



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2020 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R1038/D/20/3249538

Bonne Vienne, Staveley Road, Duckmanton, Derbyshire, S44 5JF

- 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 Bowler against the decision of North East Derbyshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00073/FLH, dated 20 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 March 2020.
 - The development is described as a proposed two storey extension.
-

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 development on the character and appearance of the property.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property comprises a detached two-storey dwelling with an attached garage to the side of the property and ancillary outbuildings. Pedestrian access to the site is situated on the corner of the site at the junction of Staveley Road and a small lane, with vehicular access to the site located further along the lane.
 5. The proposal seeks to convert the attached garage and to add a first-floor extension above the garage.
 6. The existing property is characterised by its steeply pitched hipped roof with projecting eaves and steeply pitched catslide roof over the garage. The proposed first floor extension, which would appear as a substantial addition to the property, would have a flat roof, concealed by a parapet wall which would project above the eaves of the building. Accordingly, the proportions, form and massing of the proposed extension would not reflect that of the property and as such it would be a discordant addition which would significantly detract from the character and appearance of the building.
-

7. I note that the presence of a flat roofed section of the building above the front porch which appears to be part of the original design of the building. This is a limited element of the building as a whole and is viewed against the backdrop of the existing dwelling. Accordingly, it is not a prominent feature and moreover does not define the overall character of the property. As such, whilst I acknowledge that it has been used as a point of reference in the design of the extension, it does not justify the proposal before me.
8. I acknowledge the appellant's reasons for preferring a flat roof with parapet instead of a hipped roof to match the existing property. I also acknowledge that the proposal would provide enhanced living accommodation for the occupiers. These private benefits of the proposal carry limited weight in favour of the scheme but do not outweigh the significant harm that has been identified.
9. While the proposed extension would not be visible from Staveley Road or the neighbouring properties, it would be highly visible when entering the site from the vehicular access and would have an, albeit limited, impact on the appearance of the area.
10. I therefore conclude that the two-storey extension with a flat roof and parapet would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies BE1 and H5 of the North East Derbyshire Local Plan (adopted 2005) (LP) and Policies SS1 and LC5 of the North East Derbyshire Local Plan Publication Draft (2018). These policies require, amongst other things, development to be in keeping with the existing property, in terms of its proportions and character.
11. I note that the Council refers to Policy GS6 of the LP in the reasons for refusal on the decision notice. This policy sets out criteria for new development in the countryside. The officer's report raises no conflict with these criteria or with the policy as a whole, and based on the evidence before me I have no reason to disagree.
12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR