
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2022

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A1015/D/22/3299649

2 Tansley Way, Inkersall, Derbyshire S43 3DT

- 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 Miss Georgia Smart against the decision of Chesterfield Borough Council.
 - The application Ref CHE/22/00076/FUL, dated 4 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is an orangery to side elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a semi-detached bungalow which enjoys an elevated and prominent corner position within Tansley Way. Tansley Way is home to a mix of semi-detached and detached bungalows of a broadly similar design and their largely open frontages are a noticeable and positive element of the street scene.
4. The appeal dwelling currently has a modest conservatory added to its side elevation, set back from the front elevation. Given the limited depth of this addition, it sits comfortably alongside the dwelling and does not appear overly prominent within the street scene. The proposal seeks to replace this conservatory with a deeper and more substantial structure which would protrude slightly forward of the principal elevation of the host dwelling.
5. I am mindful that the planning application did not generate any formal objections from nearby residents or Ward Members. Nevertheless, given the additional depth, the greater proportion of brickwork and the fact that the extension would protrude beyond the principal elevation of the host dwelling, I consider that it would be a significantly more substantial structure and it would appear as a somewhat awkward and disjointed addition.
6. Bearing in mind the exposed corner position of the host dwelling, I consider that the adverse visual effect would appear overly dominant within the street scene, thereby harming its well ordered character and appearance.

7. The Appellant asserts that the arrangement of the dwelling would be reconfigured by wrapping fencing from the driveway to the boundary line. However, the principal elevation of the dwelling would still read as it does now and the fencing would not adequately mitigate the visual harm I have described, not least because the extension would be readily visible above it.
8. The Appellant refers to other extensions within the local area and specifically to one at No. 6 Tansley Way. A single storey extension has been added to the front of this property, but it sits between other dwellings. It does not enjoy a prominent corner position and therefore this extension and its setting is not directly comparable to the proposal before me, which I have considered on its individual merits.
9. I also note the Appellant has expressed disappointment in the manner in which the planning application was determined by the Council. However, this is not a matter for me to consider.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed orangery would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits. In such terms, it conflicts with policy CLP20 of the adopted Chesterfield Borough Local Plan and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document titled '*Successful Places*' which promote high quality design that responds positively to the character of the site and its surroundings.
11. The arguments advanced by the Appellant do not outweigh this visual harm and the associated policy conflict therefore the appeal does not succeed.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR