
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 August 2025

by **Paul Martinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/25/3360574

Suidhe Ban, The Nook, Eyam, Derbyshire S32 5AB

- 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 Williams against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref is NP/DDD/0324/0312.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'stone faced garden room extension with a tiled roof'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the Appeal Form in the interests of clarity and brevity.
3. The appeal site is located within a Conservation Area. I have therefore had special regard to section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Eyam Conservation Area and the effect on the significance of Suidhe Ban, a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

Special Interest and Significance

5. Eyam Conservation Area (the CA), covers much of the settlement. It comprises of tightly packed stone dwellings with a high solid to void ratio, roofed with Welsh and stone slates and set within a Pennine landscape with rising ground to the edge of the village. The surrounding hills, many of which are wooded, are visible in views throughout the village forming a verdant backdrop to the townscape. The settlement pattern becomes more sporadic to its fringes with elevated individual dwellings visible on the hillside as part of the verdant backdrop.
6. I am provided with little evidence with regard to the significance of the CA, however, based on my own assessment, the special interest and significance derives from the prevalence of modest sized traditional cottages and houses, their consistency in form and solid to void ratio, the uniformity of materials, the distinctive settlement pattern, and its setting within of a high quality, scenic landscape.

7. The appeal property is a two storey stone built dwelling orientated roughly north-south with a linear form and outriggers to the rear. The original building dates to 1751 although it has been extended on multiple occasions, including, through the addition of a timber framed glazed conservatory to the western gable. The windows of the dwelling comprise of vertically proportioned or square casements. Owing to its fenestration and solid gables, the appeal building has retained the high solid to void ratio that characterises the cottages and houses that characterise the CA.
8. The existing conservatory is of a typical domestic conservatory design, nevertheless it has a modest footprint and height and owing to being entirely glazed, the coursed stone walls of the gable remain visible. The conservatory is located away from The Nook and is not prominent in views from along it. However, owing to the village's topography, it is visible, along with the gable of the dwelling, and some of its neighbours on the hillside, seen in distant views from the south west, notably from Tideswell Lane.
9. As a traditional stone built dwelling with a high solid to void ratio that is visible as part of the scenic landscape, the appeal building reinforces the character and appearance of the CA and contributes positively to its significance.
10. The National Park Authority considers that the building is a non-designated heritage asset, in line with the Planning Practice Guidance¹ and paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). Whilst I recognise that the building has evolved since its construction, this is not unexpected given its considerable age. Having regard to my above assessment, I consider that the building retains sufficient heritage significance to be considered a non-designated heritage asset.
11. In that regard its significance, insofar as it relates to the appeal, derives from its considerable age, traditional construction and form including its high solid to void ratio, its local walling materials, and its setting on the edge of the village within a rural landscape.

Proposals and Effects

12. The appeal proposal would involve the removal of the existing timber conservatory and the construction of a new garden room extension. The new structure would be wider and would project out a greater distance from the dwelling than the existing conservatory.
13. The structure would include stone walling and concrete roof tiles reflective of the materials present in the existing dwelling, taking the form of a typical single storey extension. However, the wide, somewhat squat, windows comprising of four casements to each side of the extension would contrast starkly with the narrow or square casements present in the existing dwelling. Moreover, this would reduce the extent of stone walling around the window, resulting in a much lower solid to void ratio than is present in the existing dwelling or that characterises the CA.
14. The gable would be entirely glazed including glazing to its apex at odds with the characteristic solid gables present in the existing dwelling. Owing to the extent of glazing in the roof, occupying most of its length and extending to the ridge, the roof

¹ Paragraph: 039 Reference ID: 18a-039-20190723.

would also exhibit a significantly lower solid to void ratio than is present in the existing dwelling or than is typical within the CA.

15. Owing to its siting on the gable, the proposal would be a highly visible addition to the dwelling in views from the south west. Its low solid to void ratio and contrasting fenestration would appear discordant and would dominate these views, at odds with the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, and the character and appearance of the CA. For the same reasons the proposal would be harmful to the significance of the existing dwelling as a non-designated heritage asset.
16. The structure would be particularly prominent in views from Tideswell Lane looking into the CA. Here the proposed addition would be the most prominent element of the dwelling and would be seen in an elevated position when travelling towards the village.
17. I acknowledge that the existing conservatory is entirely glazed, however, owing to its means of construction, it is a much more lightweight structure than that proposed. It also occupies a smaller footprint and is lower in height than the proposal. Moreover, my role is to assess the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the CA.
18. The appellant has directed me to other extensions nearby. Damson Trees is located outside of the CA and is a bungalow located amongst similar properties. It does not appear to be prominent in wider landscape views, nor can it be viewed from within the CA. Whilst I have little detail with regard to the barn conversion that I have been provided with a photograph of, this building appears to exhibit a high solid to void ratio and includes a tall opening reminiscent of a barn doorway.
19. The extension that has been constructed at Windward House has a much greater solid to void ratio than the appeal scheme, incorporating a predominantly solid roof and part solid gable. Its fenestration also has a vertical emphasis reflective of that of the dwelling rather than the wide casements proposed as part of the appeal scheme. I would also note that the gable of this dwelling is not as prominent in landscape views as that of the appeal proposal. On this basis, none of the examples provided represent a precedent that would justify allowing the appeal.
20. For the above reasons, the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. This would be contrary to the requirements of sections 72(1) of the Act. In doing so it would cause harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset. The proposal would also result in harm to the significance of a non-designated heritage asset.

Public Benefits and Balance

21. Paragraph 212 of the Framework sets out that, when considering the impact of a proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Given the extent and nature of the proposed works, I find that the harm in this instance would be 'less than substantial' but, nevertheless, of considerable importance and weight. Under such circumstances, Paragraph 215 advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
22. The Framework also sets out that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the

application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

23. The appellant has advanced the proposal to allow for year-round use and to replace the conservatory which is in need of repair. I accept the proposal would be beneficial in those respects. Nevertheless, those are essentially personal benefits as opposed to the public harm to heritage assets that would result. Nonetheless, minor economic benefits to the local economy would arise from the construction processes. However, I am not convinced that the appeal scheme is the only means of achieving such benefits.
24. The Framework is explicit in its requirement that any harm to the significance of designated heritage assets should require clear and convincing justification, which, in all of the respects outlined above, I find not to be the case in the scheme before me. The public benefits would not outweigh the harm to the designated heritage asset to which I must give considerable importance and weight.
25. The proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. This would be contrary to the requirements of section 72(1) of the Act and the provisions within the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance heritage assets. There would also be harm to the significance of a non-designated heritage asset. The harmful impact would be contrary to Policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, and L3 of the Peak District National Park Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM1, DMC3, DMC5, DMC8 and DMH7 of the Peak District National Park Development Management Policies (2019). Together, and amongst other things these seek to ensure new domestic extensions preserve and enhance heritage assets and the cultural heritage of the National Park whilst providing high quality design that makes a positive contribution to local distinctiveness.

Other Matters

26. I acknowledge the lack of an objection from the Parish Council and the lack of objections from local residents. However, a lack of objection does not necessarily equate to a lack of harm.

Conclusion

27. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations that indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Martinson

INSPECTOR