



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 October 2024 by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/24/3344884

Ferny Knowl, Deep Lane, Sheen, Staffordshire SK17 0ER

- 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 Hall against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application reference is NP/SM/0324/0238.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, stone-built traditional farm dwelling, which is part of a cluster of farm buildings, located within the countryside. It is located within the Peak District National Park (PDNP) and as such there is a statutory duty to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of this nationally significant area.
 5. The proposal seeks to add a single storey side extension, which would be set back from the south-west elevation of the dwelling, would wrap around the side and rear elevations, and would be linked to the existing single storey rear element of the dwelling.
 6. Due to its siting, the development would fail to respect the established building line, as it would extend the host dwelling beyond the line determined by the farm buildings located to its north-west. Furthermore, the extension, due to its rear and sideways projection would excessively extend the width of the gable, which would not be in keeping with the traditional narrow gable width of the building. In addition, due to its width, the roof angle of the extension would not match that of the host dwelling, which adds to the inappropriateness of the development.
-

7. The number of openings would be excessive, particularly for the south-west and south-east elevations. The amount of glazing proposed for the south-west elevation would not accord with the traditional high solid to void ratio. The proposed two windows and a door on the south-east elevation would occupy a considerable proportion of the gable wall, which would also be at odds with the traditional appearance of the farm dwelling. Thus, due to the number, size, and placement of openings there would be a disruptive solid to void ratio, which would weaken the elevations and diminish the strong appearance of the traditional host dwelling.
8. The appellants have referred to other side extensions with glazed openings, however no specific examples have been provided. Nevertheless, I have considered the appeal development based on its own merits and site-specific circumstances.
9. My findings above are irrespective of whether the appeal property is considered a barn conversion or a rebuilt dwelling. Accordingly, the development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and thereby it would fail to conserve or enhance the PDNP. It would therefore be contrary to Policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3 of the Peak District National Park Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011) and Policies DMC3 and DMH7 of the Development Management Policies part 2 of the Local Plan for the Peak District National Park (2019). Collectively, these policies require developments to respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings that are subject to the development proposal, as well as the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge the private benefits of the development in terms of enhanced living space. Such personal circumstances, however, seldom outweigh general planning considerations. Furthermore, based on the evidence submitted, I am unconvinced that a plant room cannot be installed internally in a less intrusive manner. Thus, I afford limited weight to the benefits, and they do not outweigh the harm I have identified.
11. The Authority found other aspects of the proposal to be acceptable, save for the issue considered above. Given the evidence before me, and my observations during the site visit, I have no reason to disagree with the Authority's findings. However, this is a neutral matter rather than one that carries positive weight in favour of the development.

Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan regarding the character and appearance of the host dwelling and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight, that would indicate to the contrary. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andreea Spataru

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR