



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2025

by M J Francis BA (Hons) MA MSc MCIfA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/Y/25/3368683

Dakin Cottage, Waterswallows Road, Fairfield, Buxton, Derbyshire SK17 7JJ

- 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 Mrs Tiffany Atkinson against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is HPK/2024/0324.
 - The works proposed are new single storey garden room extension and conservation repairs to Dakin Cottage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for an award of costs has been made by Tiffany and Antony Atkinson which is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. Although the appellant applied for both planning permission and listed building consent, both of which were refused, the appeal is only against the refusal of listed building consent. Therefore, as required by section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), I have had special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural interest which it possesses.
4. The Council refused the application based on revised plans submitted during the course of the application. This is the basis on which I have determined the appeal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve the grade II listed building, or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

Special interest and significance

6. Dakin Cottage and attached garden wall¹ is a grade II listed building, formerly known as Fairfield Farm. It is within an area of housing which runs along one side of Waterswallows Road. The two-storey house is set away from, and below the level of the road, reached by a driveway. The house is viewed through a group of

¹ List entry number:1257798

trees within the northern section of the garden, part of the landscaped and spacious grounds that provide a verdant setting for the property. The high, stone, garden wall, in part crenelated, is an important feature which defines the property on the eastern side.

7. The special interest and significance of the building, with regard to this appeal, derive from its archaeological, architectural and historic interest. Originally a farmhouse, the building, with a datestone of 1683, appears on maps from at least 1841. It was constructed on a L-plan as a hall and cross-wing. It has seen many alterations, including being extended by one bay prior to 1841 which is visible on the southern elevation. The cross wing was extended and a single storey extension added on the east side, as shown on an 1878 map, when it was called Townend Farm. The garden wall is also visible on the map at this date, as well as gardens and an orchard.
8. The building is in a vernacular style in locally sourced limestone. It has a stone slate roof, with kneelers and stone chimney stacks. The stone mullion windows with stone surrounds, door lintels and a large doorway with a bracketed hood on the west elevation, contribute to its architectural interest. Internally, there are stone fireplaces, and a chamfered doorway. The buildings association with the Dakin, or Deakin family, who are thought to have owned the property from 1588 until the mid-19th century, provides the historical interest to the building, particularly the surviving Dakin crest on the crenelated wall.

Effect of the proposed works

9. The proposed extension would be sited on an open area covered by stone slabs between the north elevation of the house and the surrounding stone garden wall, utilising the outbuilding along the eastern elevation. From the evidence before me and what I saw, other than works undertaken in the 20th century, the northern elevation represents part of the latest phase of the building. There are two small windows on the ground floor, one of which appears to be modern, and a small window on the first floor.
10. The proposed extension is single-storey and contemporary in style. Infilling the yard area, the appellant refers to it being extended with a cross wing to form a H-plan, akin to a double ended hall house. Offset from the north-west corner of the house, it would extend forward of the existing western elevation of the cross wing.
11. The roof, designed to reduce future maintenance and to protect the listed building and the garden wall, slopes away from the building, with gutters and an overhang over the garden wall allowing drainage into a French drain. Sited so that it does not affect the first-floor window cill, it enables a sizeable portion of the gable wall to be seen from Waterswallows Road and would remove the unsightly pipework on this elevation.
12. Whilst the design of the zinc standing seam roof, including the overhang, elegantly reduces the visual weight and massing of the roof, in revising the design so that it does not overlap the quoins on the corner of the building, the footprint of the building has been enlarged, extending it further towards the west. Although the quoins on the western elevation would be visible externally, the proposed ground floor plan suggests that would be some overhang from the roof. However, there is no long section through the proposed extension showing the southern face,

viewed against the garden wall, only one that shows a cut through northern elevation of the house.

13. The lead coping on the garden wall, referred to as a subsidiary feature within the listing, would be appropriate. I consider that the proposed use of a coloured zinc for the roof, which could be controlled by a suitably worded condition, would successfully integrate the roofscape with the adjoining stonework, Welsh and stone slates. This, as well as metal framed doors, would clearly indicate that the proposal is a modern addition, although one built in complementary materials.
14. Extra daylight would be provided by two sets of frameless glass rooflights. These provide a neat and appropriate method of providing light. Moreover, used in combination with the zinc roof they enable a more efficient way of conserving heat than a fully glazed roof, and prevent light spill which could be highly visible from vantage points, particularly when viewed from Waterswallows Road. Moreover, the nearby trees would drop leaves and seeds on a glazed roof, creating shade and making it difficult to clean. This would quickly appear unsightly and detract from the appearance of the listed building.
15. Internally, adjoining the garden wall the extension would have an ashlar wall with glazing sited at below eaves level. The use of stone in this way would provide a visual contrast to that found in the formation of the cottage. However, there is no substantive evidence as to how this would be constructed so that it protected the listed wall.
16. I saw that the outbuilding is currently under-used and in poor condition. Connecting this to the extension by re-building the internal wall, repairing and insulating the roof, installing conservation rooflights, a new breathable floor, timber doors and stone sills, would integrate this underutilised space into the house, improving thermal performance. Additionally, removing hard cement mortar, and replacing it with lime mortar would provide positive benefits to the building. However, the proposed plans indicate that if the lintels are found to be in a poor condition, they would be replaced on a like for like basis, even though one of these lintels with a datestone of 1683 is a significant feature of the building. Yet there is no substantive evidence before me whether if the lintel was removed, it would be re-located or preserved.
17. Connecting the proposed extension to the existing house, two door openings are proposed in the thick, outer wall. One, a single planked door, and the other a pair of glazed doors created from the two existing window openings. Whilst there has been disturbance to this elevation, it would result in a moderate loss of historic fabric, even if some of this has been infilled and sandstone quoins and sills would be reinstated or re-used. Whilst I understand that a door is intended to create a new focal point along a north-south corridor, I have limited substantive evidence of the need for both openings even if this is through fabric of later, and lower, significance than other parts of the cottage.
18. The appellants consider that the site of the proposed extension is underused and its condition detracts from the setting of the house. The orientation of this yard makes it damp and shaded by trees, and I could see green algae on the walls. However, whilst the works and installation of heating could improve the condition of this elevation, I have not been provided with any evidence that there is damp within the house. Foul drainage would be routed internally and concealed in

boxings, however, there is no substantive evidence as to where this would be located. The appellants acknowledge that there would be some harm to the northern gable, although consider that the works are reversible. However, the proposal involves the removal of stonework within the gable and alterations to the boundary wall which would not make it easily reversible.

19. I understand that the thick stone walls throughout the house means that extending it and creating new openings is more difficult. However, this is not unusual in a listed building. Whilst the appellant wants to provide family living space that is well insulated and more energy efficient, with a closer connection to the garden, there is limited substantive evidence as to how the extension would be heated and benefit the listed building. Furthermore, there is no evidence that renewable energy would be used.
20. The proposal has been designed following a detailed heritage assessment and consideration of the significance of the listed building. As such, it has demonstrated that the site of the proposed extension would be attached to the later wing and have the least effect on historic fabric. Visually, based on its location, height and materials, it would appear subordinate to the listed building. Notwithstanding this, the forward projection would cause some harm to the listed building, in addition to the removal of historic fabric following the creation of two doorways. However, based on the siting, proposed materials and colour palette, the extension would not harm the setting of the listed building.
21. Therefore, given the above, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the listed building and features of special architectural interest which it possesses, although I find that it would preserve the setting of the listed building. This would harm the significance of the heritage asset. Consequently, I give this harm considerable importance and weight.

Public Benefits and Balance

22. Paragraph 212 of the Framework advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 213 goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets and that any such harm should have clear and convincing justification. I find the harm to the listed building to be less than substantial, and whilst this is on the lower end of the scale, it is, nevertheless, of considerable importance and weight.
23. Where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. The Planning Practice Guidance² sets out what may be regarded as public benefits, such as works to a listed private dwelling which secures its future as a designated heritage asset. Whilst there would be some economic benefits from the proposed works, the building is already a private house and therefore has an optimum viable use as a dwelling. Therefore, this would be a limited public benefit.
24. The loss of historic fabric is referred to as a minor harm by the appellant, with the tidying up of the north elevation, and bringing the yard back into use, providing

² Paragraph: 020 Reference ID: 18a-020-20190723, 23 July 2019

significant public benefits. However, although the yard area is potentially the least attractive part of the property, the current entrance to the house is on the eastern elevation, and the yard is not highly visible, or harming the overall condition of the site. The appellant refers to limited accommodation on the ground floor, wanting more useful family space and that the layout, including the existing toilet and laundry area, is not appropriate to their needs. However, there are several existing rooms on the ground floor and as such any extension would be a purely private benefit.

25. Notwithstanding this, repairing and repointing historic walls, kneelers and coping stones with lime mortar, whilst part of the regular management of owning a listed building, would improve the condition of the site and ensure its long-term conservation. This provides some moderate public benefits. Although energy efficiency and improvements can be a public benefit as set out in the appeal decision³ submitted by the appellant, there is limited substantive evidence of energy efficiency measures in this proposal.
26. Therefore, in the absence of any sizeable public benefits, I conclude that, on balance, the proposal would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the grade II listed building. This would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and paragraph 212 of the Framework. It would also conflict with policies EQ 6 and EQ 7 of the High Peak Local Plan, 2016. Collectively, and in part, these policies require well-designed development that responds positively to both its environment and the challenge of climate change, and conserves heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Conclusion

27. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M J Francis

INSPECTOR

³ APP/P1045/W/24/3343210