
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2020

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/20/3253769

76 Castleton Road, Hope S33 6RD

- 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 Stuart Hollinrake of Hope Developments Ltd against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/HPK/0120/0041, dated 17 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is a rear two storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear two storey extension at 76 Castleton Road, Hope S33 6RD in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: NP/HPK/0120/0041, dated 17 December 2019 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans; Plan, Elev, Location and Site Plan Proposed Sheet 1 of 1, Revision 3.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building. All new stonework (plinth, quoins, string course, lintels and cills) shall be in stone to match the existing.

Background

2. The proposal is connected to a separate proposal for a rear two storey extension and demolition and rebuild of front porch at the adjoining property, no. 78 Castleton Road. This separate proposal is also subject to a planning appeal¹.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

¹ APP/M9496/D/20/3253768

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached property. It is located on the main road through the village of Hope. With the adjoining property, the site forms the last pair of properties on this side of Castleton Road before the railway bridge. The appeal site is located within the Peak District National Park.
5. The property has previously been extended by way of a flat-roofed, two-storey infill extension at the rear that has been combined with an existing single storey store building. The result is a mishmash of building and roof-styles that does not create an overly attractive appearance to the rear elevation.
6. Notwithstanding a set back from the side elevation, the appeal proposal would span the width of the rear elevation. The set-back and lower roof would ensure the development would appear subordinate to the main dwelling. The proposal would incorporate a flat-roof to part of the dwelling, which although not a prevalent roof-style in the area, it would not be discernible from any public vantage points. I do not consider that this element would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.
7. Due to its footprint, relative to the existing dwelling, I do not consider that the extension would be excessive. Although I have determined the appeal on its own merits, I am also mindful of the size of the extensions to surrounding properties in the area to which the appellant has drawn my attention.
8. Due to its design, which incorporates matching materials, quoin detailing and hipped roof, I consider that it would not detract from the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the street-scene. The extension would not be prominent in the street-scene and would only be visible from a small section of the main road, through a gap between the appeal site and the adjacent property. For the reasons outlined above, I find that no harm would be caused.
9. The Council consider that the proposal would not respect the original form and massing of the property and would not be in keeping with other pairs of semi-detached properties in the street. The contribution of the property to the street-scene is predominantly defined by its front elevation, which would be unaltered. Its original form would be entirely legible from the street, where glimpsed views of the side of the extension would not cause harm for the reasons identified. The very nature of any extension is to depart from the original 'as-built' property, however I consider that due to its overall design, scale and siting, it would not cause harm.
10. The Council consider that the use of full height glazing to the ground and first floor of the rear elevation is not in keeping with the character and appearance of the property. Whilst it would depart from the more traditional appearance of the front and side elevations, it would not be prominent in the street-scene or readily visible. For these reasons, I do not consider that it would cause any unreasonable harm.
11. I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Policy GSP3 of the Peak District National Park Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011) and Policies DMC3 and DMH7 of the Peak District National Park Development Management

Policies (2019). Collectively these policies require, amongst other things, that developments, including house extensions, respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the building including having regard to scale, form and mass; and that extensions to dwellings do not detract from the character and appearance of, or dominate, the original building.

12. The proposal would also comply with guidance contained in The Peak District National Park Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document which outlines that all extensions should harmonise with the parent building, and an extension should respect the dominance of the original building and be subordinate to it in terms of its size and massing.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area and the host property, it is necessary to impose a planning condition requiring the use of matching materials.
14. I find that the level of detail outlined in the Council's requested condition relating to materials is not necessary. For clarity, I have incorporated into the materials condition outlined above, that the elements of stonework to be used are required to match the existing stonework.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR