackets and without the use of fascia boards. There shall be no projecting or exposed rafters.
- 8) The roof verges shall be flush pointed, with no barge boards or projecting timberwork.
- 9) The photo-voltaic panels to the flat roof over the existing swimming pool shall be fitted flush to the roof.
- 10) The submitted climate change mitigation measures shall be fully implemented before the development is brought into use and shall then be maintained for the lifetime of the development.

End of Schedule