



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2021 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/21/3282110

Clough View House, Main Road, Wensley DE4 2LH

- 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 Claire Spencer against the decision of the Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/DDD/0421/0407, dated 7 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single story porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the Peak District National Park.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property comprises a detached bungalow and lies in a prominent position in the open countryside between the settlements of Wensley and Winster. The property has a sense of detachment from the nearest buildings at Clough View Farm given the separation between the site and the Farm.
 5. The existing bungalow is of a simple gable design, with additional gable features to the front and rear elevations. The simple design and the position of the property are such that it is an attractive feature in the local picturesque landscape. Furthermore, the design is in keeping with the local vernacular tradition of simple building shapes that characterises the Peak District National Park.
 6. The proposed porch would be finished in materials that match the original property. However, the part-pitched and part-lean-to roof of the porch would be more complex than the simple pitched roof of the original dwelling. The width and irregular design of the porch would also unbalance the appearance of the existing gable elevation despite the limited size of the proposed porch. Overall, the porch would contrast awkwardly against the attractive and simple
-

form of the original bungalow. Although the porch would not be visible from west of the site, it would be visible from the road to the front and east of the site and consequently the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the property and the Peak District National Park.

7. For these reasons, the proposal would conflict with policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1 and L1 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (October 2011) and policies DMC3 and DMH7 of the Development Management Policies Part 2 of the Local Plan (May 2019). These all seek, in various ways and amongst other things, to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the Peak District National Park and to prevent development that detracts from the character and appearance of the original dwelling. The proposal would also fail to comply with paragraphs 174 and 176 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seek to protect and enhance valued landscapes and the character of the countryside, and affords great weight to the conservation and enhancement of National Parks. Furthermore, the proposal conflicts with the guidance in paragraph 7.13 of the Peak District National Park Authority Design Guide, which states that porches must be appropriate to the property and well designed.

Other Matters

8. I understand the benefits the proposed porch would bring to the living conditions of the occupants of the dwelling given the exposed position of the appeal property. However, it has not been demonstrated that these benefits could not be achieved by a porch of a design that is more in keeping with the existing dwelling. Moreover, the benefits of the scheme would not outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed because of the conflict with the development plan and there being no material considerations which indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR