



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 June 2023

by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P1045/D/23/3314218

Brackendale, Ashbourne Road, Brassington DE4 4BD

- 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 against the decision of Derbyshire Dales District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01085/FUL, dated 15 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension above existing kitchen and utility.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling, once an agricultural building, which, along with the adjacent cluster of dwellings and built form, formed part of a single farmstead. As recognised by the appellant, the extensive renovation, remodelling, conversion and separation of the farmstead has resulted in significant changes to the original agricultural character of the site. Despite this, the dominant linear presence of the main stone part of the appeal dwelling, with its subservient sections and outbuildings and open expanse of land surrounding it, retains positive reference to its agricultural past.
4. The proposed development would result in the upward extension of the single storey side section of the property, which is clearly a modern, subservient feature to the original stone part of the dwelling. As it is already of a considerable width and footprint, the proposal's generous height and resultant increase in volume would cause this section of the property to be a very large mass which would dominate the main part of the dwelling. This lack of subservience would further dilute the agricultural character and appearance of the dwelling and its setting.
5. I appreciate that the proposal takes its design cues from a Dutch barn which, the evidence indicates, was sited within the centre of the former farmstead. In particular, the extension seeks to replicate the former barn's curved roof design. However, it seems to me that despite its large scale, the barn had a simple, functional appearance and was likely transient in nature given its construction and use. It was also separated from the now stone dwelling, reinforcing its subordinate relationship.

6. To the contrary, the proposal forms part of the main dwelling and, for the reasons given, would dominate it. It would therefore fail to reflect the independence which the buildings once would have had. It would also be strikingly domestic and contrived due to its fenestration design, notably the vast amount of glazing, ratio of blank wall to openings and materials.
7. It would not therefore reinstate, replicate or reinforce the former agricultural character of the site, but rather it would be an intrusive and overbearing addition which would visually compete with the simple form and design of the traditional stone dwelling. Therefore, the former presence of the barn is not satisfactory justification alone for the appeal proposal.
8. Whilst the juxtaposition between the roof of the stone part of the dwelling and the appeal proposal has been sensitively designed through a glazed link, this element in itself would fail to overcome the concerns with the overall scale and design of the extension, as noted above.
9. Accordingly, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and thus would conflict with policies PD1 and HC10 of the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan (December 2017) which seek to ensure that developments contribute positively towards and respect their context and the host dwelling. It would also fail to accord with the design guidance set out in paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

10. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations which indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

H Ellison
INSPECTOR