



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2025

by **J Hobbs MRTPI MCD BSc (hons)**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/W/24/3348548

1 Horsedale, Bonsall, Derbyshire DE4 2AY

- 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 Andrew Clark against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref is NP/DDD/0224/0148.
 - The development proposed is 2-storey and single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The “Options A-3 – Sectionals” drawing¹ was submitted as part of the planning application; however, it was not published on the Authority’s website. Nonetheless, the proposed floorplans shown on the drawing are also within the Design and Access Statement which formed part of the planning application submission shown online. The drawing also formed part of the appeal submission which the Authority and interested parties have had chance to review. For these reasons, no one would be prejudiced by me considering the drawing as part of my assessment of the appeal proposal.
3. There is a disagreement between the parties in relation to whether the two-storey outrigger is an extension to the original house. The Conservation Area Appraisal² is not conclusive. It states that a number of properties were built and/or adapted during the nineteenth century including the appeal property. There is no compelling evidence that the outrigger did not form part of the original dwelling. I have therefore assessed the proposal on the basis that the outrigger formed part of the original dwelling.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including the Peak District National Park (PDNP), and the extent to which it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Bonsall Conservation Area (CA) and the effect on a non-designated heritage asset; and
 - the effect of the proposal on protected species

¹ Drawing No OptA-3-Elev Rev.00

² Bonsall Conservation Area Appraisal, Peak District National Park Authority, March 2011

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. Under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, the two purposes of National Parks are to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage; and to promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of them by the public. The Act requires me to further these purposes. Moreover, paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in the National Parks. The Design Guide³ identifies that traditional buildings in the Peak District have their own unique character. Given the climate and local materials, buildings are often robust, simple, and horizontal in form. The vernacular architecture contributes to the scenic beauty of the PDNP.
6. As the appeal site is within the CA, the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the 1990 Act) requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. The significance of the CA in part relates to the architectural unity provided by buildings of a similar scale and the use of local materials within most buildings. The statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the 1990 Act concerns the CA as a whole. There is no indication that the significance diminishes as it reaches its outer limits. Furthermore, the Authority has identified that the appeal property is a non-designated heritage asset due to its local historic and architectural interest.
7. The appeal property is located at the junction between Horsedale and The Bank. Given the extent of the long-distance views of the property available from the east, it is in a prominent location within the village. The appeal site rises from the south to the north and there is a steep embankment to the rear of the property. The appeal property has a simple T-plan form, and the main section of the dwelling has a pitched roof with the ridgeline running parallel to the longest axis, and the gable end facing toward the road. The rear outrigger has a single pitched roof which runs perpendicular to the main section. Although most buildings in the village have been finished in natural stone, there are examples of buildings which have been rendered such as the appeal property. Overall, the design of the appeal property is largely reflective of others in the village and the wider PDNP, it is also making a positive contribution to the significance of the CA.
8. From the front of the property, the proposed extension would appear as a two-storey side extension stepping down to a single storey. The eaves and ridge height of the extension would be set down from the original dwelling. However, both the two-storey and single storey elements of the extension would have a vertical emphasis. This would contrast with the strong horizontal emphasis of the existing building and is contrary to the guidance within the Alterations and Extensions SPD⁴. The proposed extension would connect to the outrigger and partially wraparound the side elevation. It would result in the creation of a complex plan form with two long sections running parallel to one another. For these reasons, the resultant dwelling would appear incongruous within the street scene.

³ Design Guide Peak District National Park Authority

⁴ Detailed Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document, Alterations & Extensions, Peak District National Park, August 2014

9. Moreover, the proposed extension would result in a 30% net increase in internal floorspace. This is not in accordance with the guidance within the Design Guide where it indicates that extensions limited to less than 25% of the original building are more likely to be approved. At its tallest, the extended section would only be slightly shorter than the original dwelling, it would also add significant massing to the rear and side of the property. Given the complex plan form, the extension's inharmonious proportionality, massing, and scale it would appear as a bulky addition to the appeal property and would not appear sympathetic or subservient. This would be contrary to paragraph 135 of the Framework where it identifies that planning decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character and history.
10. The area is characterised by properties with simple pitched roof forms. Whilst the pitch of the extension's roof would match the original building, the proposed extension would lead to the property having a double pitch and valley roof. The complex roof form would appear discordant in the roofscape.
11. In principle the use of natural stone on the extended section would be acceptable as the stone would assimilate with other properties and the boundary wall, and the contrast between the old and new would allow the building to be readable. Notwithstanding this, the natural stone would contrast with the light-coloured rendered finish of the original building. This would increase the visual prominence of the extended section and amplify the harm identified above.
12. Parts of the proposed extension would be screened by the existing dwelling, the garage building, and steep embankment to the rear. Nevertheless, it would be prominent in views from the east. As such, the level of screening would not mitigate the identified harm.
13. The proposed fenestration within the extension, including details such as the stone sills and lintols would be in keeping with the original building and surrounding properties and would not cause harm.
14. I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area including the PDNP. It would also neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. The proposal would also have a harmful effect on the appeal property which is a non-designated heritage asset. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3 and L3 of the Peak District National Park, Local Development Framework, Core Strategy Development Plan Document, October 2011 (CS) and policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC8 and DMH7 of the Development Management Policies, Part 2 of the Local Plan for the PDNP, May 2019 (DMP). These policies indicate that all development shall be consistent with the National Park's legal purposes; development must conserve the significance of a historic asset; and extensions to dwellings will be permitted provided the proposal conserves the character and appearance of the building, amongst other matters.

Protected species

15. The Bat Roost Appraisal⁵ submitted with the application indicated that it was necessary to undertake a dusk emergence survey. Following the determination of the planning application and prior to the submission of the appeal, a Dusk

⁵ Bat Survey Report, Bat Roost Appraisal, Ref. WDEC494, January 2024 – Version 1

Emergence Survey⁶ has been undertaken. The survey has been undertaken within the optimal survey period and completed by appropriately qualified individuals. The survey concluded that there was no evidence of bats roosting within the property and recommended that ecological enhancement measures should be incorporated into the design of the proposed extension. This could be conditioned as part of any planning permission.

16. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on protected species. The proposal would comply with CS Policy L2 and DMP policies DMC11 and DMC12, which indicate that development must conserve any features of biodiversity importance, amongst other matters.

Other Matters

17. The Authority has indicated that the proposal would be contrary to CS Policy DS1. Section C of this policy is most relevant to the proposal where it indicates that within settlements, extensions will be acceptable in principle. It is not clear how the proposal would be contrary to this policy.
18. The appellant has indicated that the scheme suggested by the Authority would be contrary to their own guidance. My assessment is based upon the appeal proposal only.
19. There is not a legislative requirement for the planning officer to consult the Authority's Built Heritage Team on proposals affecting heritage assets. Furthermore, I acknowledge the appellant's comments in relation to the conduct of the Authority during the determination of the application. However, these are matters between the appellant and the Authority and it is not a matter for my consideration on the acceptability of the appeal proposal.

Planning Balance

20. Given the scale of the proposal compared to the size of the CA, the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the CA. Regardless, paragraph 212 of the Framework is clear that great weight should be given to a heritage assets conservation. The proposal would significantly alter the design of the appeal property, a non-designated heritage asset; therefore, substantially diminishing its significance. I ascribe substantial weight to the harm caused by the proposal to both the CA and the non-designated heritage asset.
21. Paragraph 215 of the Framework indicates that less than substantial harm to the CA should be weighed against the public benefits. Paragraph 216 indicates that a balanced judgement will be required when assessing proposals that affect non-designated heritage assets.
22. The proposal would lead to a better functioning family home which in turn would lead to an improvement of the housing stock in Bonsall and could make a better use of an under-utilised building. The proposal also includes energy efficient measures which would reduce energy usage and carbon emissions. Given the scale of the development, I ascribe modest weight to these benefits. The lack of a harmful effect on neighbouring occupiers' living conditions and a retention of the natural stone boundary wall are neutral factors. I conclude, even when considered

⁶ Bat Survey Report, Dusk Emergence Survey, Ref. WDEC509, May 2024 – Version 1

in combination the benefits do not outweigh the less than substantial harm to the CA or the harm to the non-designated heritage asset.

Conclusion

23. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

J Hobbs

INSPECTOR