
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 June 2017

by Katie McDonald MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/D/17/3172246
5 Ramsden Close, Glossop SK13 7BB

- 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 Mrs Robyn Calder against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
 - The application Ref HPK/2016/0615, dated 3 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a rear and side extension with timber cladding and render to existing house walls.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached buff brick dwelling, gable fronted with a dual pitched grey concrete tiled roof and attached single storey garage to the side. The dwelling is set within an ample plot featuring front and rear gardens, and is sited on a suburban residential road. The area is characterised by single and two storey detached dwellings of similar material palette, set within spacious plots featuring established landscaping. The area has a pleasing appearance.
4. The appeal scheme proposes a two storey side and rear extension and single storey rear extension. It is proposed to clad the majority of the external walls with timber. The roof would comprise single ply membrane, finished in dark grey with standing seam detailing. It is also proposed to render the existing walls of the house and change the fenestration from white uPVC frames to aluminium frames. The roof of the two storey side and rear extension would be a 'diagonally aligned pitched form', featuring a very shallow pitch, and the roof of the single storey rear extension would be flat.
5. The proposed roof design of the contemporarily designed two storey side and rear extension would result in an awkward and unharmonious junction with the existing traditionally designed dwelling. While I am satisfied that the single storey flat roofed element of the scheme would be acceptable in itself, the overall extension would appear incompatible with the existing dwelling. Moreover the use of different materials on the extension and the existing

dwelling would serve to emphasize the incongruity of the extensions rather than having a unifying effect. Despite the setback of the two storey side extension, it would appear as an unduly strident feature within the street scene. Additionally, the rear of the dwelling is also moderately visible due to the public footpath to the side. The prominence of the proposals, coupled with the incongruous design and material choice, would adversely affect the character and appearance of the existing building with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

6. The proposal would be in conflict with Policy EQ6 of the High Peak Local Plan (April 2016) which aims to ensure that all developments are well designed, of high quality and contribute to local distinctiveness and a sense of place; and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraphs 17, 56-58.

Other Matters

7. I have had regard to all of the evidence submitted as part of the appellant's case, which includes justification for requiring the extensions and supplementary drawings. Nonetheless, these do not alter my findings on character and appearance.
8. I have also seen the appellant's drawings which seek to demonstrate what could be built at this property under permitted development rights. However, such a scheme would appear quite different to that before me and so I have afforded it only limited weight.

Conclusion

9. Having had regard to all other matters raised, and for the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Katie McDonald

INSPECTOR