
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 April 2022

by Andrew McGlone BSc MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13TH May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/D/22/3295781

Forge Corner, 10 Outram Way, Chinley SK23 6EQ

- 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 Dale Carroll against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
 - The application Ref HPK/2021/0715, dated 21 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a new 2 storey front and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modern two-storey family-sized detached dwelling within a housing development that is being built out. The property lies in a prominent position at the edge of the housing development next to the Peak Forest Tramway, a public bridleway, and on the corner of Outram Way. Beyond the bridleway is open countryside. The property occupies an 'L' shape footprint with a single-storey hipped roof garage set forward of the main body of the dwelling. One half of the original garage has been converted to a home office. A garden wraps around the property to the side and rear.
4. Other dwellings within the housing development reflect the characteristics of the appeal property in terms of its scale, massing, design and the use of materials, though some properties have been finished in render. The host dwelling's garage projects forward of the principal elevation's building line. However, it is a harmonious subordinate part of the dwelling on the corner of the road.
5. The proposed extension would step down from the host dwelling, but it would be of a considerable scale and massing. The proposed eaves and ridge heights strongly influence this. Collectively, the effect would, when allied with its position forward of the principal elevation of the host dwelling and the front elevation's visual appearance, result in a dominant form of development to the front and side of the host dwelling and next to the bridleway. This would be of a far greater overall scale and massing than the existing single storey element. Furthermore, the proposed extension would introduce built form of a scale and mass into a gap between the dwelling and the bridleway. Gaps are

characteristically maintained where parts of the housing development adjoin the bridleway. This would lead to significant harm when viewed from Outram Way and the bridleway in either direction given the dwelling's prominent location. As such, I do not consider the proposal, which was amended by the appellant to address Officer concerns, to be well designed or of a high quality that responds positively to the host dwelling or its local environment.

6. The appeal scheme seeks to make effective use of land, provide a flexible living space for the occupants, and add further soft landscaping whilst omitting the flank boundary fence. Matching materials and roof pitches are proposed whilst the elevations facing Outram Way and the bridleway would contain window openings. However, even if these aspects accord with local or national policies, they do not outweigh the appeal scheme's effect in design terms and the harm that would be caused when the proposed extension is considered in the round.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would conflict with Policies S1 and EQ6 of the High Peak Local Plan (Local Plan), The High Peak Borough Council Design Guide and The Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD 2). Jointly these seek, among other things, development to be informed by the surrounding built environment and positively contribute to an area's character in terms of scale, height, layout, appearance and materials and to harmonise with the parent building. The proposal would also not accord with Local Plan Policy S1a as the extension would not represent sustainable development. Given my findings, the proposal would not accord with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Other Matters

8. A representation from 8 Outram Way is said by the occupiers to be from a person who doesn't live at the property. Even so, I have considered the points raised and I do not consider the proposal would result in harm to neighbouring occupants' living conditions and there would be some modest biodiversity benefit. Furthermore, there would also be a modest improvement to natural surveillance, but these matters alter or outweigh the significant harm that the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the host building or the surrounding area.
9. I note the appellant's efforts in discussing the proposal with neighbours and the housing developer before submitting the planning application to the Council, and while there have not been any objections on design grounds, I have considered the appeal based on its own planning merits. The alleged lack of engagement by the Council with the appellant does not alter my conclusion.
10. Despite the appellant's willingness to discuss the Outram Way elevation further to improve it, it is open to the appellant to submit a fresh planning application with any revisions to the Council in the first instance to assess.

Conclusion

11. The proposal does not accord with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate that I should take a different decision other than in accordance with this.
12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR