
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 January 2018

by Elizabeth Pleasant DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State.

Decision date: 23 January 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/P1045/D/17/3181910

Ridgewood Lodge, Derby Road, Cromford DE4 3RN

- 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 Steve Burton against the decision of Derbyshire Dales District Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00262/FUL, dated 13 February 2017, was refused by a notice dated 13 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing conservatory and erection of new single storey extension and alterations to Ridgewood Lodge including, new loft conversion with new dormers and balcony.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the appeal was submitted the Council has adopted its Local Plan (LP), December 2017 and this now forms the development plan. Consequently, policies referred to in the Council's Decision have been superseded by policies in the adopted LP, 2017. Details of the relevant adopted LP policies have been subsequently provided by the Council, and the appellant has had an opportunity to comment on them and so has not been prejudiced.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

4. Ridgewood Lodge has a distinct arts and crafts architectural character, the appearance of which is reinforced by the property's overall scale and solitary position. With the exception of a modern conservatory that has been constructed to link the original dwelling to an outbuilding, the dwelling remains generally free of other unsympathetic alterations or extensions.
5. The host property's projecting gable and hipped roof provide the dwelling with some symmetry, and overall the dwelling displays a horizontal emphasis which is derived from its width, fenestration and roof design. The proposed wrap

around extension would destroy that symmetry by obscuring part of the dwellings principal elevation. Furthermore, the proposed arrangement of the glazed window panels and doors would introduce a dominant glazed element with a predominantly vertical emphasis which would conflict sharply with the original design characteristics and form of Ridgewood Lodge.

6. Notwithstanding the overall design quality of the existing conservatory, its light weight appearance and scale provide a visually 'weak' link which enables the original design and form of the host property to remain clearly discernible. In contrast, the side extension would not appear subservient. The ridge line of the extension's roof would sit above the dwelling's eaves line, and its solid nature and expanse would appear as a dominant mass which would diminish the character and form of the host property.
7. Furthermore, intrinsic to the original design and appearance of the host property is its front facing gable which incorporates a double height bay window. Despite the use of glass to form the new opening and balustrade above the bay, the proposed balcony would be visually prominent and it would appear as an incongruous addition in this location and detract from the simple composition of the dwelling's original front façade.
8. I conclude that the proposed extension would have a significant and harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and would conflict with the development plan. In particular, it would conflict with Policies PD1 and HC10 of the LP which seek to ensure, that amongst other things, that new development and extensions to dwellings are of a height, scale, form and design which is in keeping with the scale and character of the original dwelling, and its wider setting and location.

Other Matters

9. Ridgewood Lodge lies within the Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site (DVMWHS) Buffer Zone. Here, Policy PD2 of the LP requires that particular protection is given to designated and non-designated heritage assets including the DVMWHS. In doing so it will take into account the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of the asset and ensure that development proposals contribute positively to the character of the built and historic environment.
10. Although the site is situated on the hillside above the River Derwent, the dwelling is well screened from the A6 trunk road which runs through the valley and there is no inter-visibility between the property and the DVMWHS. The proposed extension would not significantly extend the footprint of the dwelling nor encroach into its landscape setting. I am therefore satisfied that the setting of the DVMWHS would not be compromised and consequently there would be no conflict with Policy PD2 of the LP. However, the absence of any harm to the setting of the DVMWHS does not outweigh the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the host property as set out above.
11. It is clear that the property is in need of some general maintenance and repair, and there is no dispute that the proposed materials of external construction would reflect those used on the original dwelling. These considerations do not however justify the harm I have identified in the main issue.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elizabeth Pleasant

INSPECTOR