



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2021

by David Jones BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/D/21/3283925

5 Clifton Bank, Buxton, SK17 7DS

- 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 & Mrs Drake against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
 - The application Ref HPK/2021/0198, dated 6 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition of bay window to rear of property and proposed single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of bay window to rear of property and proposed single storey extension at 5 Clifton Bank, Buxton, SK17 7DS in accordance with application, Ref HPK/2021/0198, dated 6 April 2021, 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:
A_CCB_L_100 Rev D, A_CCB_P_302 Rev D, A_CCB_P_350 Rev F,
A_CCB_P_300 Rev D, A_CCB_P_455 Rev D, A_CCB_P_450 Rev D,
A_CCB_P_501 Rev C, A_CCB_P_301 Rev D, A_CCB_P_452 Rev D,
A_CCB_P_451 Rev D, A_CCB_P_500 Rev D, A_CCB_S_201 Rev C
 - 3) Prior to any above ground construction, details/samples of all materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details/samples.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed single storey extension on the host dwelling, having particular regard to whether or not it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Fairfield Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling located on a small cul-de-sac within the Fairfield Conservation Area, and like many properties in the area it is constructed in stone with a tiled roof. To the rear of the property is an adequately sized and relatively secluded garden which is bounded by close

boarded timber fencing to the east and west, and trellis fencing to the north. The rear elevation of the property includes a small bay window, whilst there is also an existing lean-to addition with a mono-pitched roof.

4. The property is located in very close proximity to the western boundary of the Fairfield Conservation Area. The Fairfield Conservation Area Character Appraisal (FCCA) identified the site as sitting within 'Area 1: St Peters Church'. The FCCA goes on to describe this area as containing buildings comprising a mixture of architectural styles, and that those buildings are constructed from either natural gritstone or limestone.
5. It was apparent from my site visit that whilst the defining appearance of the CA remained one of predominately stone buildings, other structures and materials were now also present within the street scene. These included an array of uPVC windows and doors, as well as timber fencing and outbuildings.
6. The proposal would see the demolition of the existing small bay window from the rear elevation, and the erection of a single storey rear extension. The extension would be constructed using timber cladding with large glazed doors and windows looking out onto the rear garden. The roof would be dual pitched with a lower eaves height to one side of the extension. The development would provide an open plan living/kitchen/dining space for the occupiers of the property.
7. The High Peak Borough Council Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (HPRD SPD) (2005) states that in general terms extensions should maintain proportion and symmetry and complement the existing house and not overpower it.
8. Furthermore, the High Peak Borough Council Design Guide (HPDG) (2018) adds that extensions should harmonise with the parent building and be subordinate in terms of its scale and massing. It does however acknowledge that in some circumstances it may be acceptable to consider extensions which do not emulate the style of the original building, and that a more contemporary approach in terms of style and materials would provide a more honest recognition of the building's evolution and retain its historic integrity.
9. There is no dispute between the parties with regards to the scale of the proposed extension, which is considered appropriate and to respect the dominance of the host building. I find no reason to come to a different conclusion in respect of the scale of the extension, which I consider to be proportionate. The matters of dispute relate to the design, proposed materials and the ridge height of the proposed extension.
10. I acknowledge that the proposed extension, by virtue of its design and use of timber cladding with large expanse of glazing on the rear, would be of a contemporary feel in contrast to the traditional stone built host dwelling. I also recognise that timber cladding is not a traditional form of development in High Peak nor is it widely prevalent within the CA. Additionally, despite being constructed using slate tiles, the asymmetrical design of the roof would not follow the profile of the existing roof on the property.
11. In my opinion however, despite its design and contrasting materials the single storey extension would still respond to and complement the host dwelling. Its timber clad appearance, along with its size and scale, would clearly lend itself

to being read as a recent modern addition to the original traditional stone property.

12. The proposed extension would be located entirely to the rear of the host property, and as a result it would not be immediately obvious from views within the CA and nearby St Peters Road. The most visible part of extension would be the slate tile roof, which in terms of its materials is entirely consistent with other roofs in the immediate vicinity. I also do not consider the roof height of the proposed extension to be excessive or result in any undue harm.
13. Due to its secluded location, any views of the extension from St Peters Road would be fleeting and intermittent in between other adjacent properties and structures. These fleeting views in between other existing residential properties would largely be screened by the presence of a large timber outbuilding. Elements of timber fencing and other outbuildings would also be experienced within the same view. Consequently, any views of the extension would be limited and therefore in my opinion it would not be overly prominent in the CA and would not result in harm.
14. As a result, I conclude that the proposed single storey extension would not harm the character and appearance of either the host property or the surrounding area. It would therefore have a neutral effect, preserving the character and appearance of the CA, and consequently I find no conflict with Policies S1, S7, EQ6 and EQ7 of the High Peak Local Plan (adopted 2016) (LP) which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that developments are well designed and of a high quality, and that they are sympathetic to and minimise any harm to heritage assets.
15. I also find that the proposed development would comply with guidance contained within the HPRD SPD and the HPDG, which seeks developments to be proportionate to the original building, whilst also allowing a more contemporary approach in terms of style and materials to complement the host dwelling.

Conditions

16. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition concerning the approved plans for the purposes of clarity.
17. The Council has indicated that they considered that a condition was necessary requiring the materials to be used in the construction of external surfaces of the development to match those used in the existing building. However, for the reasons set out above I have found the proposed materials which would not match those on the existing dwelling to be acceptable, and therefore such a condition is not necessary.
18. The Council have also stipulated stated that they consider a condition is necessary requiring samples of materials to be submitted to and agreed in writing prior to the commencement of development. Whilst I do not consider it necessary to be a pre-commencement requirement, in order to ensure that the materials used in the extension are appropriate and of the necessary quality, I have imposed a condition requiring details or samples of all external materials to be used in the construction to be submitted and approved prior to any above ground works taking place.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Jones

INSPECTOR