



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 13 November 2024

by JP Sargent BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P1045/W/24/3343210

White House, Church Road, Churchtown, Darley Dale, Derbyshire DE4 2GL

- 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 David Burgess against the decision of Derbyshire Dales District Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/01288/FUL.
 - The development proposed is single and 2 storey rear extensions, including first floor balcony and alterations to windows and doors.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/P1045/Y/24/3343216

White House, Church Road, Churchtown, Darley Dale, Derbyshire DE4 2GL

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr David Burgess against the decision of Derbyshire Dales District Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/01289/LBALT.
 - The works proposed are internal and external alterations & extension.
-

Decisions

APP/P1045/W/24/3343210

1. The appeal is dismissed.

APP/P1045/Y/24/3343216

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue with each of these appeals is the effect of the works on the special architectural and historic interest of this listed building, and whether they would harm its significance and, if harm would be caused, whether this is outweighed by public benefits

Reasons

4. White House is a Grade II listed 2-storey cottage built of coursed stone rubble, which probably dates from the late 17th Century. The special architectural and historic interest of this older element lie in the way its detailing, scale, design and materials reflect its origins as an older cottage in a rural village. Its significance is therefore partly architectural and partly historic.
5. In recent years though it has been extended in 3 phases. Cumulatively, these extensions are of an appreciable scale when compared to the original part of

White House, and this means that, to a certain extent, they undermine its significance as a simple rural dwelling. However, the dominance of these elements is mitigated, to a degree, by them having elevations of stone. While this stone is by no means an ideal match, lacking the nuance and finish of what has been used on the 17th Century element, it nonetheless means that, visually, the external appearance of the extensions is relatively subdued and not so jarring, having some sympathy with that of the older part.

6. Although I accept that the newer elements post-date the listing of the property, under section 1(5) of the Act they should be treated as part of the listed building.
7. The internal alterations, which include relocating doors, exposing original stonework, creating a 2-storey hallway and changing the locations of recent staircases and walls, do not cause harm to the significance of the house. Indeed, by removing the plaster now on what was the outer face of the original northern gable and opening up this area, the significance of the building would be better revealed.
8. Externally, it is proposed to treat the existing extensions and their openings in a manner that creates a clear and bold distinction between those elements and the older part. This would be done through the use of render and new window designs. Whilst I fully accept that this distinction would be more apparent as a result, when account is also given to their scale, I find that what is proposed would mean the recent additions would challenge and compete with the original element to a far greater extent than at present. This is because the extensions would be visually more pronounced and dominant, and many of their elements that echoed the older section, such as the materials and the treatments and sizes of windows, would be diminished. As a consequence, the older element would be a more subservient part of the house than at present.
9. Whilst I recognise that the external materials on the majority of the front elevation would be unchanged, the nature of the intended and striking treatment on the newer element would emphasise its presence disproportionately. Moreover, at the rear the introduction of the second gable and a larger conservatory would further emphasise the scale of the additions, and so add to any challenging effect they may have on the older part.
10. In coming to this view, I accept a render is now on the northern elevation of the recent additions. That though can only be seen from a limited number of places, as it faces onto a narrow passage that runs between the house and the large detached garage, and cannot be readily appreciated in the context of the older element. As such, its presence does not lead me to a different view. The 2-storey rear element would be coming level with the back of the large garage but, mindful of the garage's relationship to the original cottage, that too does not allay the harm I have identified.
11. Consequently, I recognise that the extensions have an adverse effect on the listed building now, and the works would deliver some benefits to the significance of this heritage asset through matters such as the exposure of the original northern gable internally and the replacement of windows. Overall though I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and would cause a moderate level of less than substantial harm to its significance.

12. The appeal property is immediately to the north of the Grade II* listed St Helen's Church, which dates back many centuries and includes Norman elements but was restored in the 19th Century. Insofar as this appeal is concerned, its special architectural and historic interest rest in its external detailing and the manner in which it has been the spiritual focus of the settlement for so many centuries. Its significance is therefore partly architectural and partly historic. Moreover, the setting of this heritage asset is very strongly defined by the graveyard in which it sits.
13. The principal doorway to the church is on its south side, and the main approaches to that entrance are from the east and south. A path runs along its northern elevation, between the church building and the White House boundary, but this seems to be less used, while views to the appeal property are filtered by intervening trees. As such, and mindful of the existing impact of White House, I consider the effect of the works on the setting of this neighbouring designated heritage asset would not harm its significance.
14. The *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) states that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets, as they are an irreplaceable resource. It adds that any harm to the significance of designated heritage assets should require clear and convincing justification. Moreover, if less than substantial harm is caused to the significance of any such asset, that harm should be weighed against the public benefits.
15. In this case the appellant has emphasised as a benefit what he describes as the '*tactful*' distinguishing of the older part of the house from the newer, but as is apparent from my reasoning above, that is not something I perceive to weigh in the scheme's favour.
16. Otherwise, the further public benefit concerns improvements to energy efficiency from solar panels, higher insulation, upgrading of glazing, and the installation of air source heat pumps. I accept that these are a public benefit, both in their contribution to reducing energy consumption and also by the way they would mean the dwelling was better equipped for future usage. However, it is not clear why such benefits necessitate the adverse effects of this scale that I have identified. As such, they do not outweigh the harm, and neither do any other public benefits before me.
17. Accordingly, I conclude that the works would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of this Grade II listed building, causing less than substantial harm to its significance. In the absence of any public benefits to outweigh this harm, I further conclude the scheme would conflict with Policies PD1, PD2 and HC10 in the *Derbyshire Dales Local Plan* and the Framework, which together seek good design on houses that sustains and enhances the historic environment.

Conclusion

18. I therefore conclude both appeals should be dismissed.

JP Sargent

INSPECTOR