

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2022

by John Whalley

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2022

Appeal ref: APP/M9496/D/22/3300002

Rue Hayes Farm, Blakelow Road, Onecote ST13 7SG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal of planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Andrew Hulmes against the decision of the Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application ref. NP/SM/0621/0633, dated 27 May 2021, was refused by a notice dated 4 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a new sunroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of an 18m² floor area sun room on the northern façade of the farmhouse at Rue Hayes Farm, Onecote ST13 7SG, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. NP/SM/0621/0633, dated 27 May 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 2064-XX-XX-GF-DR-A-0107 Revision A 10/11/21.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the immediate surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The Appellant, Mr Andrew Hulmes, proposes to construct an 18m² floor area sun room on the northern façade of the farmhouse at Rue Hayes Farm, Onecote. The sunroom would have an oak frame, with glazed windows to the walls and doors and with a low pitch hipped roof.
4. The Council said the proposed length, width and height of the structure would be of a suitable scale in proportion to the host building. Also, the elevations being stepped in from the front and rear elevation raised no objection and would be in accordance with the design guide. Further, the proposed materials, the stone plinth to match the existing and the hardwood structure were

considered to comply with policy and adopted guidance. I agree. The new structure would blend in with the existing stone farmhouse well enough.

5. However, the Council said the form and design of the lead standing seam hipped roof structure was unacceptable. Also, the hipped roof would have an extremely shallow pitch of reduced height to avoid fouling the first floor window above. That would not reflect the traditional pitched roof of the dwelling, its associated outbuildings, or the local building style. As a result, the sunroom would be harmful to the character and appearance of the built environment and landscape of the locality. It would be contrary to Local Plan policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L1, DMC3 and DMH7.
6. I can understand the Council's preference for a steeper pitch to the sunroom roof. But I do not consider the harm to the appearance of the new structure resulting from the use of a shallower pitch relative than that of the farmhouse to be sufficient to warrant a refusal of planning permission. Minor amendments to the originally proposed sunroom have successfully sought to address some of the Council's concerns, such as providing an assurance that the oversailing eaves detail would have a timber finish not be finished in matt aluminium. Also, their concerns that the form and design of the proposed roof structure would be "exacerbated by the additional gallows brackets within the timberwork below, further complicating the design", were addressed by the Appellant's intention to remove the gallows brackets. In fact, no part of the sunroom, its base walls, its fenestration, its gable end doors nor its basic structure would be of similar form to the main farmhouse building. Yet the overall resulting structure would, in my view, cause no undue harm to the appearance of the Rue Hayes Farm farmhouse and or its group of associated outbuildings. Accordingly, the local policy background that seeks to ensure that new development, including building extensions, do not detract from the character, appearance or amenity of the original building, its setting or neighbouring buildings – e.g. policy DMH7 – would be reasonably satisfied.
7. I conclude that planning permission should be granted for the appeal sunroom. For the reasons given above, the appeal succeeds. The condition limiting the duration of the permission is applied, (s.91 of the Act), as is a condition defining the amended scheme.

John Whalley

INSPECTOR