
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: 5TH May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/21/3289152

Far View, The Miers, Birchover, DE4 2BQ

- 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 John Coffey against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/DDD/0821/0927, dated 24 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on i) the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings and ii) the living conditions of occupiers of The Retreat, with particular regard to light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Far View is one of the middle two cottages within a terrace of four. The two cottages to the east, known as The Retreat and Roslyn, have matching and adjoining two storey extensions to the rear, which are approximately half the width of each dwelling, are set in from any other neighbouring boundaries, have eaves levels matching those of the original building and have a roof pitch to match that of the front gable and the hipped roof at either end of the terraced block. They are constructed in matching stone and render with matching roof tiles. The windows, which are timber framed and inset, reflect the proportions and alignment of those found in the remainder of the terraced block, reflecting the character and appearance of the original dwellings.
4. The proposal before me would project further out from the rear wall of the terraced block than the adjacent two-storey extensions. It would not be adjoining another extension or set in from the eastern boundary. It would have a shallow pitched roof, it would have eaves falling below the top of the existing ground floor windows, the floor levels would be lowered, which in turn would lower the height of the new window and door. Consequently, the new kitchen window and door would not align horizontally with the rest of the windows and doors across the rear of the terraced block. Nor would the new

kitchen window align vertically with the bedroom window above it. The reduced width of the existing kitchen window and its stone surround would not match any other windows in the rear of the terrace. The stone gable end of the extension would be higher than the stonework on the rest of the dwelling and indeed the rest of the terraced block. Details and materials for the new external steps down to the garden and the handrail(s) have not been provided.

5. For all of the above reasons, I conclude that the extension has not been well designed and would not respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling or its immediate surroundings. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policies DMC3 and DMH7 of the Peak District National Park Development Management Policies, adopted May 2019(the DMP), which seek to achieve a high standard of detailed design and to avoid extensions and alterations to dwellings that detract from the character or appearance of the original building or its setting.

Living conditions

6. The assumed boundaries shown on the existing and proposed layout and elevation plans differ from the boundaries shown on the submitted site location and block plans. Based upon my observations on site, the boundary shown on the site and block plans appears more accurate. Either way, the proposed extension, which would extend approximately 4.2 metres from the rear wall of the cottage, would be very close to the lounge window of the neighbouring property known as 'The Retreat'. I also note that the proposed extension, as shown on the submitted block plan, is larger and closer to the adjacent property known as 'Anchorage' than shown on the detailed drawings.
7. As the extension would be to the north west of The Retreat, would have low eaves level (when measured from the ground level immediately to the rear of the house) and the roof sloping away from the neighbour, it is unlikely to result in any significant level of overshadowing or loss of direct sunlight. However, due to the combination of its projection from the rear wall, its proximity to the boundary of The Retreat and the presence of the adjacent two-storey extension, the proposal would result in an unacceptable sense of enclosure and loss of outlook to the neighbouring lounge window. The presence of another lounge window to the front of the house would not negate this.
8. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies DMC3 and DMH7 of the DMP, which require particular attention be paid to the amenity of other properties and restrict extensions and alterations to dwellings where they would detract from the amenity of neighbouring buildings. The proposal is also contrary to the guidance in the Peak District National Park alterations and extension Detailed Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which advises that single storey rear extensions should be limited to 3 metres from the rear wall for terraced properties and should be a minimum of 1 metre from the boundary of adjoining properties.

Other Matters

9. The Appellants claim that other similar developments in the area have been granted planning permission over the last 5 years. Whilst I have no reason to doubt this, every property, its immediate surroundings and every proposal is different. I have therefore determined this case on its own merits.

10. I am mindful that the Appellants have expressed dissatisfaction with the way in which the application was dealt with, but this is not a matter for me to consider. I am only concerned with the planning merits of the case and the onus is on the Applicants/Appellants to demonstrate that their proposal would not result in any harm.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Rachael Bartlett

INSPECTOR