



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 27 November 2025

by **N Kempton BAHons, PGDip, MA, IHBC, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 February 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/M1005/W/25/3370875

Knowts Hall Farm, Golden Valley, Riddings, Alfreton, Derbyshire DE55 4ES

- 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 and Mrs C Kelly against the decision of Amber Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is AVA/2024/0812.
 - The development proposed is single storey garden room extension.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/M1005/Y/25/3370877

Knowts Hall Farm, Golden Valley, Riddings, Alfreton, Derbyshire DE55 4ES

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs C Kelly against the decision of Amber Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is AVA/2024/0813.
 - The works proposed are single storey garden room extension.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed and listed building consent is refused for a single storey garden room extension.

Preliminary Matters

3. The proposal is within the setting of a listed building and relates to works to a building within its curtilage. As required by sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), I have had special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
4. In my determination of Appeal B, I have had regard to the development plan policies cited on the Council's decision notice where material. However, I am not obliged to determine the appeal in accordance with them.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve the setting and significance of the grade II listed building, Knowts Hall Farmhouse¹ and the buildings within its curtilage and any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

¹ Knowts Hall Farmhouse List entry number: 1335394.

Reasons

Special interest and significance

6. Knowts Hall Farmhouse and the barns, which are arranged in a traditional inward facing courtyard, within its curtilage, are significant as a well-preserved rural farmstead that embodies centuries of architectural change. The barns, which have been converted to residential use, are low level, simple in form and design and constructed of a mixed palette of local stone and red brick. Their grade II listing highlights their national importance not only as individual structures but as part of a cohesive historic farmstead, valued for their age, architecture and contribution to Derbyshire's rural landscape and agricultural heritage.
7. The buildings in the farmstead complex have a past functional link to one another. The setting of this complex is defined by the quiet, rural surrounding agricultural land and the wider landscape. Fundamentally linked to the use of the farmhouse and associated agricultural land, and an integral part of the countryside, the farmstead and its setting contribute to the significance and setting of the listed building, including the barns.

Effects

8. The proposal includes the addition of a fully glazed, single storey extension to the southwestern elevation of one of the barns in the group. Whilst the proposal would be an honest contemporary addition, unapologetically modern and lightweight, the extensive glazing would contrast with the robust agricultural character and appearance of the barn. The glazed extension would arguably serve to re-orientate the property to the detriment of the barn group's legibility. Where traditionally activity would be inward facing and largely contained within the courtyard, the extension would be sited on the outward face of the barn group. Furthermore, the visual permeability of the glass extension would render activity and use of the space, as well as the domestic paraphernalia, highly visible, thereby domesticating the barn, to the detriment of the agricultural character and appearance of the building and the group.
9. The proposed extension would be visible from the shared driveway on approach to the property and courtyard entrance. The slight set back behind the gable end of the existing barn, would be insufficient to fully obscure the extension. The proposed use of anti-reflective glass is noted, however, prominence of the glazed extension would be particularly evident outside of daylight hours due to artificial lighting and resultant light pollution.
10. The existing modest barn is narrow in form and proportion. The proposed extension, whilst linear in form, would fail to reflect the vernacular proportions. The proposal would erode the essential character of these traditional farm buildings, which are simple and unassuming. As such, the proposal would be detrimental to the character and setting of the farm group.
11. For these reasons, I have found that the proposed works would be harmful to the special interest and significance of the listed building and the buildings within its curtilage, and to their collective setting. The proposal would fail to preserve the listed building and its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Taking account of the design and lightweight construction of the proposal, I find that there would be less than substantial harm,

towards the mid-point of the scale, in relation to the significance of the designated heritage assets, but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight.

Public benefits

12. Paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing the asset's optimum viable use.
13. Paragraph 213 of the Framework stipulates that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset requires clear and convincing justification. Moreover, paragraph 212 indicates great weight should be given to the conservation of each designated heritage asset. The appellant is of the opinion that the proposal would be beneficial because it would enhance the amenity of the property, extend the living space, improve circulation and provide improved level access to the ground floor of the dwelling, thereby aiding accessibility for their dependent child. I acknowledge the benefits that the proposed extended living accommodation would deliver. I also acknowledge the negative impacts of dismissing the appeal on the appellant arise since they would be unable to deliver the proposed works as sought, and the care requirements in terms of living conditions would not be met in this regard. Furthermore, there is a chance that the appellant's specific needs would not be met if an acceptable alternative could not be put forward.
14. Notwithstanding this, the continued viable use of the appeal property as a residential dwelling is not dependent on the proposal, as the building has an ongoing residential use that would not cease in its absence.
15. It is accepted that there would be some short term uplift to the local economy through construction jobs and trade for local suppliers and contractors.
16. Given that these are largely private benefits and any public benefits would be limited, they would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified. I conclude that, on balance, the proposed works would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the Grade II listed building and its setting, thus failing to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 212 of the Framework, and development plan policy insofar as relevant.
17. As such, in relation to Appeal A, the proposed development would be contrary to Policy EN24 of the Amber Valley Borough Local Plan (2006), which ensures that heritage and archaeology are safeguarded during development. The policy balances growth with cultural preservation, preventing the loss of irreplaceable historic assets.

Other Considerations

18. I have had due regard to Article 19 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD), the Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA), and to the Public Sector Duty (PSDD) under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which sets out the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and access, and foster good relations between persons who share a protected

characteristic and those who do not share it. Disability is a relevant protected characteristic to which the PSED applies.

19. These rights are engaged in reaching my decision and I have kept these interests at the forefront of my mind. However, they are qualified rights and interference may be justified where in the public interest. The concept of proportionality is key. I recognise that the proposed development has primarily been designed to meet the appellant's personal circumstances and specifically to enable care of a dependent child with a protected characteristic, by enabling a step-free circulation route through the ground floor of the living accommodation.
20. All matters have been taken into account in reaching my decisions on these appeals.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons given above the Appeals A and B should be dismissed.

N Kempton

INSPECTOR