



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2024

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B3438/D/24/3345061

Longhurst Farm, Dimmingsdale, Oakamoor, Staffordshire ST10 3AS

- 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 Sam Hankinson against the decision of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council.
 - The application Ref is SMD/2023/0649.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear and side single storey extension and alterations to existing elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and host property.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a traditional Staffordshire Moorlands linear farmstead which has previously been extended. The property is identified as a non-designated heritage asset by the council and it is constructed of stone walls with a clay tiled roof. The proposed development includes the erection of a single storey extension with a pitched roof which would wrap around 2 sides of the property. The external materials would include timber boarding, grey zinc and aluminium frames for the openings. There would be extensive areas of glazing. An alteration is also proposed to the existing single storey lean-to addition but this is not the subject of a specific objection from the council.
4. The appellant has identified that there would be the opportunity to use available Permitted Development Rights to extend the property albeit this would not create a wrap around extension. Further, no details of what could be erected have been provided to enable a comparison to be made to the proposed development. For these reasons, only limited weight is given to the potential fallback position in the determination of this appeal.
5. The property is situated within the countryside and is adjacent to traditional and modern agricultural buildings which are constructed of a variety of materials, including timber boarding. Only parts of the first floor and roof of the property and other buildings are visible from the road.

6. The proposed single storey extension to the property would not materially affect the character and appearance of the surrounding open and verdant countryside which the Council has identified as a valued landscape. The visually dominant built form of development would be the modern agricultural buildings rather than the extended property being a prominent intrusion which would fail to respect the local landscape character. As such, there would not be a conflict with Policy DC3 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (LP) which seeks to protect local landscape.
7. By reason of its height, the proposed extension would be subordinate to the host property and, with the extent of the glazing, be a lightweight construction. However, because of its footprint, the size of the proposed extension would represent a significant addition to the host property and, taken together with its wrap around form, would be a disproportionate, rather than subordinate, addition
8. Further, although there would be a clear distinction between the old and new parts of this extended farmhouse, the contemporary design and choice of external materials would visually accentuate the scale of the proposed extension, notwithstanding its lightweight construction. The size of the proposed fenestration would also not reflect the openings of the traditional design of the farmhouse. The character of the host property as non-designate heritage asset would not be respected by the proposed development.
9. Reference has been made to an appeal decision for a near-by cottage (Ref APP/B3438/D/22/3307683) where the Inspector referred to oak board cladding as being a natural and acceptable external material for the scheme. This same assessment would apply to the proposed development, particularly where some of the walls of the agricultural buildings have timber cladding. However, few details of the planning circumstances of this other scheme have been provided and the nature of this other scheme appears to have been different to the proposed development, including its design and other external materials. For these reasons, limited weight is given to this other scheme in the determination of this appeal which has been assessed on its own circumstances
10. Benefits associated with the appeal scheme have been identified by the appellant as including improved internal layout and funding repairs to a non-designated heritage asset. However, even when taken together with the appeal scheme not materially affecting the character and appearance of the surrounding open and verdant countryside, they do not outweigh the unacceptable harm the proposed extension would cause to the host property.
11. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and, as such, it would conflict with LP Policies SS10, DC1 and DC2. Amongst other matters, these policies refer to development being well designed, for extensions to dwellings situated within a rural area to be appropriate in scale and design, and for development to contribute positively to the character of non-designated heritage assets. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR