



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2024

by T Bennett BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P1045/W/24/3347217

Tinkersley House, Tinkersley, Rowsley, Derbyshire DE4 2NJ

- 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 P Goodwin against the decision of Derbyshire Dales District Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/01142/FUL.
 - The development proposed is partial rebuilding and extension of agricultural building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and whether the proposal would help to sustain an existing agricultural enterprise.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a parcel of agricultural land located in the small hamlet of Tinkersley, on a hillside, close to existing residential buildings. The rural area is characterised by its sloping topography, with views across the landscape from the winding road to the south and east of the application site.
4. The existing site comprises two single-storey, derelict agricultural buildings that have partially collapsed. These buildings are located approximately halfway up the sloping field, with residential buildings below. The buildings have a small footprint and are unassuming and discrete in scale. They relate well to the topography of the land, having a stepped appearance. From the existing plans, the two buildings had differing roof heights to reflect the sloping topography. Their size and scale contribute positively to the rural character of this hillside location.
5. The proposed rebuilding and extension of the agricultural buildings would combine the two modest buildings into a single two-storey agricultural building. The proposal would be rectangular in form, with a pitched slate roof and constructed of gritstone, reflecting that used in the surrounding buildings. However, the stepped appearance would be lost and the proposal would almost double the width of the existing buildings and introduce a continuous ridgeline. This would make the proposal appear substantially larger than the existing building due to the increased mass. This would be exacerbated by the sloping topography of the land and would consequently appear as an unduly

prominent and conspicuous feature in the landscape, failing to respond positively to the sloping topography, compared to the existing buildings.

6. Criterion f) of Policy S4 of the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan (2017) (the LP) supports proposals for agriculture where they maintain the landscape quality and character of the countryside and where they help sustain existing agricultural enterprise.
7. Aside from the proposal providing a useful storage space in a convenient location, very limited information has been put forward as to how and why the proposed building would help and be necessary to sustain the existing agricultural enterprise. The appellant states that it would be cheaper and easier to extend existing storage facilities elsewhere within their holdings and that their principal aim is to avoid the loss of a traditional field barn. I note that Historic England recognises that such buildings make a fundamental contribution to both landscape character and local distinctiveness through their varied forms, use of materials and the way they relate to the surrounding landscape.
8. However, as I have already set out, the proposed development would appear very different in form to the existing agricultural buildings. I find it would not positively contribute to the landscape character and local distinctiveness, a feature that Historic England recognises of traditional field barns.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. It has also not been demonstrated how the proposal would help sustain the existing agricultural enterprise. It therefore fails to accord with Policy S4 of the LP. It would also conflict with Policy PD1 of the LP, which, amongst other matters, requires proposals to respond positively to the local environment and contribute positively to the area's character.

Other Matters

10. The appellant asserts the proposal would be more respectful of its surroundings than other recently approved development, however I have little information as to the location of the development referred to or the design, as such it does not alter my findings above.
11. I acknowledge that the existing buildings may fall further into disrepair, however this does not justify allowing a scheme which I have found would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area.
12. The absence of objections from the Parish Council and chairman of the planning committee is noted. However, I am required to assess the proposal on its planning merits and the absence of an objection does not alter my findings.

Conclusion

13. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

T Bennett INSPECTOR