

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2022

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/22/3299321

Railway Cottage, Tagg Lane, Hurdlow, SK17 9QJ

- 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 Pogmore against the decision of the Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/DDD/1221/1407, dated 5 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is replacement of existing garage and storage shed adjacent to dwelling with new limestone garage to similar footprint.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of Peak District National Park.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey dwelling accessed along a short track from Tagg Lane. It is located in the countryside. There are several attractive mature deciduous trees to the front of the property and the track running back to Tagg Lane.
 4. The appeal property's wider surroundings comprise expansive open fields. The appeal property is situated within the Peak District National Park and is located nearby to a car park for the Tissington Trail, a popular route for cyclists and walkers.
 5. Close to the track connecting the appeal property with Tagg Lane are three small outbuildings situated adjacent to one another, comprising two small garage-like structures with flat corrugated roofs and a small shed.
 6. These outbuildings appear as low, small, narrow, functional ancillary structures. There is a small track to the front of them and an attractive dry-stone wall beyond that, forming the boundary to a large field beyond.
 7. The structures, whilst not attractive, do not appear especially out of place in a rural setting but rather, to some degree, they appear as the kind of ancillary buildings common to rural areas. Their low height, narrow width and small
-

overall volumes mean that they do not draw attention to themselves – rather, it is the deciduous trees in the wider area draw the eye rather than these fairly innocuous structures.

8. The proposed development would replace the outbuildings with a single large stone garage. Cut and fill construction would result in the proposal being set into the ground and a sedum roof is proposed.
9. Whilst it would be similar in length to the aggregate length of all three of the existing outbuildings, the proposed garage would be significantly taller and wider. It would fill the current gap between the outbuildings and the dry-stone wall.
10. I find that the overall volume of the proposed garage, combined with its non-vernacular built form would result in the creation of a large, monolithic, flat-roofed structure that would draw attention to itself as an incongruous feature. It would have an awkward, elongated “blocky” appearance, the harmful impact of which would not be mitigated to any noticeable degree by the inclusion of a sedum roof – which I find, would appear as a flat roof when viewed from various locations.
11. One of the National Park Authority’s reasons for refusal related to the loss of trees and I note earlier that mature deciduous trees make a positive contribution to local character. Any loss of existing trees close to the proposed garage would serve to lessen the “softening” of the appearance of the proposal and exacerbate the visual harm identified.
12. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposal would result in the creation of a large, prominent and visually intrusive building, out of keeping with its surroundings. Whilst the existing outbuildings are not attractive, I find that the proposed garage would have a considerably greater detrimental impact on its surroundings than the buildings it would replace.
13. Consequently, I find that the proposed development would fail to conserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Peak District National Park. It would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Peak District National Park Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011) Policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3 and L1; and to Peak District National Park Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Plan (2019) Policies DMC3, DMH8 and DMC13, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR