
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2022

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 February 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/21/3283556

3 Copperstone, Over Road, Baslow DE45 1PL

- 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 Jennifer Pringle against the decision of the Peak District National Park.
 - The application Ref NP/DDD/0321/0324, dated 18 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear extension and rear hipped roof dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey rear extension and rear hipped roof dormer at 3 Copperstone, Over Road, Baslow DE45 1PL, in accordance with the terms of application, Ref. NP/DDD/0321/0324, dated 18 March 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:

JCA-1198-001 Rev P01 (Site Location Plan)

JCA-1198-012 Rev P01 (Proposed Floor Plans)

JCA-1198-013 Rev P01 (Proposed Elevations)
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) All new windows and door frames shall be recessed a minimum of 100mm back from the external face of the related walls.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
-

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a large, modern detached property which is located within a group of similarly sized dwellings. The dwelling immediately to the north-west is of a similar design and has a sizeable box dormer to its rear roof profile. Whilst the National Park Authority explains that no planning history relates to this dormer, there is no suggestion that it is the subject of any enforcement action either.
4. Planning permission has already been granted for the proposed two storey extension which would project from the rear elevation of the appeal dwelling. On this basis, it would serve no planning purpose for me to consider the merits of this particular element of the scheme any further.
5. In addition to the previously permitted two storey rear extension, the proposal seeks permission for a large hipped roof dormer which would occupy a large proportion of the catslide roof of the main body of the dwelling.
6. Although sizeable, the dormer would be set in a reasonable distance from the ridge and eaves of the host dwelling. It would also be set in from the side elevation and also from the projecting two storey extension, if this was to be built. The window arrangement and proportions would be appropriate to the rear fenestration and it would be finished in suitable external materials.
7. I am mindful that the National Park Authority's adopted Supplementary Planning Document titled '*Alterations and Extensions*' (SPD) and its Building Design Guide (BDG) indicate that dormer roofs are rarely appropriate within the National Park unless they positively contribute to the local building tradition within the immediate locality. However, the building tradition within the immediate locality is mixed and the appeal dwelling and the adjacent dwelling are of a modern and unremarkable design rather than a traditional design.
8. In light of the above factors, I am satisfied that the proposed dormer would sit comfortably within the existing roof profile and would not 'over-complicate' the roof of the host dwelling as suggested by the National Park Authority. I am also satisfied that when considered alongside the permitted two storey extension, it would not be oversized or dominate the original dwelling, which is a large, detached property. Furthermore, it would sit comfortably alongside the dormer on the adjacent property and would not appear out of context.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed rear dormer, when considered in isolation, or with the previously permitted extension, would not dominate or detract from the character or amenity of the original dwelling or that of the surrounding area and it would not have an adverse impact on the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the National Park. In such terms, I find no conflict with the overall aims of policies DMC3 and DMH7 of the National Park Authority's Development Management Policies Development Plan Document or the SPD and BDG.

Other matters

10. I am mindful of concerns that the dormer would result in increased overlooking of the property to the rear. However, in the context of the approved two storey extension, and bearing in mind the reasonable separation distances involved

combined with the presence of some tall, mature vegetation to the rear boundary, I am satisfied that any additional overlooking would be within acceptable parameters.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard conditions which limit the lifespan of the planning permission and direct that development takes place in accordance with the approved plans, the Council has suggested several conditions in the event the appeal succeeds. I agree that the external finishing materials of the addition should match those of the host dwelling and that windows and doors should be recessed a minimum of 100mm from the external face of the related walls in order to ensure a visually acceptable development.
12. However, I do not agree with the suggested condition requiring the provision of three on-site parking spaces. With the existing garage, the appeal property currently has two on-site parking spaces and these would remain. The creation of a third would necessitate the loss of some of the attractive front garden. This would be regrettable in my view, particularly as kerbside parking did not appear to be in short supply at the time of my visit. In the absence of any compelling evidence to persuade me that a highway safety issue would arise if additional on-site parking was not provided, I am satisfied that this should be left to the discretion of the Appellant.
13. In allowing the appeal, I shall impose the conditions outlined accordingly.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR