
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2017

by Michael Boniface MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 26th April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P1045/D/17/3169041

25 Whitewood Way, Starkholmes, Matlock, Derbyshire, DE4 3DA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ashley Stone against the decision of Derbyshire Dales District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00824/FUL, dated 1 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey extension at 25 Whitewood Way, Starkholmes, Matlock, Derbyshire, DE4 3DA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/00824/FUL, dated 1 November 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 616/4649.1 and 616/4649.2.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in materials matching that of the existing building.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have used the description of development from the Council's decision notice rather than the planning application as this more accurately describes the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling within a residential street. There are a variety of dwelling types in the street, notwithstanding that there are a number of semi-detached dwellings similar to the appeal property. I also noted that there are other properties in close proximity that have been extended in a similar manner to that now proposed, including opposite the site at No 18.

5. The proposed side extension would enlarge the existing property towards its boundary, continuing the roof line and the front wall. This would significantly enlarge the property and increase its mass when viewed from the public realm but the extension would be entirely in keeping with the existing design and appearance of the property. The buildings are well spaced in the street and the staggered building line provides further visual distinction between the pairs of properties. The proposed extension would alter the appearance of the dwelling so that its symmetry with the adjoining neighbour would be lost but given the variety in the street and the presence of numerous similar extensions, I do not consider that this would be in any way discordant or harmful. I do not agree that the existing extensions are harmful in the street scene as again, they are entirely in keeping with the existing properties.
6. I found no support in the development plan policies identified by the Council to support its assertion that extensions should normally be subservient, nor did it explain why this should be the case. As such, I attach this matter little weight.
7. The development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, I find no conflict with Policies SF5 or H2 of the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan (2005) which seek good quality design that protects the character and appearance of the area, local distinctiveness and reinforce sense of place.
8. I have had regard to the concerns raised by a neighbouring occupant but these largely relate to existing development within the rear garden that is unrelated to this appeal and cannot be taken into account. The development would be sufficiently removed from neighbouring windows and private garden areas to avoid any overbearing impact. The planning application suggests that surface water drainage is to be dealt with by soakaway and I see no reason why this should affect neighbouring properties given the modest scale of the proposal. There is no evidence before me to suggest that drainage is an issue in this area.
9. In light of the above, and having considered all other matters, the appeal is allowed.

Michael Boniface

INSPECTOR