



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025

by **D Cleary MTCP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P1045/D/25/3370133

Mount Pleasant Cottage, Bullhill Lane, Ireton Wood, Derbyshire DE56 2SD

- 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 Phillip Newson against the decision of Derbyshire Dales District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00496/FUL.
 - The development proposed is for side and rear extensions, and the erection of a car port.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for side and rear extensions, and the erection of a car port at Mount Pleasant Cottage, Bullhill Lane, Ireton Wood, Derbyshire DE56 2SD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00496/FUL, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans referenced:

Location Plan (dated 21/05/25)

812.1468.1-(08)003 Rev P3 – Existing Elevations

812.1468.1-(08)004 Rev P4 – Proposed Plans

812.1468.1-(08)005 Rev P3 – Proposed Elevations

812.1468.1-(08)006 Rev P5 – Callouts & Sections
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be as detailed within the application and approved plans.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the banner above, and in my formal decision, I have taken the description of development from the decision notice of the Council rather than the application form. This is because it more concisely describes the development proposed, although I have made some minor alterations for precision.

Background and Main Issue

3. The appeal development includes an extension to the kitchen and a new car port. The Council do not raise any objection to these parts of the appeal scheme. The kitchen extension would be positioned to the side of the dwelling, is modest in scale and is of a form which respects the host building. The car port would be positioned deep in the site, away from the public highway. This position, along with its modest scale would ensure that the car port would appear subservient to the dwelling. Furthermore, it would not appear prominent within the surrounding area and would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the countryside. As such, I have no reason to disagree with the Council's conclusions with regard to those elements of the scheme.
4. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the rear extension on the character and appearance of the existing building.

Reasons

5. Mount Pleasant Cottage is a detached property which is located within a rural location. The building is of narrow linear footprint and form, positioned perpendicular to the street. The main building is broken into three distinct sections. The front section, closest to the street, is the tallest and deepest part and includes the main architectural detailing of the dwelling. The middle and rear sections are similar in depth to each other. The eaves and ridge of the roof for each section are stepped down. This results in a clear visual hierarchy within the building. The front and middle sections are in use as habitable accommodation, while the rearmost section is in use as a domestic garage and storage space. The dwelling occupies a relatively remote rural hillside location and is surrounded by fields.
6. The extension would project to the rear by less than half the depth of the dwellings existing rearmost section. This modest projection, would only add a limited amount of additional mass to the dwelling. The roof would continue the existing ridge and eaves heights meaning that the modest addition would visually assimilate with the existing building. The rear extension would be appropriate in scale and form.
7. The additional mass would result in the rear section of the dwelling having a greater depth than that of the middle section. While this would elongate the section, I do not consider that the additional depth would be so significant to imbalance the visual relationship. Furthermore, the lower ridge and eaves heights would be sufficient to ensure that the rear section would remain subservient and that the sense of visual hierarchy within the building would be retained.
8. The rear extension also includes a single storey element to the side. This would have a lean to roof with an overall height which would be set below the eaves of the existing building. The scale of this part of the extension would appear as a modest addition and would be of a similar form to an existing single storey lean to on the dwelling. Therefore, the lean-to would respect the character of the existing building. Together, the extensions to the rear are not significant in scale and would remain visually subservient to the existing building. Therefore, I do not find that the cumulative scale or form of the extensions would be harmful to the dwelling.
9. The part of the building which would be extended is the existing garage. This space would be converted to habitable floorspace. The existing main openings include a

double garage doors and a pedestrian doorway within one elevation while there is an external staircase to the rear gable elevation. While the garage is likely to be of some age, its overall character has been diluted by the domestic nature of the site. Therefore, in this instance, I am not persuaded that its features are so characteristic that their retention ought to be prioritised.

10. Notwithstanding the above, the proposed openings include a full height glazed window and a further “roller barn door”, with window. While these would not be a like-for-like replacement in terms of proportion and design, they would nonetheless provide a rural character to the converted element of the building. As such, the development would appear as a converted ancillary building positioned adjacent to the main dwelling which has more domestic style windows and features. Therefore, the new openings to the side would visually harmonise with the wider elevation.
11. The gable of the extension would be glazed, almost in its entirety. The design of this elevation takes an alternative non-traditional approach to the treatment of openings. I agree that the extent of glazing is large and is of a design/appearance which is not traditional to the site or of rural buildings. However, it would be provided within the new build element and its position on the end elevation means that it would not be prominently visible in the context of the other elevations. Furthermore, any public views of the elevation are likely to be limited. Therefore, I do not find the design or appearance of the extension, including the extent of glazing in the gable, to be unduly harmful to the building.
12. I acknowledge the advice contained within The Conversion of Farm Buildings Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (the SPD). Firstly, it should be noted that the content of the SPD is guidance only. I also do not have the evidence to definitively conclude that the appeal building was a “farm building” and therefore whether it is directly relevant to the appeal. Nonetheless, I do accept that the existing building does contain some rural character and that the guidance contained within the SPD is a useful tool for considering how the conversion/extension to the building could be carried out.
13. In this instance, I consider that the development does adhere to elements of the SPD. In particular, the proposal would follow the general advice for extensions and additions (page 19). As I have noted above, the extension would be designed “*to respect and harmonise with the existing building in terms of the extensions’ form, shape, character, size, scale, and massing*”. While, with regard to windows (in extensions), the SPD states that “*the extent, form, shape and type of fenestration/openings to an extension or addition will need to be given very careful consideration in terms of their potential impact on the host building*”. This does not appear to explicitly prohibit large expanses of glazing in new extensions. As I have considered above, I am satisfied that the extent of glazing, due their position, would not have a harmful effect on the host building in this instance.
14. For the above reasons, the development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing building. Therefore, the development complies with Policies S4, PD1 and HC10 of the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan (2017). Together, amongst other things, these require that development is of a high-quality design which respects character, identity and context, and that the height, scale, form and design of extensions are in keeping with the scale and character of the original dwelling.

Conditions

15. I have imposed standard conditions relating to the commencement of development, and to require compliance with the submitted plans for certainty. I have also attached a condition for materials to be as detailed within the application, which is necessary in the interest of the character and appearance of the building and area.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR