



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2024

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22ND July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R1038/D/24/3343599

Blakelow Cottage, Holestone Gate Road, Holestone Moor, Ashover, Derbyshire S45 0JS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr John Lomas against the decision of North East Derbyshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/00900/FLH.
 - The development is described as 'extensions and alterations to dwellinghouse (part retrospective)'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extensions and alterations at Blakelow Cottage, Holestone Gate Road, Holestone Moor, Ashover, Derbyshire S45 0JS, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/00900/FLH, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 301, 302, 303 Rev A, 304, 005 Rev A and 006 Rev A.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The development comprises a patio and pergola which have already been built, together with a proposed rear extension and a proposed link between existing garages. In my decision I therefore refer to the scheme as a proposal, but in my formal decision, and as it is not an act of development, I have amended the description to omit reference to its partly retrospective nature.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. Blakelow Cottage is a former agricultural building which was converted to a dwellinghouse under Class Q to Part 3 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as

- amended). It comprises a rectilinear, single storey building, with a mono pitched roof, and which is finished in timber boarding. It therefore broadly retains the simple, fairly utilitarian, form and style of the agricultural building it once was.
5. The pergola has a simple timber framework, and is affixed to the rear of the building around a patio. Whilst a pergola is not a structure typically associated with an agricultural building, given its open-sided construction, it is very lightweight, and its posts and associated open picket-style fence reflect the colour and materials of the host property. As it is sited at ground level, the patio is not a prominent feature.
 6. The proposed roof linking the principal building to the recently built detached garage would have a very modest scale and would retain glimpses between these two structures. It would not therefore significantly increase their perceived mass.
 7. Turning to the proposed rear extension, it would be much narrower than the host dwelling, and it would cover only a small proportion of its rear elevation. According to the appellant's calculations, it would add a modest 29.6sqm to the original dwelling's 159sqm footprint.
 8. It would therefore have a relatively limited scale and it would appear clearly subordinate to the original building. Additionally, its matching roofline and materials would help it to integrate with the host. Thus, having regard to the recently built garage and porch, and to cumulative impacts, whilst the resultant building would have a slightly more complex form and footprint, it would still retain a simple, utilitarian appearance.
 9. As the scheme would respect the style, scale, materials and proportions of the existing property, and would not harm its character and design, it would comply with Policy LC5 Part 1a of the North East Derbyshire Local Plan 2014 - 2034 (2021) ('NEDLP').
 10. Given that the alterations and extensions would be predominantly to the rear of the building, there would be only limited views of them from the highway in front of the site. Approaching from the south along Holestone Gate Road and from around Allen Lane, they would be more visible, but only at a considerable distance, and in the context of the existing building, whose design they would respect. The scheme would not therefore harm the character and appearance of the area; and it would not conflict with NEDLP Policy LC5 Part 1b and Part 2; nor with NEDLP Policy SS9 Part 2.
 11. For similar reasons, the scheme would not conflict with the general thrust of Ashover Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2016 - 2033 (2018) Policy AP2, or with the approach in its Policy AP11. Given that conclusion, it would also comply with Part 1i of NEDLP Policy SS9.
 12. Turning to the matter of conditions, as a start on the development has already been made, the standard time limit for commencement is neither necessary nor appropriate. However, having regard to the appellant's suggestion, and in the interests of certainty, a condition is necessary requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Finally, in the interests of good design, a matching materials condition is also necessary.

13. Summing up, the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area, and it would not conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole. Having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR