



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 25 June 2021 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R1038/D/21/3269290

East View Cottage, Calow Green, Chesterfield, Derbyshire S44 5XQ

- 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 Henry Kay against the decision of North East Derbyshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00896/FLH, dated 17 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is room in the roof space and ground floor extension to rear elevation.
-

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.

Preliminary Matter

3. In the header above I have removed 're-sub of 20/00270/FLH – free go' from the description of development taken from the application form because it does not refer to development.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. East View Cottage is the central house in a terrace of three dwellings which are similarly designed with roof slopes that are unadorned, other than by small chimneys. They have some differences in terms of materials and window arrangements, and a stepped roofline reflecting the change in ground levels, however overall, the three dwellings are similar in appearance and are viewed as part of a group. Each house positively contributes to the group value of the terrace, and together their traditional form makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. The other dwellings nearby vary in design and form, however there are some other properties of similar age and style further along the road.
6. The proposed front dormer window would extend across almost the full width of the roof and would extend to the full ridge height of the dwelling with a

pitched roof. While some roof would be visible around the dormer, it would nevertheless add significant bulk to the dwelling, giving it a top-heavy appearance. Although it would broadly line up with the edge of ground floor openings, the dormer would not relate well to the vertically proportioned windows below and would be significantly larger in scale than the chimney, dominating the front roof slope. The small window proposed within a very large dormer would create a contrived design and emphasise the scale of the dormer. As such, the proposal would significantly and harmfully alter the original roof form of the property, detracting from the simple unadorned roof which contributes to the character of the host dwelling.

7. The scale of the proposed dormer would make it a dominant and incongruous feature in this row of three similarly designed dwellings, which would erode the generally consistent character and appearance of the group. Given its scale and siting it would be highly visible within the street scene and would not be effectively screened by the chimney or the dormers on a nearby property. As such, the proposal would also harm the character and appearance of the street scene.
8. There are other dwellings within the street scene with off-set windows over multiple storeys, and with dormer windows. However, these are not part of a group of consistently designed dwellings, as in this case, and those windows and dormers are more sympathetically proportioned relative to the dwelling than the proposal before me. Therefore, those properties are not comparable to the appeal scheme and do not justify the harm identified.
9. Accordingly, the proposed front dormer window would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. As such, that part of the proposal would be contrary to Policies H5 and BE1 of the North East Derbyshire Local Plan (adopted 2005) as well as Policies LC5 and SDC12 of the emerging North East Derbyshire Local Plan (2014 – 2034) publication draft (2018). Collectively these Policies permit development which respect the character and appearance of the area and extensions that are in keeping with the property and the street scene.
10. The proposed rear extension and dormer have already been granted planning permission by the Council (Application Ref: 20/00270/FLH). The rear dormer window would not be visible from the road or the wider public domain and the ground floor rear extension would be modest in scale and appearance and, as a result, would be subservient to the host dwelling. Therefore, these elements would not harm the character and appearance of the dwelling or the wider street scene. Furthermore, given their scale and siting, they would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings.
11. Consequently, I find no conflict with the above Policies in respect of these rear elements. However, because the proposed work to redesign the roof and the loft would be reliant on the proposed front dormer window, the two elements of the development would not be easily severable. As such, a split decision could not be issued in this instance. However, the appellant already has planning permission for these elements which does not appear to have lapsed, and their ability to implement that permission is not affected by the outcome of this appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. There are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Sibley

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, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

L McKay

INSPECTOR