



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 April 2022

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28TH April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/D/22/3293568

Arran House, 12 Compton Road, Buxton, SK17 9DN

- 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 and Mrs Silson against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
 - The application Ref HPK/2021/0616, dated 27 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing conservatory, external stairs and side bay window. Proposed modest extension, new sliding doors and glass oriel window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing conservatory, external stairs and side bay window. Proposed modest extension, new sliding doors and glass oriel window at Arran House, 12 Crompton Road, Buxton, SK17 9DN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HPK/2021/0616, dated 27 October 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:
Location Plan Drawing No.A_TCR_L_100 Rev B
Proposed Site Plan Drawing No.A_TCR_P_200_ Rev C
Proposed 3D Illustration Drawing No.A_TCR_P_475_Rev E
Proposed Ground Floor Plan Drawing No.A_TCR_P_300 Rev D
Proposed First & Second Plan Drawing No.A_TCR_P_301 Rev D
Proposed Roof & Cellar Plan Drawing No.A_TCR_P_302 Rev D
Proposed Ground Floor Plan Drawing No.A_TCR_P_350 Rev H
Proposed Front Elevation Drawing No.A_TCR_P_400 Rev D
Proposed Rear Elevation Drawing No.A_TCR_P_401 Rev G
Proposed South Side Elevation Drawing No.A_TCR_P_402 Rev D
Proposed North Side Elevation Drawing No.A_TCR_P_403 Rev D
 - 3) The natural stonework to be used externally for infilling apertures shall match that of the existing building in terms of type, colour, size and bedding of stone coursing, pointing and mortar mix.
 - 4) Prior to any above ground construction or the installation of the sliding doors, full details of the materials, including the colour, of the sliding doors, the external flue and the metal sheeting to be used in the

development hereby permitted, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be undertaken in strict accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained.

- 5) Prior to the removal of the existing bay window, full details of the proposed oriel window, including manufacturers specifications and section plans showing the thicknesses of any frames and/or joins of the glazing panels, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be undertaken in strict accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the Buxton College Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an unlisted, late 19th century, three storey, detached villa, constructed in stone with a slate roof. It is located on the corner of Crompton Road and Crompton Grove, just inside of the CA boundary.
4. It is proposed to demolish a modern timber framed conservatory and the external concrete fire escape stairs from the rear of the dwelling. The fire escape doorway would be blocked up using matching stonework. New glass sliding doors are proposed to be installed in the rear elevation and a modest ground floor extension is proposed to infill the south east corner of the dwelling. The extension would have a neutral coloured metal sheet finish and an external flue. It has been brought to my attention that all of these alterations have already been granted planning permission under a separate application.
5. In addition to the works that have already been granted planning permission, it is proposed to replace an existing bay window/door in the side elevation of the dwelling with an oriel window. Whilst this is the main area of dispute, the council has indicated that it would object to the development as a whole, should it include the oriel window, due to the cumulative impact that multiple modern additions would have on the historic character of the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the CA.
6. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area.
7. Based upon the evidence before me, I cannot be certain whether or not the existing side bay window forms part of an original feature of the property or if it is a later addition. Either way, it has clearly been altered in more recent years from a traditional style bay window, above a low stone wall, with stone cills etc., to a full height white UPVC window/door, with black UPVC guttering.
8. I observed that some, but not all, nearby properties on Crompton Road and Green Lane, which are of similar age and appearance to the appeal property, have bay windows in their side elevations, in addition to those on the front elevations. However, these windows vary in terms of their form and appearance, comprising a mixture of single or multi-storey bays, square and

angled sides and a mixture of flat and hipped roofs. The other bay windows I saw in the area were generally more ornate and traditional, featuring timber sliding sash windows, stone mullions and stone heads and cills, above low stone walls. In contrast, the bay window in the appeal property has floor to ceiling glazing and a door in a white UPVC frame. It is more akin a French bay window/French patio doors. It is not, in my view, a feature of any historic significance or a feature that makes a positive contribution to either the host dwelling or to the CA. , I am not convinced by the evidence before me that the replacement window would result in any loss or harm to the significance of the CA.

9. The proposed oriel window would be modest in scale and would be viewed in context with the approved modern extension and flue, all of which would serve the same room in the south east ground floor corner of the house. Its proportions would be more traditional than the existing tall window to be replaced. Even when viewed with the proposed contemporary corner extension, the alterations are of a very minor nature, which would not dominate the dwelling. The use of high quality contemporary design and materials ensures that in the future clear distinctions can be made between old and new.
10. In my view, the proposed alterations, particularly the removal of the unsympathetic conservatory, external staircase and UPVC framed bay window, would preserve and indeed enhance the character and appearance of the CA and would cause no harm to its special architectural or historic significance.
11. I therefore find no conflict with Policies S1, EQ6 or EQ7 of the High Peak Local Plan (2016), which require, amongst other things, that new development is of a high quality that responds positively to local character and that protects or enhances the historic environment. I also find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework. The decision notice also suggests that the development would be contrary to the Buxton Conservation Area Appraisal. I have not been provided with a full copy of this document but from the information before me it does not appear to contain any planning policies. I have also not been provided with a copy of the council's design supplementary planning documents, but based upon the extracts contained in the Appellants case and the appended appeal decisions, this appears to support contemporary alterations, in principle.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission I have specified the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. Conditions relating to materials and colours and requiring larger scale, detailed drawings of the oriel window, are necessary to ensure that the development would not harmfully detract from the character and appearance of the CA.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed.

Rachael Bartlett

INSPECTOR