



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2019

by J Hunter BA (Hons) Msc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P1045/D/19/3227085

The Firs, Rodsley Lane, Yeaveley DE6 2DT

- 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 Yeomans against the decision of Derbyshire Dales District Council.
 - The application Ref: 19/00129/FUL, dated 4 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension to existing dwelling to provide additional accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modest single storey dwelling located in a generous plot, on the periphery of the village of Yeaveley.
4. The proposal is for a substantial two storey side extension that would provide additional living accommodation. The extension would project approximately 8 metres from the eastern gable, effectively doubling the width of the property. To the front and rear there would be modest projections of around 1 metre and 1.7 metres respectively. The ridge of the proposed extension would be approximately 0.7 metres higher than that of the host property.
5. Policy HC10 of the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan 2017 provides direction in relation to extensions to dwellings and sets out three key criteria. I am satisfied that the proposal would meet criteria a) and c) which seek to control over-development, by ensuring plot sizes are large enough to accommodate proposed extensions and necessary parking provision. However, criteria b) seeks to ensure that extensions are in keeping with the scale and character of the original building, its wider setting and location.
6. The proposed extension would effectively double the size of the host property, which in itself, is not a determining factor. However, the design of the extension and in particular the increased ridge height and scale of the side

projection, would introduce a bulky and incongruous addition that would, due to its scale and design, visually and physically dominate the host dwelling thereby resulting in a discordant juxtaposition of the old and new elements of the enlarged dwelling. Consequently, I find conflict with Policy HC10 as described above, and PD1 which relates specifically to design.

7. Whilst I do sympathise with the appellant's desire to improve and extend the family home, such matters do not outweigh the harm I have found.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has referred to the approval of extensions and alterations to the Harleys, Rodsley Lane, Yeaveley. However, no details of that development have been provided, and therefore I am unable to assess the similarities between that case and this.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons outlined above and taking into account all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

J. Hunter

INSPECTOR