



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 March 2022

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/D/21/3284946

Quarry Bank, Lanehead Road, Taxal, Derbyshire SK23 7DZ

- 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 Speakman against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
 - The application Ref HPK/2021/0373, dated 24 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is three storey side extension, and single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The original description of development was modified as a result of revised plans. There was no formal agreement to change the description, but I understand that the Appellant agreed that revised wording was appropriate for the proposal and utilised the same on the appeal form. I am satisfied that neither party was prejudiced by this change.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development in the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the wider rural landscape including the setting of the Peak District National Park.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is three storeys to the elevation facing Lanehead Road (southern elevation) and two storeys to the northern elevation due to the change in site levels. The southern elevation has garaging and storage to the lower ground floor, and there is no internal connection to the rest of the property.
5. The property is stone built, with tiled roof. It has recessed windows but an unusual bay window to the upper ground floor of the southern elevation which appears somewhat incongruous when seen in the context of the remaining fenestration.

6. The proposed extensions would, in my view, result in the enlarged dwelling having a sprawling and somewhat disjointed appearance that detracts from the simple aesthetic of the existing dwelling. There would be a visual inconsistency between the proposed extensions with a number of apertures and the existing building. I find that the overall effect would be of an ordinary and decent house extended beyond limits it could comfortably bear. The original dwelling would be lost within and overwhelmed by the various extensions. Because of the resulting visual incoherence this would be harmful to the character and appearance of the building, and would not be mitigated or justified by any particular quality of design
7. For these reasons, the proposed extension would be an incongruous form of development which would fail to respect or enhance the surrounding natural landscape character. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with Policies S1, EQ2, EQ3 and EQ6 of the Local Plan, and the design guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. Together these policies set out the sustainable development principles for the Borough, including taking account of the distinct Peak District character and landscape, with development proposals to be informed by, and sympathetic to the distinctive landscape character areas; and resisting development which would harm or be detrimental to the character of the local and wider landscape as well as ensuring that extensions are subsidiary to the building
8. Guidance on residential extensions is provided in the High Peak Design Guide (2018). Paragraph 5.5 says that extensions should harmonise with the parent building and should be subordinate in terms of their size and massing. However, the proportions of the proposed extensions would make it appear disproportionate in relation to the main house. This would mean that it would fail to harmonise with the host property, as required by paragraph 5.5 of the Design Guide.

Other Matters

9. I have taken into consideration the comments of the appellant with regard to the unsuitability of the house and the need to reflect the needs of modern residents, but I find that the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the dwelling outweighs the need to modernise in this form.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR