



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2024

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F1040/W/24/3344462

Pippins Paddock, Fox Hollow, Ingleby Road, Stanton-by-Bridge, Derby DE73 7HT

- 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 Clive Gerrard against the decision of South Derbyshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is: DMPA/2024/0057.
 - The application is for construction of a detached garage, built from brick, with access from within Pippins Paddock.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the Stanton By Bridge Conservation Area and upon the setting of the Grade II Listed Ivy Farm Cottage and other nearby Non Listed Buildings.

Procedural Matter

3. Since the determination of this application a revised National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) was published on 12 December 2024 whose main focus was not directly relevant to this appeal. Nevertheless, I have determined this appeal in accordance with the revised provisions within the Framework.
4. The description of development used in the heading above differs from that used on the Council's Decision notice and instead the description is that as used by the Appellant on their original application form. I consider that the description of development still accurately reflects the proposal before me and as such I have used this description accordingly.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a small area of land formed out of the curve of the access road that serves the development known as Pippins Paddock. Pippins Paddock is a small development of bungalows, of which Fox Hollow is one. The site is located within the Stanton By Bridge Conservation Area which was first designated in 1978 and a public footpath runs through and around the edge of the site towards the valley beyond. On my site visit there was stored upon this site a plastic portaloo structure of some type.

6. The Conservation Area Appraisal explains the historic development of the village from one of Anglo Saxon settlement to developing to a much greater degree following the 14th century causeway that can still be seen today. Following later enclosure the village expanded further as it did also in the later 20th century. Nevertheless, the village maintains its rural character with development primarily focussed around Ingleby Road/Church Close and the two greens at either end of this linear spine. As such the character of the village is very much dictated by this linear layout with open fields around which can sometimes be glimpsed from the Ingleby Road.
7. The same Conservation Area Appraisal identifies a view into and over the appeal site area as a principal view. This is due primarily to the outlook it maintains into the countryside beyond the front building line of the Ingleby Road. I consider that this view may well have been identified as such due to the perception of open space and landscape that this site preserves as it is one of only a few remaining glimpses of the surrounding fields from this part of Ingleby Road.
8. The site is also within the setting of the Grade II Listed Ivy Farm Cottage that dates from around the mid 18th century and, as its name suggests, would have likely had some relationship to the open countryside around the village and it maintains some oblique outlook over this site today. I therefore consider that the contribution of this site to the character and appearance of the CA is significant and that it contributes in a minor positive manner also to the wider setting of the Grade II Listed Building of Ivy Farm Cottage. It also has a positive effect upon the setting of the non designated heritage assets in the form of Plum Tree Cottages for similar reasons of its role in providing a sense of openness.
9. The proposal before me seeks permission to erect a single storey, mono pitch garage upon this small plot of land to the west of the vehicular entrance into the Pippins Paddock development. The building would be built of a conservation style (Cassandra) brick with corrugated roofing material and would face in a northerly direction allowing vehicles to access from the unadopted road that serves the existing bungalows further down the hill. The garage would measure around 6m by 5m and would have a maximum height of around 2.5m.
10. In considering whether to grant planning permission I am required by Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to show 'special regard' when assessing proposals for development that may affect a listed building or its setting. Similarly, Section 72 of the same act requires me to show 'special attention' to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. This is reflected in The Framework, which states that 'great weight' should be given to a heritage assets' conservation and also illustrates the positive contribution that heritage assets can make to the creation of sustainable and economically viable communities.
11. As mentioned above the site represents a potentially rare survival of landscape and outlook from the village main street towards the countryside and the very historically significant causeway bridge beyond. As such I cannot see it as a coincidence that the bungalows that form part of Pippins Paddock were sited so far to the north and so far back from the line of Ingleby Road. Indeed, although

I have no evidence before me to confirm this, I consider it likely that the previously undeveloped nature of this site was pertinent in this original decision and that the openness, views and landscape setting that this site provided were considered important even then.

12. Despite this however, the fact remains that this site represents a rare survival of visible open land immediately adjacent to the main village spine road. The siting of the proposed garage however, would not only encroach into this view and upon this landscape area, but it would also be set beyond the gable line of the adjoining non designated row of cottages to such an extent as to make this structure more obvious and more visible. This was confirmed to me through the visibility of the portaloo structure that was on site at the time of my visit.
13. Moreover, the design is very generic in its form and the suggestion of corrugated iron roofing and UPVC windows would introduce materials that are, despite some isolated examples, largely alien and harmful in this context. As a result, this proposal does not respond in a positive manner to the overriding character of the historic environment to which it forms part.
14. Ultimately therefore, this proposal would introduce a harmful development both in terms of its design and materials as well as its encroachment upon a valuable open space and principal view from the CA that could not be outweighed by the very modest public benefits as outlined by the Appellant. As such this scheme does not meet the requirements of The Framework as it is reflected within Policies S2, BNE1, BNE2, H27 and BNE10 of the South Derbyshire Local Plan.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, and taking into account of all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR