



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2021

by M Shrigley BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/21/3278528

3 Elliott Avenue, Bradwell S33 9HQ

- 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 Phil Tibenham against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/DDD/0121/0058, dated 11 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is a 1st floor extension to create ancillary accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in consideration are: i) the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and local area; and ii) whether resultant car parking space provision serving the property would be adequate.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is situated in a row of predominantly stone-built link attached properties. The properties forming the row exhibit uniform architectural qualities, building heights and frontage widths. Most of them have front garden greenery, some of which is separated by modest intervening residential driveways. All of those factors in combination provide noticeable and attractive characteristics of the local street-scene.
4. The proposal in dispute would substantially increase the frontage width of the appeal dwelling at first-floor level. Owing to its size, the new extension would introduce an overly excessive amount of physical bulk and mass at the side of the dwelling. Its dimensions above an existing single storey structure would appear visually dominant and take up important separation space between other dwellings which is reflected elsewhere along the road.
5. The scale of the development would appear disproportionate to the size and design of the appeal dwelling. This would be out of keeping with the intentional uniform dimensions of nearby properties which collectively provide positive design features distinctive to the local area. Despite the appeal property being at the end of the row of link attached dwellings, and the variation in house

design further along the road, it does not alleviate my concerns to how the extension would appear.

6. Consequently, I find that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the main dwelling house and the immediate street-scene. This conflicts with Policies GSP1 and GSP3 of the Peak District National Park Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011); Policies DMC3 and DMH7 of the Development Management Policies document (Part 2 of the Local Plan for the Peak District National Park, May 2019); the guidance contained within the Peak District Authority Design Guide (2007); as well as the Detailed Design Guide, Alteration and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2014) which all combined seek to encourage high quality design principles in decision making and that the appearance of the local area is respected. It also conflicts with the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seek to encourage good design.

Car parking

7. At my site visit I could see that Elliott Avenue is narrow in width and that parked vehicles on the highway result in a single lane restriction for other passing vehicles. I also acknowledge that some properties within the row have independent off-road parking which in turn diminishes the need for on-street parking for some residents. Nevertheless, the removal of existing parking options serving the property increases the likelihood of creating highway pinch points where oncoming traffic would find it difficult to pass.
8. Although some off-road parking would remain, it would be limited to around one car parking space without further modification of the existing driveway. Relative to the number of occupants who could potentially have access to a car and reside at the appeal property this would be deficient, also paying regard to visitor parking needs and the resultant increases in habitable space.
9. I appreciate that the amount of off-road parking proposed may not be a problem for the current occupants and that the nature of the ancillary accommodation proposed is for an elderly family member who may not have a car. But there is no reason to discount that future occupiers would not have access to an increased number of vehicles should the property be sold on at any future point. I have had regard to the historic planning consent referred to by the appellant. However, reliance on arguments that existing parking space options are not sufficiently secured is not a strong reason for me to set aside functional issues which are likely to stem from new development.
10. Moreover, I have also considered scope for a planning condition securing additional off-road parking but that would most likely involve the taking up of attractive front garden space. In addition, more substantial changes to the appeal scheme may also introduce development which strays beyond the scope of what was originally applied for leading to this appeal.
11. In that context, I find that the development is likely to exacerbate on-street parking demand pressure and in doing so would restrict the manoeuvrability of vehicles travelling along the highway. The resultant effect would be harmful to the day-to-day function of the locality. Accordingly, the development conflicts with the aims and objectives of Paragraph 130 of the Framework which seeks

that the design of new development will function well and add to the overall quality of the area.

Other Matters

12. I am sympathetic to the appellant's points that the creation of ancillary accommodation for elderly relatives proposed has the potential to provide care and other related social benefits. Nonetheless, those benefits would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the locality or the way the area is most likely to function post the development occurring in this case.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal does not succeed.

M Shrigley

INSPECTOR