
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2020 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/19/3243416

The Pringle, Ashopton Road, Bamford, Derbyshire S33 0AZ

- 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 Christopher Megson against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/HPK/0919/1017, dated 18 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is side extension to provide dining area with study above.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

4. The Pringle is an extended single-storey dwelling, set back from and at a higher level to the road and surrounded by a garden area. The character of the building is derived from its generally horizontal form, relieved by a more recent front addition. The consistent eaves and ridge lines of the original property contribute to its well-proportioned form and massing.
5. The proposed extension, which would accommodate two storeys, would be located to the side of the bungalow, set back from both the projecting front extension and the front elevation of the original building. Whilst this set back would reduce the prominence of the extension, both the ridge and the eaves lines of the extension would be higher than those of the original building. As such the proposed development would not reflect the consistency in the form and massing of the existing building or its proportions. In addition, the introduction of the first-floor window would be at odds with the pattern of windows at ground floor level only. As a consequence of these issues, the

development would appear visually discordant with the single-storey form and appearance of the bungalow.

6. I acknowledge that the extension would have a limited footprint and I understand that it has been designed so that the increase in height above that of the existing ridgeline has been kept to a minimum by, amongst other things, accommodating part of the upper room within the roof. I also note that the materials of the extension would match those of the original building. Nevertheless, for the reasons set out, the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling. I acknowledge that the front extension is a later addition to the property. However, like the original building, it is single storey in height with an eaves line that is consistent with that of the bungalow. Moreover, it is set down from the height of the original building and as such it is a subservient addition that does not detract from the character of the property.
7. My attention has been drawn to examples of extensions to other local buildings along with an example of a Church with a varied roof form. I am unconvinced that these developments are directly comparable to the proposal before me given the different character of the properties and their immediate context, and the different style of development involved in each case. In addition, I am not aware of the circumstances that led to their approval including the relevant development plan policies in place at the time. In any event, I have determined this appeal on its own merits based on the site-specific circumstances of the case.
8. I note that appellant has suggested that amendments could be made to the proposal, for example, by omitting the first-floor window and redesigning the eaves. However, amended plans are not before me and in any event, I can only determine the scheme on the basis of the plans submitted to and taken into consideration by the Authority.
9. I acknowledge that there would be only fleeting glimpses of the extension from the highway as it would be set back from the road and well screened by vegetation including a mature oak tree, particularly in the summer months. It would not therefore cause any significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
10. Nevertheless, for the above reasons I conclude that the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the host property. As such it would be contrary to Policy GSP3 of the Peak District National Park Core Strategy (2011), Policies DMC3 and DMH7 of the Peak District National Park Development Management Policies (May 2019) which together seek to ensure that extensions are of a high standard and do not detract from the character of the host dwelling.
11. In reaching my decision I have had regard to the personal circumstances of the appellant and the cramped nature of some of the rooms within the host dwelling. However, whilst I am sympathetic to the need, I do not consider that it outweighs the harm I have identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR