



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 22 June 2021

by Paul Martinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/20/3265928

Wayside Cottage, Chapel Walk, Hope S33 6RY

- 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 Paul Malesa against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/HPK/0720/0602, dated 2 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as: Replacement porch, 2 no. Cat-slide dormers to match adj property, 2no. Velux to rear roof slope, Removal of render to expose & reinstate original stonework, Erection of timber garden shed.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Hope Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The Hope Conservation Area ('the CA') comprises of a tight-knit arrangement of stone faced and rendered buildings, of a simple form and appearance with unbroken roofs, positioned at right angles to Edale Road and fronting onto narrow lanes. The distinctive arrangement of buildings, the materials and their simple front elevations and built form are features which contribute to the significance of the CA.
4. Wayside Cottage is a semi-detached dwelling of a simple appearance, positioned at right angles to nearby Edale Road. The gable abuts the edge of the pavement of the road and the front elevation of the dwelling and its roof are reasonably prominent within the streetscene in views above the boundary hedge and wall that demarcate the front garden. It is visible for some distance to the south along Edale Road between surrounding buildings. Like its adjoining neighbour, the external walls of the appeal property have a rendered finish. There are two doors on the front elevation with a small glazed porch with a lean-to roof located over the door closest to Edale Road. Given its position, simple appearance and use of materials, I saw that Wayside Cottage reinforces the characteristics that contribute to the significance of the CA as set out above.
5. It is proposed to replace the existing porch with a new porch over a larger footprint. This would consist of stone walling to the lower levels with timber

windows above. The door would be offset with a window to the side and horizontal boarding above whilst the roof would be pitched. The second porch would be open with timber posts supporting a pitched roof.

6. The existing porch is a lightweight structure, that, whilst described by the appellant as modern, does not dominate the front elevation. The proposed replacement porch being wider and taller, with its gabled form causing the ridge to extend well above the first floor window sills would dominate this part of the dwelling and would appear imposing in views from Edale Road. The use of boarding above the door would introduce a discordant feature that is not present on the existing dwelling, nor is it characteristic of the surrounding area. Furthermore, I saw that, of the limited examples of porches within the CA visible from Edale Road, these tended not to have a canopy supported by timber posts in line with the second porch proposed. Moreover, the provision of both porches alongside one another would overcomplicate and diminish the simple character of this elevation. The proposed porches would therefore represent incongruous additions to the dwelling that would be at odds with its existing character, resulting in significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the CA.
7. The proposed catslide dormer windows would reflect those on the attached dwelling, which would involve raising the two first floor windows so that they project above the existing eaves level. The roofs of the dormers would have a shallower pitch than the main roof and they would project above the plane of this. Other than the attached dwelling, I saw no dormer windows to the front of dwellings nearby which is consistent with the characteristic unbroken roofs described above.
8. The raising of the first floor windows and the provision of the dormers would radically alter the appearance of the front elevation of the dwelling at odds with the overwhelming character of the area. The dormers would be an incongruous addition to the roofscape, drawing the eye on the approach along Edale Road and diminishing the simple character of the dwelling, resulting in significant harm to its character and appearance and that of the CA. Whilst I have had regard to the dormer windows at the attached property, these are not easily viewed as part of the roofscape seen along Edale Road due to the screening provided by the surrounding buildings and its setback from the road. This is in contrast with the roof of the front of the appeal property which is seen amongst surrounding buildings for some distance when travelling towards this elevation along Edale Road.
9. On the site visit I saw that the use of render was prevalent on buildings along Edale Road within the CA. I have not seen any practical reasons justifying the removal of the render which, being consistent with the character of the area, currently has a positive effect on the CA. I therefore disagree with the appellant that render is generally regarded as an inappropriate finish to a traditional building. For these reasons and those above, I conclude that the erection of the porches, installation of dormer windows and the removal of render would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and would thereby fail to preserve or enhance the CA. Nevertheless, the harm would be less than substantial and in accordance with paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('The Framework'), that harm should be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal.

10. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, to which I have attached considerable importance and weight.
11. The existing porch, whilst modest and lightweight, is not particularly reflective of the character of the dwelling and there would be some minor benefits from its removal. The appellant advises that it would be replaced with a 'traditional' form of development, however, for the reasons outlined above, neither porch is reflective of the traditional character of the area. Furthermore, the minor benefits arising from the removal of the existing porch would be greatly outweighed by the harm to the CA as set out above. Likewise, the benefits arising from the replacement of the windows with a more appropriate style would be outweighed by the overall harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the CA.
12. The appellant states that the proposed porches would emphasise the historical development of the appeal property, which they advise was formerly two adjoining cottages. However, whilst the Council also argues that this may have been the case, I have not been provided with evidence to support this. Even if I were provided with such evidence, I have found significant harm to the character and appearance of the CA which would not be outweighed by this comparatively minor benefit.
13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the Hope Conservation Area, contrary to Policies GSP3 and L3 of the Peak District National Park Core Strategy (2011) and Peak District National Park Development Management Policies (2019) DMC3, DMC5 and DMH7 which seek, amongst other things, to conserve heritage assets and the cultural heritage of the National Park and provide high quality design. The proposal would also conflict with paragraph 196 of the Framework insofar as it seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that heritage assets are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Other Matters

14. The appellant submitted the proposal following pre-application advice. In response to this, changes were made to the scale of the replacement porch. The appellant also argues that the Council advised that the proposed dormer windows would appear as a continuation of the row of properties and help to introduce symmetry. The Framework stresses the benefits of early engagement and of good quality pre-application discussion. Whilst this is not binding it is clearly unfortunate if proposals are adjusted to suit or where proposals are offered encouragement but then the final outcome is an adverse one. Nevertheless, at appeal the proposal is considered afresh and as a consequence the positive feedback given does not warrant allowing the appeal.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Martinson INSPECTOR