



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2021

by David Jones BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/21/3282054

East View, Coombs Road, Bakewell DE45 1AQ

- 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 McNeill against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/DDD/0321/0308, dated 2 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extension to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. East View is a semi-detached dwelling located within the Bakewell Conservation Area. The CA is characterised by predominately two to three storey buildings constructed in either gritstone or limestone with slate tiled roofs. The consistent use of these materials gives the CA a relatively uniform and traditional appearance, which contributes greatly to its importance as a designated heritage asset.
4. The proposal would see the demolition of a small glazed porch, single storey stone extension and timber outbuilding which currently project from the gable, and the subsequent erection of a two storey extension with glazed link set back from the front elevation of the property.
5. The Peak District National Park Detailed Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) advises that extensions should respect the dominance of the original building and be subordinate to it in terms of size and massing. The SPD further adds that setting back the extension is often a way of reinforcing the dominance of the original building, and that side extensions should avoid being too long or too high in order to prevent the development looking like a pair of houses as opposed to a house with an extension.
6. The proposed development would be substantial and add significant mass and bulk to the side of the host dwelling. Although set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling, I find that by virtue of its scale, form and massing the

proposed development would be overly dominant and would not be subordinate to the host dwelling.

7. Furthermore given the exposed nature of the side elevation and its prominence when viewed from Coombs Road, particularly when approaching from the east, I find that the proposed development would represent an incongruous feature that would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the CA.
8. Additionally, whilst both the host property and its adjoining property 'West View' have additions to their respective gables, these additions are relatively modest and do not negatively impact on the properties which retain their appearance and symmetry as a traditional pair of semi-detached dwellings. The proposed development however would not relate to the local vernacular or harmonise with the existing building, and would significantly alter the appearance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings to the detriment of the character and appearance of the CA.
9. Whilst I acknowledge that the glazed link element of the proposal is of contemporary design and intended to 'break up' the built form, it was apparent from my site visit that the prevailing character of the CA is one of traditional stone buildings with slate tile roofs. Particularly in the immediate vicinity of the appeal property, there was very little variation from this character with no examples of contemporary or modern designs and materials immediately noticeable in the street scene.
10. The glazed link does not represent a traditional form of development, which due to its materials and appearance would be at odds with the host dwelling. When viewed together with the two storey extension the development would sit uncomfortably next to the host dwelling, and would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area.
11. Consequently, I find that the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Whilst this harm would be less than substantial, paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires this harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
12. I note the appellant's desire to have a large expanse of glazing in the extension in order to provide views into the rear garden, and to allow more natural light into the dwelling and in particular the kitchen. However, whilst I acknowledge these benefits of the proposal, I am not satisfied that these objectives could not be achieved with a more appropriately designed extension.
13. I have also had due regard to the personal circumstances of the appellant regarding their need for more space for their growing family, and also the current location of the bathroom on the ground floor away from the bedrooms and the inconvenience that causes the current occupiers of the property. Whilst I have given these matters due consideration, in general planning is concerned with land use in the public interest. I consider it highly likely that the proposed development would remain long after the personal circumstances cease to be relevant.

14. Having considered the matters advanced, I do not consider these to amount to public benefits which outweigh the great weight I am required to give to the conservation of the CA.
15. Paragraph 176 of the Framework also requires me to give great weight to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, and that developments within National Parks are sensitively designed in order to avoid or minimise adverse impacts. For the reasons set out above I do not consider that the proposed development is sensitively designed, and therefore the development would fail to conserve and enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the National Park.
16. I therefore conclude that the proposed two storey extension with glazed link would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. As a result, the development would be contrary to Policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1 and L1 of the Peak District National Park Core Strategy Development Plan (adopted October 2011) and Policies DMC3, DMH7 and DMC8 of the Peak District National Park Development Management Policies (adopted May 2019) and the SPD. These policies, amongst other matters, seek to ensure developments respect, conserve and enhance all characteristics of the building subject of the proposal, do not dominate the original dwelling and that the character and appearance of the CA is preserved or enhanced.

Other Matters

17. Two neighbour consultation responses were received in support of the proposal, including views that the proposed development was well designed and would increase the value of neighbouring properties. However, whilst I have given these comments due consideration, the effect on property values is not a planning matter and for the reasons set out above I have found that the design of the development would result in harm being caused to the character and appearance of the CA. Consequently, these do not weigh in support of the proposal.

Conclusion

18. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had due regard to the development plan as a whole and all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

David Jones

INSPECTOR