



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 March 2022

by Diane Cragg Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/21/3282831

Tower Cottage, Moorfield, Glossop, SK13 7PP

- 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 R Rowarth against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/DDD/0221/0197, dated 15 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is conversion of garage to kitchen, construction of single storey rear extension and enlargement of existing structural opening to side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant confirms that no agreement has been given to the change in the description set out on the planning decision notice. Therefore, I have used the description on the planning application form and determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property as a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

4. Tower Cottage is a semi-detached dwelling formerly within the grounds of Moorfield House. The building dates from 1874 and forms part of a larger structure which was originally constructed as a coach house associated with Moorfield House.
5. Although the appellant expresses some concern that the building has not been identified on a local list or its significance clearly expressed, the parties agree that the property is a non-designated heritage asset. Its significance lies in the architectural character of the original structure and its historical association with Moorfield House.
6. Tower Cottage is set within a substantial plot on a sloping site. Set above Moorfield House, the appeal site is relatively visible in its immediate surroundings. The property has previously been extended over two storeys with the existing extension broadly at right angles to the original building and incorporating a garage. The proposed single storey extension would be set in from the side gable of the garage and below the eaves line of the rear

- elevation. Constructed of stone and incorporating stone detailing around window openings, the scale and design of the extension would sit acceptably with the existing structure and would not be visually significant in its context or detrimental to the earlier parts of the building with which the extension would have no intervisibility.
7. The proposed cedar cladding and horizontal window that would replace the garage door would not detract from the front elevation of the extension or undermine the original building's architecture.
 8. The side gable of the garage extension is designed to replicate the robust architectural design of the original building. It has attractive stone surrounds to the ground and first floor windows with stone mullion detail. The window openings reflect the original building's design. The gable wall is a particularly prominent part of the site being elevated on the plot and facing towards the adjacent garden area.
 9. The proposed Juliet balcony would project forward of the first-floor side gable wall and, together with the new double door opening, would jar with the ground floor window detail and the robust design of the gable elevation. Because of its raised position, forward projection and modern materials, the alterations to the window opening and Juliet balcony would be a particularly prominent and incongruous feature. Consequently, in this respect the proposal would detract from the character of the host property and there would be some limited harm to the character of the building as a non-designated heritage asset.
 10. Overall, whilst I conclude that the rear extension and alterations to the garage would not be harmful, the alterations to the window in the side gable and Juliet balcony would detract from the character and appearance of the host property as a non-designated heritage asset. In this respect, the proposed development would conflict with Policies GSP1, GSP3 and L3 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document October 2011 and Policies DM3, DM5 and DMH7 of the Development Management Policies May 2019 which collectively seek, among other things, to respect local context and character.
 11. In accordance with paragraph 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework, I have taken into account the effect of the development on the significance of the non-designated heritage asset. I find that, on balance, the Juliet balcony and new door opening would be detrimental to the architectural character of the building and hence its significance. There would also be conflict with the Framework where it seeks to achieve development that is well designed and sympathetic to local character and history.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the extension and replacement garage door would not be harmful, but the alterations to the gable elevation would conflict with the development plan and the Framework, and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR