
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 June 2020

by R Morgan MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/D/20/3247566

65 Scotty Brook Crescent, Glossop, Derbyshire SK13 8UG

- 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 Tony Power against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
 - The application Ref HPK/2019/0556, dated 12 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey rear extension with single storey side extension.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modern, two storey detached house with a modest sized rear garden, which is located in a residential area on the corner of Scotty Brook Crescent and Shirebrook Drive. The house occupies the majority of its plot width and has a large side gable, which faces onto Shirebrook Drive.
4. The proposed two storey extension would continue the line of this prominent side elevation, which is sited closer to the road than the front building line of the neighbouring property, 7 Shirebrook Drive (No 7). I note the appellant's comment about larger heights and densities being allowed on prominent corner plots in other areas. However, in this case the proposed two storey addition would appear as a continuous block of solid development along Shirebrook Drive, which, due to its length, height and proximity to the back of the pavement, would appear overly dominant from the street and would fail to enhance this corner location.
5. Furthermore, although the proposed extension would be no longer than the existing rear conservatory, its additional height would make it far more prominent when viewed from the street than the existing light framed conservatory.
6. Guidance on residential extensions is provided in the High Peak Design Guide 2018 (Design Guide). Paragraph 5.5 says that extensions should harmonise

with the parent building and should be subordinate in terms of their size and massing. Whilst the appeal proposal would be subservient in terms of height, the extension would be narrow relative to its depth. I acknowledge the reasons for this, and the benefits of retaining a kitchen window and garden space, and allowing an ensuite to be provided. However, the proportions of the proposed extension would make it appear overly long and thin when viewed from the road and disproportionate in relation to the main house. This, together with the lack of set back from the side elevation, would mean that it would fail to harmonise with the host property, as required by paragraph 5.5 of the Design Guide.

7. The narrow width of the extension would result in it having a low ridge height, but it would be similar to that of the front gable and, as such, this feature would not appear out of character with the main house.
8. I acknowledge that the increase in footprint relative to the existing house would not be excessive, and the proposal would not have any detrimental impact on trees or the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. The proposed materials would match those of the existing house and the extension would be more efficient to heat than the existing conservatory. However, these factors would not outweigh the harm to the character of the host property and the wider area.
9. I conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policies S1 and EQ6 of the High Peak Local Plan 2016 which, amongst other considerations, require a high quality of design in new development which respects and contributes positively to the character of the area. There is also conflict with section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to achieve well-designed places, and further conflict with the requirements of the Design Guide.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

R Morgan

INSPECTOR