



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2022

by J Williamson BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P1045/D/21/3284507

Brackendale, Ashbourne Road, Brassington DE4 4DB

- 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 Noel Spiteri, Sitwell Investments Ltd, against the decision of Derbyshire Dales District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00969/FUL, dated 28 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is Construction of a First Floor Extension to the Existing Dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the host building, the group of surrounding buildings and the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is part of an L-shaped building which has recently been converted to a dwellinghouse from agricultural buildings. The section of the building to which the application relates is single-storey and is attached at 90 deg to a two-storey section, the totality of which constitute the dwellinghouse known as 'Brackendale'. The single-storey element was originally a steel-framed shed; the structure now has timber clad elevations and a very shallow-pitched asymmetrical roof, covered with grey panels/sheeting. The two-storey section of the dwellinghouse is constructed of stone under a dual-pitched, symmetrical, tiled roof.
4. Brackendale is one of 3 dwellings, each with associated outbuildings, on the site of a former farmstead, where the original farmhouse has been replaced and associated surrounding buildings redeveloped/remodelled. The 3 dwellings located on the site of the former farmstead are surrounded by open countryside, which is sub-divided into fields bounded by hedgerows and trees; the nearest neighbouring properties are between around 100 and 150 m away.
5. The proposed extension would add an additional storey to the existing single-storey section, thereby doubling its size. It would be designed with a curved roof, like a Dutch barn, of grey composite material, which would only partially link into the dual-pitched roof of the two-storey section of the property. I accept that there are examples of hay barns with curved roofs scattered around the district, and therefore the proposal has some relevance to the history and culture of the surrounding landscape.

6. However, due to the siting and design of the proposed roof (as described above), it would have an awkward, disjointed relationship with the existing roof of the two-storey part of the dwellinghouse. The proposed curved and existing pitched roofs would not merge comfortably nor relate well to each other. The scale of the proposed extension would be out of keeping with the scale of the existing single-storey section of the dwellinghouse, which currently reads as the subservient section of the property that provides an indication of the relationship between the original buildings under their previous agricultural use.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The design of the proposed roof would also be out of keeping with the immediate neighbouring properties. As such, the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.
8. Consequently, the proposal does not wholly accord with policies PD1 and H10 of the Adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan, 2017, or paragraphs 126 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Collectively, and among other things, these policies require new development to be of high-quality design, to create beautiful buildings, respect site context, be sympathetic to local character and the surrounding built environment, and to be of a scale and design in keeping with the scale and character of the original dwelling.

Other considerations & planning balance

9. Planning legislation requires me to determine the proposal in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
10. The appellants have an extended family, and they require more space to accommodate them as guests. I appreciate this desire. However, as the planning system primarily operates in the public interest, rather than the private interests of individuals, it is a matter to which I attach limited weight.
11. The appellant refers to permitted development rights which allow upward extensions to dwellings, illustrating the Government's intentions to allow homeowners to extend their properties upwards. Although these observations are correct, given that a range of permitted development rights have been removed from the property, in this instance such an extension is not possible. I therefore attach little weight to this matter.
12. The appellant points out that the proposal would result in little additional energy use, that the curved roof would be used to collect surface water which could be used in the garden and the construction would include recycled materials. I appreciate such measures would be environmentally beneficial. However, the scale of the proposal is such that the benefits would be very minor. Consequently, I attach limited weight to them.
13. I consider the other considerations outlined neither individually or collectively outweigh the significant harm I have found in respect of the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons outlined above, I consider that there are no other considerations that lead me to conclude other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

J Williamson

INSPECTOR