



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2023

by C Dillon BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P1045/Y/23/3317363

Bradley Hall, Yew Tree Lane, Bradley, Ashbourne DE6 1PG

- 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 Mr Paul Staley against the decision of Derbyshire Dales District Council.
 - The application Ref is 22/00731/LBALT.
 - The works proposed are described as internal and external alterations associated with the conversion of attic to habitable rooms.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and listed building consent is refused.

Preliminary Matters

2. The submitted site location plan confirms that the appeal site comprises the Grade II listed 'Bradley Hall, Yewtree Lane' (the main hall) and a Grade II listed former 'Stable Block at Bradley Hall' (the stables). A relatively recent two storey extension to the main hall almost seamlessly conjoins these two buildings both internally and externally. This appeal relates to the refusal of listed building consent for internal and external works to provide additional living accommodation in the roof space of the main hall and its extension.
3. There is a discrepancy between the submitted plans and elevations in terms of the number of roof lights proposed. Clarification on this could not be provided by the main parties during my site visit. Nonetheless, my assessment is made on the basis of up to a maximum of 13 roof lights given the number could be controlled by a suitably worded planning condition.
4. Since the appeal was lodged, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published. Although I have made my determination against that updated national policy context, the relevant changes relate to formatting and do not raise any new matters which are determinative to the outcome of this appeal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether or not the proposed works would preserve Bradley Hall or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Reason

6. Bradley Hall faces onto Yew Tree Lane. Being contained behind a retaining wall the elevated position of the main hall heightens its presence and stature relative to the former stable building within the wider context of the rural lane.

7. Bradley Hall has been subject to incremental alterations and additions in the 19th, 20th and 21st centuries. Nonetheless, the special interest features of the main hall continues to relate to its architectural and historical values. These are derived from its mid-18th and early 19th century origins as a country house, initially planned as stables to a new hall, which was never built, and was subsequently made into a principal building hall, 'Bradley Hall'. The architectural features of this two storey, red brick property include its extensive plain tiled hipped roofs with gable features and chimney stacks and also its mix of canted bay windows, sash, oculus, oriel and Venetian fenestration. Of particular significance internally are its circa 1740 staircase and its doorways with mid-18th century moulded surrounds and open pediments.
8. Outwardly, the appeal proposal would result in the installation of up to 13 No. conservation style rooflights across what the plans refer to as the 'east facing' roof slope of both the main hall including its link extension and the making good and repair of the existing roof covering. Internally, alterations include the installation of a waterproof membrane and tile vents within the original roof of the main hall and the blocking up or removal of dividing firebreak walls to enable the creation of the room layout sought. Also proposed is the installation of two staircases and fire safety measures throughout the property. These works would facilitate the provision of two ensuite bedrooms, a games room and an office in the historic and extended roof voids.
9. The existing roof plane is extensive given the scale and linear proportions of the main building's footprint. Notably, in view of the two storey link extension, not all of the fabric of this outwardly seamless roof structure to which the appeal proposal relates is historic.
10. I appreciate that the placement of the proposed rooflights within the east facing roof slope means that they would not be evident on approach in either direction along Yewtree Lane. Moreover, a limited number of discreetly placed rooflights were evident within the wider roofscape of the building group. Nonetheless, whether there be 12 or 13 more, the appeal proposal would represent the introduction of a considerable number of rooflights across each of the 3 sections of the main roof.
11. Whether or not they would be seen only from the grounds of the host property, they would be alien features to the special architectural and historic interest of the historic roof and building's plan form. They would disrupt the simple flow of the existing roof plane. Furthermore, they would introduce visual clutter to this predominantly historic roofscape. This would distract from and interrupt the rhythm and simplicity of the generously spaced chimney and gable features which define the historic integrity which defines the special architectural and historic interest of this roof. Furthermore, the roof lights would decrease the strong solid to void ratio of this side of the main hall.
12. In terms of the effect on the main built fabric, the majority of these rooflights would be inserted into the historic roof structure. The submitted details do not adequately demonstrate the extent of the interference that would be caused to the historic roof timbers. Furthermore, their insertion would necessitate the loss of some of the historic roof covering. Moreover, as well as the absence of greater detail, the need and appropriateness of the proposed waterproof membrane and tile vents has not been adequately justified.

13. The appeal scheme includes the installation of a new staircase to serve the proposed ensuite 'master bedroom' and 'office/study'. This would lead from the existing first floor 'nursery' located in the original part of the building. This would significantly alter the appearance and layout of that room and potentially historic views from its window. It would also necessitate a sizable portion of the ceiling being removed. Moreover, no details have been provided to demonstrate the level of interference with that room's existing chimney breast, sash window opening and timber panelling below. From my own site observations and in the absence of finer details to demonstrate otherwise, these works would be a significant incursion to this room and would interfere with the appreciation and integrity of these particular architectural and historic features of special interest of the main hall.
14. The appeal scheme includes a further staircase to be installed within an existing cupboard off the first floor landing to serve the proposed second ensuite 'bedroom 04', 'storage' and 'games room'. This would result in the blocking up of the existing cupboard door opening, the removal of its door and surround, the removal of a significant portion of ceiling and the encroachment of two of the proposed stairs onto the landing. Being part of the more recent extension, this would represent the loss of part of the building's more recent fabric. Nonetheless, it would cause a significant alteration to the plan form of this landing area as experienced from the corridor of the original part of the main hall building.
15. A series of fire safety measures are annotated on the submitted plans. These include upgrading existing floors to ensure the first floor would achieve half hour fire resistance, the creation of a new floor structure in the roof void, the installation of a mains connected smoke detection system, the treatment of a significant number of existing doors with intumescent paint and seals or their replacement with 'FD20' fire doors and also alterations to facilitate the provision of two escape windows off the first floor corridor. They would relate to the fabric of both the historic building and its extension. However, the details provided are insufficient to allow an adequate assessment of the extent of the interference with and loss of the historic fabric of the building which would undoubtedly occur, and which may be considerable from what is provisionally described.
16. In accordance with section 16(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) I must have special regard to the desirability of preserving this designated heritage asset and its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. In view of the identified harms, the proposed elements both individually and collectively would fail to preserve Bradley Hall in terms of features of special architectural and historic interest and so would fail to meet the provisions of the Act.
17. By virtue of its nature and scale, the effects of the appeal proposal on this listed asset would, in terms of the Framework, amount to less than substantial harm.
18. The appellant's quest for further living accommodation to meet the needs of his family is not a public benefit. In the context of paragraph 208 of the Framework, no public benefits have been put forward. I afford considerable importance and weight to the harm I have identified. Overall, I find that there

are no public benefits outweighing the harm that would arise. Therefore, that harm is unjustified, and the appeal proposal does not accord with paragraph 206 of the Framework.

19. I recognise that subject to a number of conditions, the appeal proposal had gained the support of the Council's officers. However, for the reasons set out I do not concur with that view as I have found that the appeal proposal would not preserve features of special architectural or historic interest of the Grade II listed Bradley Hall and there are no compelling public benefits which would outweigh those harms.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons set out above and having had regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

C Dillon
INSPECTOR