



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 December 2023

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/W/23/3320562

Torr Farm, Leadmill, Hathersage, Hope Valley S32 1BA

- 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 & Mrs Davison against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/DDD/0522/0704, dated 19 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 4 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of triple garage with home office above.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the Peak District National Park.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is within a complex of buildings accessed along a short track, located in the countryside. The proposed appeal building would be located outside of that complex in what appears to be a hardstanding area.
4. The farm itself is Grade II listed, but the Council have raised no specific concerns worthy of reason for refusal with regard to that matter, and I have no reason to find otherwise. The appeal proposal would be a triple garage, constructed in stone, with a pitched slate roof, and solar panelling on one of the roof faces.
5. The appeal sites wider surroundings comprise expansive open fields and forestry. Cut and fill construction would result in the proposal being partially set into the ground and office space is proposed above the ground floor garage.
6. The garage may be of simple design and would be constructed in appropriate materials, in line with the design guidance of the National Park Authority. However, the proposed size of the structure to enable the potential accommodation of 3 cars and office space to the first floor would mean that the garage would not be insignificant in size. The overall scale and massing created by the proposed square structure would be prominent and out of proportion in the context of more modest surrounding buildings in the immediate vicinity.
7. I find that the overall volume of the proposed garage, combined with its size of the built form would result in the creation of a large structure that would draw attention to itself as an incongruous feature in the wider area. It would have an

awkward appearance in the locality given its size, the harmful impact of which would not be mitigated to any noticeable degree by the cut and fill works.

8. 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. 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, GSP3 and L3; and to Peak District National Park Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Plan (2019) Policies DMC3, DMH7 and DMC5, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conclusion

9. The proposal does not accord with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate I should take a different decision other than in accordance with this.
10. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR