



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 2021

by C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/W/21/3277083

Norton House, Station Road, Bakewell DE45 1GA

- 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 Aylsa Geeson and David Turner against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/DDD/0221/0142, dated 4 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extension to existing dwelling comprising; demolition of single story utility spaces, garage with loft space and carport to be replaced by three storey extension to create lower ground entrance level, and replacement conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in July 2021, which forms a material consideration in the determination of this appeal. I consider that there have been no fundamental changes relevant to the main issue in this appeal and therefore, I will not prejudice any party by taking the Framework into account in reaching my decision.
3. Reference is made in the decision notice to Policy L3 of the Peak District National Park Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted October 2011) (the CS). However, I was provided with a copy of Policy L1 which is also referenced in the officer report. The proposal appears to have been assessed against L1 rather than L3 and I have proceeded on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The Council do not take issue with the replacement conservatory. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposed three-storey extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the setting of the Bakewell Conservation Area (BCA).

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling of stone construction with a projecting front gable and pitched roofs. To one side is an attached garage while to the other is a conservatory constructed of glass and uPVC. The

property has a relatively open frontage with low stone walls and occupies an elevated position set back from Station Road which rises steeply. Houses along Station Road display a variety of architectural styles, although they are similarly detached and in elevated positions with generous setbacks from the road. The appeal site is located adjacent, but outside of, the BCA.

6. The Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) advises all extensions should harmonise with the parent building. An extension should respect the dominance of the original building and be subordinate to it in terms of its size and massing. Setting back the new section from the building line and keeping the eaves and ridge lower than the parent building will help.
7. The proposal would add significant mass and bulk to the side and rear of the host dwelling. Although I note the intention to use matching materials, the ridge height of the extension would align with that of the host while its front elevation would project past the corresponding front elevation of the main building.
8. I understand the design has taken into account the forward projections of neighbouring dwellings, including Merse Cottage which has a front double gable and was granted planning permission¹ to extend to the rear and sides. However, each proposal is assessed on its own merits and subject to site-specific circumstances. In any event I have little information on that application. In this case, the additional mass to this side of the host building would create a somewhat unbalanced arrangement of the building and harm its form. This would be compounded by the larger window openings of the extension to the front when compared to the host building. As a consequence, the extension would lack subordination and would not respect the dominance of the host building as advised in the SPD.
9. I have had regard to other advice in the SPD which states extensions limited to less than 25% of the original building are more likely to be approved. It is argued that the proposal constitutes an increase of 23.7%. I note this calculation is not in dispute. However, this appears to be based on the footprint of the proposed extension only. As such, this does not convince me the large scale and lack of subordination of the extension would be acceptable.
10. Other approved planning applications are also drawn to my attention, including Gorse Hill², Orchard Leigh³ and 9 Stanton View⁴. I have little information on any of these and as such cannot be certain of their relevance to the proposal before me, particularly regarding their site-specific circumstances and any effects on their respective local areas. In any event, each proposal is assessed on its own merits and the existence of other large extensions nearby or otherwise does not convince me the harm I have identified in this case is acceptable.
11. In addition to the above, the site is in proximity to, and visible from sections within, the BCA. The Framework requires, at paragraph 200, a clear and convincing justification for any harm from development within the setting of a designated heritage asset. I have concluded that the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the host building which is prominent on

¹ NP/DDD/0516/0448

² NP/DDD/1016/1000

³ NP/DDD/1018/0934

⁴ NP/DDD/0518/0419

Station Road. I note it is not disputed that the appeal site is within the setting of the BCA, despite being outside of its boundary.

12. I have not been provided with an assessment of the significance of the BCA, although from my observations this is derived in part from its vernacular architecture. There is no conclusion from the Council as to the level of harm or why this would occur. However, the extension would only be visible from limited points within the public realm, primarily along Station Road. Those public views would be from outside of the BCA and at a reasonable distance. As such, I am satisfied that any views of the proposed extension would not harm the significance of the BCA from within its setting.
13. Notwithstanding the lack of harm to the setting of the BCA, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host building. This would be contrary to policies GSP1 and GSP3 of the CS and policies DMC3 and DMH7 of the Peak District Local Plan Development Management Policies (adopted May 2019). These seek, among other things, for development to respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and building subject to the proposal. Attention should be paid to design which is in accordance with the Design Guide.
14. I have found that the proposal would not harm the setting of the BCA and as such the proposal would accord with policy DMC8 of the DMP, which seeks to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Moreover, Policy L1 seeks to conserve and enhance valued landscape character. Given the harm is limited to the host building, the proposal would not harm any valued landscape character as identified in the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan.

Other Matters

15. Reference is made to nearby Listed Buildings in the Council's officer report, although there is no assessment made in the context of the proposal. Moreover, I have no information on these, such as listing descriptions or assessments of their significance and any effects of the proposal on their significance are not assessed in the officer report. As such I have not considered this matter further.
16. I appreciate the proposal would make the internal layout of the house more legible and user friendly. However, this would be of personal benefit to the appellant and would not outweigh the harm I have identified. There are improvements to the access proposed, although to my mind these are not in dispute. However, while it is claimed these would also alleviate traffic on Station Road this is not substantiated.
17. There is reference to the installation of a ground source heat pump. While this would help towards the overarching aims of the Framework in the transition to a low carbon future, this is not shown on the submitted plans and it is unclear as to why this cannot proceed without the extension. While there may be some small increase in thermal efficiency as a result of larger windows of the extension, this is nothing substantive before me in this regard. As such any benefits of this are of little weight.

18. I understand there were no objections to the proposal from interested parties. However, this would be neutral in the planning balance rather than weighing positively in favour.

Conclusion

19. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host building although I have found no harm to the setting of the BCA. As such it would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C McDonagh

INSPECTOR