
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2022

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 February 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/W/21/3286440

Rivelin House Farm, Manchester Road, Crosspool , Sheffield S6 5SP

- 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 & Mrs Janion against the decision of the Peak District National Park.
 - The application Ref NP/S/0321/0377, dated 31 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a garage and machinery store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposed development on the setting of Rivelin House Farm, along with its effect on trees and ecology.

Reasons

Setting of Rivelin House Farm

3. The appeal relates to a parcel of land which sits immediately to the south of the dwelling at Rivelin House Farm, which enjoys an open countryside location. Rivelin House Farm comprises a former small farmhouse and barns which have been converted to a single dwelling, arranged in a 'P' shape. It is a historic farmstead dating from as far back as at least 1855 and the original range of buildings have been converted in a sympathetic manner. It is a non-designated heritage asset that makes a positive contribution to the cultural heritage and landscape of the National Park.
 4. A large, detached garage has been built to the east of the dwelling. This has the effect of enclosing the courtyard when approaching from the south and largely screens vehicles parked within the courtyard itself.
 5. There is no dispute between the parties that the application site forms part of the residential curtilage of Rivelin House Farm. There is a suggestion that it has historically been used as a walled garden, but there was no obvious evidence of any walling remains at my visit. In any event, the appeal site is somewhat
-

detached from the dwelling as it is separated by a driveway, with the main garden sitting directly behind the dwelling itself.

6. The proposed building is, in itself, of an appropriate design and finish. I also recognise that the footprint of Rivelin House Farm has evolved over time, which is an indication that it need not necessarily be preserved in its original state. Nevertheless, the proposed three bay building would have the appearance of a large domestic garage. Although the proposed building would not be visible from the public domain, it would be somewhat isolated from the main group of buildings and the courtyard and it would harm the open setting of the land to the south of the group. The Appellants assert that they are free to park vehicles on the appeal site or introduce domestic paraphernalia to it, which would also have a visual impact. However, I consider that the visual effect of doing so would not be as harmful as that caused by the large building proposed.
7. For the above reasons, I find that the proposed building would harm the setting of the undesignated heritage asset of Rivelin House Farm and it follows that it would fail to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the National Park. As such, it conflicts with policies GSP3, L1 and L3 of the adopted Peak District National Park Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DMC3, DMC5 and DMH8 of the adopted Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (DMP), which collectively promote high quality design that respects and responds positively to its context, including heritage assets.

Trees and ecological interests

8. In response to the Authority's second reason for refusal, the Appellants have submitted a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal. This confirms that the proposed development need not harm any ecological interests provided suitable mitigation and enhancement measures are put in place. In the absence of any compelling technical evidence to the contrary, I have no reason to dispute this position.
9. In addition, a Tree Survey and Constraints Plan has been submitted which indicates that only young trees of limited amenity value would need to be removed to accommodate the proposed building. All other trees would remain and their protection could be secured, along with additional planting if deemed necessary, by a suitably worded planning condition if planning permission was to be granted.
10. In light of the above factors, I am satisfied, on the basis of the information available to me, that the proposed development need not have an adverse impact on ecological interests and it would not harm any trees of significant amenity value. In such terms, I find no conflict with policies DMC11, DMC12 and DMC13 of the DMP or the NPPF.

Other considerations

11. There is no suggestion that the proposal offers any public benefits, but it would provide additional covered storage space for a car and for machinery used to tend to the adjacent field. However, nothing I have seen or read persuades me that this could not be provided in a more visually acceptable manner. The Appellants also suggest that the building would enable the retention of step free

access to the dwelling, thereby assisting with multi-generational living, but this would not be affected if it was not built.

12. The Appellants refer to examples of other farmsteads where outbuildings are positioned outside of the main group. Whilst I accept that such arrangements are not uncommon, I have based my assessment on the specific setting and context of this particular farmstead and consider that the introduction of a large building of a domestic appearance sitting outside of the main group in the manner proposed would be visually harmful.
13. Finally, I am mindful that the Appellants have expressed dissatisfaction with the way in which the application was dealt with, but this is not a matter for me to consider.

Overall Conclusions

14. I conclude that although measures could be imposed to ensure that the development did not have an adverse impact on any ecological interests or any notable trees, it would harm the setting of Rivelin House Farm, which is a non-designated heritage asset, contrary to the development plan policies outlined above.
15. The arguments advanced by the Appellants in favour of the scheme do not outweigh this harm and the associated policy conflict therefore the appeal does not succeed.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR