The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 31 March 2021

by R Morgan BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/D/20/3264100
6 Sandybank Close, Hadfield, Glossop SK13 2EE

- 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 Shaun de Vega-Oldham against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
- The application Ref HPK/2020/0182, dated 21 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 November 2020.
- The development proposed is single and two storey extensions.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single and two storey extensions at 6 Sandybank Close, Hadfield, Glossop , SK13 2EE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HPK/2020/0182, dated 21 May 2020, 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: drawing no 101 rev A - existing plans; 200 rev G – proposed plans.

   3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Procedural Matters

2. The plans were revised during the course of the application and the description of development included on the original application form is no longer entirely accurate. I have therefore used the shorter description from the Council's decision notice.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Beatrix Drive is a cul-de-sac of modern detached houses which slopes down from Tavern Road. A large gap between two properties at the end of the street allows views through to the backs of houses on Sandybank Close, including the

appeal property, which is a modern link detached house with a fairly short rear garden.

5. The rear elevation of the appeal property is clearly visible from Beatrix Drive, but the side gardens of the two properties at the head of the cul-de-sac provide a degree of visual separation from the street, and the house is viewed in the context of surrounding properties and the hills beyond.

6. The proposed rear extension would be constructed above an existing single storey element which occupies the full width of the house. Although the proposal would alter the appearance of the rear elevation by raising the height of the existing extension, the top of the roof would remain well below the main ridge line, so it would not appear dominant or out of scale in relation to the host dwelling. The footprint of the building would not protrude any further towards Beatrix Drive, and the proposed extension would not appear unduly prominent or incongruous when viewed from the street.

7. Hipped roofs are not a common feature of the houses on Sandybank Close, but properties along Beatrix Drive have a greater variety and complexity of roof forms. The existing single storey extension already has a hipped roof, as do several of the houses on Beatrix Drive. As a result, this style of roof does not appear as a particularly alien or unusual feature in the streetscene.

8. The proposed first floor side extension would be set well back from the front elevation, and the ridge height would be significantly lower than that of the main house. This would avoid creating a terracing effect and the side extension would appear as a subservient feature which would not cause harm to the character of the existing house or to Sandybank Close.

9. I conclude that the proposal would not cause undue harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is consistent with the requirements of Policy EQ6 of the High Peak Local Plan 2016, which requires development to be well designed to respect the character, identity and context of High Peak's townscapes and landscapes. There would be no conflict with the guidance on extensions contained in the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2018.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal be allowed subject to the conditions listed, which are necessary in the interests of certainty and safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

R Morgan

INSPECTOR