The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2013

by Paul Jackson B Arch (Hons) RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 21 June 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/E/12/2184108
Bank End Farm, 135 Kinder Road, Hayfield, High Peak SK22 2LE

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
- The appeal is made by Mrs Anne Fraser against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
- The application Ref HPK/2012/0061, dated 3 February 2012, was refused by notice dated 26 March 2012.
- The works proposed are a two storey extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for a two storey extension at Bank End Farm, 135 Kinder Road, Hayfield, High Peak SK22 2LE in accordance with the terms of the application Ref HPK/2012/0061, dated 3 February 2012 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:

    1) The works hereby authorised shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.

    2) The developer shall give the local planning authority 14 days advance notice of the start of any works and, for a period of 14 days before any work begins, reasonable access to the building shall be given to the local planning authority or a person/body nominated by the local planning authority for the purpose of recording the building by making measured drawings or taking photographs.

    3) The removal of parts of the flank wall where necessary to insert new windows and doors shall be carried out by hand or by hand-held tools and the materials stored for re-use in the new extension.

    4) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building including mortar pointing and coursing, slate coursing and method of fixing, rainwater goods.

    5) No development shall take place until samples of the stone, mortar (including a sample panel of the stonework of approximately 1m x 1m), slates and window materials and finishes to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out to match the approved samples and sample panel.

6) No development shall take place until details at a scale of not less than 1:10 of the heads and jambs of the window and door openings and the junction between the verges of the roof of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The gap between the underside of the slates of the existing dwelling and the top of the slates of the extension shall be not less than 250 millimetres subtended at 90 degrees to the roof pitch. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

7) Except where otherwise indicated in this decision and conditions, the works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, all dated January 2012.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the architectural character and historic interest of the building, which is listed at Grade II.

Reasons

3. The appeal property consists of a late 18th century farmhouse and barn, now entirely occupied as a single dwelling. The dwelling lies in open countryside at the far eastern end of the Hayfield Conservation Area immediately adjacent to Kinder Road. Planning permission and listed building consent were granted in 2007 for a rear extension and a side garden room (refs HPK/2007/0506 and 0600) permissions which in 2010 were subsequently given an extension of time for implementation.

4. The eastern part of the building contained the barn element. The roofing materials have been replaced with slate and rooflights inserted, but the original shape of the building remains. The end elevation retains considerable visual interest as vestiges of its utilitarian agricultural origins are visible, as well as new glazed doors and a window.

5. The new side extension would be constructed of the same stone and coursing and the details of the openings and windows would match those existing. There would be a meaningful vertical separation between the existing roof slope and the new roof, ensuring that the extension would be sufficiently visually subservient to the original building. However the new wide 4 light timber glazed door would be an incongruous modern domestic element. Together with 3 other new modern windows, the historic interest and heritage significance of the building would be diminished.

6. However the permitted garden room also includes a wide new opening in the flank wall, linking it to the dining part of the kitchen. This would be close to the boundary wall and would probably be visible from the road. Moreover, the permitted rear extension would contrast with the linear form of the original building and would be a conspicuous extension, with a ridge line close to the height of the original building; particularly so when the leaves fall from the trees. In my opinion, there remains a reasonable prospect that the permitted works would be constructed and they constitute a fall back position.

7. The appeal proposal on the other hand, provides an opportunity to limit the harm caused. Providing that the texture and coursing of the stone flank wall can be retained in the new extension including the variety of stones that provide visual interest; and the height difference between the 2 roofs can be strictly maintained (the headroom difficulties that may well result in the en-suite/wet room being dealt with internally) then I consider that the heritage significance of the building would be adequately protected. As such it would not conflict with the aims of saved policies BC7 and GD4 of the High Peak Saved Policies (2008) taken from the High Peak Local Plan adopted in 2005; or the heritage protection aims of the National Planning Policy Framework of 2012.

8. I have had regard to all the other matters raised including the impact on the character and appearance of the Hayfield Conservation Area. This matter did not form a reason for refusal. The proposed extension to Bank End Farm would only have a very marginal impact. The permitted extensions would have had a similar or greater impact and I conclude that the character and appearance of the conservation area would be preserved.

Conditions

9. I have imposed conditions requiring the stone to be re-used from the existing flank wall where it is necessary to remove it to insert new windows and openings; and all other external materials must match existing in appearance and construction including mortar pointing and coursing, to ensure that the texture and appearance of the new flank wall complements the historic interest evident in the rest of the building. To this end, samples and sample panels where appropriate of the proposed new stone, mortar, slate and windows must be approved. The local planning authority should be given the opportunity to record aspects of the original wall, should they wish to do so. Details of the new windows need to be provided at a scale of not less than 1:10 to ensure that the details are sympathetic to an 18th century building. There are no glazing bars proposed and no need for 1:2 details. It is unclear why black cast metal rainwater goods have been requested by the local planning authority as this would not match those existing or be typical of an agricultural barn.

10. Finally, it is necessary that the extension is carried out in accordance with the approved drawings, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Conclusion

11. For all the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Paul Jackson

INSPECTOR