
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2019

by E Griffin LLB Hons

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/D/19/3231504

37 Reddish Avenue, Whaley Bridge, SK23 7DP

- 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 David Jackson against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
 - The application Ref HPK/2019/0053 dated 6 February 2019 was refused by notice dated 3 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is two storey extension to a dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Reddish Avenue is a cul-de-sac of dwellings with a mix of housing styles and designs. The appeal dwelling is situated towards the end of the cul-de-sac and is detached and two storey and Nos 35 and 33 are of a similar style. The rear garden slopes down from the appeal dwelling with open countryside beyond the garden boundary. The appeal dwelling and neighbouring dwellings are constructed of largely brown brick. To the rear, the appeal dwelling has been painted white and has a bay window and a modest single storey extension with a sloping roof.
4. The Council granted planning permission for a two storey rear extension at the appeal site on the 29 January 2019 reference HPK/2018/0576 (the previous scheme) which would replace the existing single storey extension. Although a full application, the appeal proposal would effectively make changes to elements of the previous scheme.
5. The previous scheme had a monopitched roof to the ground floor element which reduced the amount of glass at first floor level and the whole of the previous scheme would be constructed in brick to match the existing dwelling under the approved conditions. The appeal proposal would increase the amount of glazing to the first floor of the extension as a result of a change to a flat green roof to the ground floor element and the appeal proposal would be rendered rather than a brick finish.

6. The appellant states that he was advised that he could render the rear and east aspects of the appeal dwelling as part of a previous planning enquiry and that the same rules should apply to any extension. However, conditions attached to the previous permission include the removal of permitted development rights under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A which would include external materials so that a formal application would be required to change the external finish of the previous scheme. With regard to the proposed use of render, the different use of external surface material to the rest of the appeal dwelling which is brick would be at odds with the appeal dwelling and surrounding dwellings.
7. The appellant considers that the green roof would only be the same as overlooking a patch of garden. However, in terms of appearance, it would appear to be at odds with the appeal dwelling. The increase in the amount of glazing at first floor level would appear to be out of proportion compared to the amount of glazing proposed at ground floor level for the appeal proposal and also compared to the windows that would remain on the rear elevation.
8. The combination of the larger glazed element, the flat green roof and the proposed rendered finish would not be in keeping with the appeal dwelling and the surrounding area.
9. I do therefore consider that the appeal proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policies S1 and EQ6 of the High Peak Local Plan Adopted April 2016 (the Local Plan) which, amongst other things, refer to high quality design. It would also be contrary to the High Peak Borough Council Design Guide February 2018 which, refers amongst other things, to design quality and the Residential Design Adopted December 2005 which, states that , amongst other things, extensions should harmonise with the parent building.
10. The Council has referred to sustainable development in terms of the criteria set out in the Framework in its reason for refusal. However, Paragraph 9 of the Framework states that these are not criteria against which every decision can or should be judged. Planning policies should take these criteria into account in reflecting matters such as the character of the area.

Other Matters

11. The appellant considers that the proposed changes would not cause harm. However, the adjacent dwellings are in close proximity to the appeal dwelling and there would be some views of the appeal proposal particularly from the garden of No 35. The lack of objections to the appeal proposal does not alter my findings.
12. The presence of a very modest area of rendering under a window at the rear of the appeal dwelling does not alter my findings when the rest of the dwelling and immediately surrounding dwellings largely have a brick finish. Whilst a map of other rendered dwellings along Reddish Avenue and the surrounding area has been supplied, those dwellings are largely of a different style to the appeal dwelling and the render to those dwellings also appears to largely form part of the original design. A number of the dwellings identified are further away from the appeal site on Reddish Lane rather than Reddish Avenue.
13. The potential heating efficiency benefits of the render is referred to but there is limited information to show that the appeal proposal would be more energy

efficient than the extension as approved. I agree with the Council that the increase in the amount of glazing at first floor level is also likely to impact upon any potential heating efficiency benefits. The size of the green roof would mean that any perceived environmental and ecological benefits would be very modest and I have limited information with regard to those benefits that relate specifically to the appeal proposal. Paragraph 175 of the National Planning Policy Framework(the Framework) does refer to supporting development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity especially when this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity. However, there is limited evidence before me of any measurable net gain.

14. There is therefore limited evidence before me that the appeal proposal would provide environmental or ecological benefits that would outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

E. Griffin

INSPECTOR