



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2023

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/W/23/3317880

**Stanley Lodge, Unnamed track from Trot Lane to Stanley House,
Great Hucklow, Derbyshire SK17 8RL**

- 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 and Mrs Burrows against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/DDD/0822/1079, dated 19 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is the conversion and change of use of existing barn, storage building and yard (sui generis) into residential use (C3).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises of a barn which is situated adjoining the main farmhouse building which is to the east. The barn has a traditional form and is constructed in rubble limestone. It dates from the early 19th Century and has been identified as a non-designated heritage asset whose significance derives from its traditional form which reflects its agricultural origins and its setting in the wider rural landscape.
4. The proposed conversion would result in a new roof and other elements such as rainwater goods that would utilise sympathetic materials. These would result in an improvement on the current building, but the proposal also includes an extension to the western side of the building.
5. Although there were historic structures in this location, which this proposal seeks to emulate, the appeal development would replicate the shallow roof pitch of the existing modern lean-to which detracts from the appearance of the barn. This extension would also be wider than the gable of the barn that it would adjoin, which would further detract from the significance of the barn. The proposal would incorporate a contemporary glazed element, but this would be contained to either side by traditional rubble limestone walls that would match the finish to the walls of the existing barn.
6. The majority of the western wall of the original barn has not been exposed for over 150 years and may be in a poor condition once it is revealed. There is

however nothing before me that demonstrates that this could not be suitably repaired. Despite the buildings that the appeal site forms part of having been subject to various alterations, the proposed extension would not retain the original form of the barn. Although from distant views, the proposal would be seen as part of a cluster of farm buildings, the development would detract from its L shaped form and it would thus be harmful to the historical agricultural significance of the barn.

7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptable harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building. As such, it would conflict with Policies GSP1, GSP3 and L3 of the Peak District National Park Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Core Strategy) and Policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC10 and DMH8 of the Peak District National Park Development Management Policies, which seek, amongst other matters, for development to conserve and where appropriate to enhance or reveal the significance of architectural or historic assets. It would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and the Conversion of Historic Buildings Supplementary Planning Document, which seek, amongst other matters, to avoid harm to the significance of non-designated heritage assets.
8. Reference has also been made to Core Strategy Policy HC1, but this relates to the provision of new housing for key workers, meeting local needs or for aged persons assisted accommodation.

Other Matters

9. The Authority has raised concerns that due to the scale of accommodation proposed, the proposal would not constitute an ancillary dwellinghouse. Reference has also been made by the Authority to a previously granted planning permission¹ for the conversion of the building. Although this appeal development is larger as it includes a lean-to extension and there are other differences, it nevertheless proposes similar ancillary accommodation for multi-generational living. I therefore consider that this matter could have been addressed by a suitable condition restricting it to being ancillary to the existing dwelling, had the development been otherwise acceptable.
10. The proposal would result in the restoration of the building, bringing it into a viable use, providing a family home that would enable multi-generational living. It would provide an acceptable layout for future occupants, and it also receives support from the Parish Council. Whilst these elements weigh in favour of the proposal, they do not outweigh the harm that I have identified on the main issue.
11. The site is not at risk of flooding and the existing buildings are not nationally listed and nor are they within a conservation area. The development would also be acceptable in relation to parking and access, living conditions, and be subservient to the main farmhouse. These are all however neutral matters and not ones which weigh in favour of the development.
12. My attention has been drawn to a number of decisions by the Authority and also an appeal decision² which are said to be examples of similar approvals. In the case of the latter, there is no reference to the building concerned being a

¹ Ref: NP/DDD/0521/0531

² APP/M9496/W/22/3302880

non-designated heritage asset. In relation to the decisions by the Authority, one³ consisted of a conversion scheme and did not include any extension. The circumstances of these two referenced cases therefore differed from this appeal. The other referenced decision⁴ by the Authority, whilst it did include an extension, there is a lack of detail provided on its size and relationship to the host building. It is not therefore clear how comparable it is to the appeal scheme. I cannot therefore be certain from the information provided that the circumstances of this referenced case is similar to that of this proposed development. In any event, I can confirm that I have considered this appeal on its own merits.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, having taken account of the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR

³ NP/DDD/1220/1172

⁴ NP//CEC/0718/0600