The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2022

by John Whalley

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2022

Appeal ref: APP/M9496/D/22/3305522
4 Steward Gate, Bamford S33 0BP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal of planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs E Wood against the decision of the Peak District National Park Authority.
- The application ref. NP/DDD/0222/0276, dated 21 February 2022, was refused by a notice dated 6 June 2022.
- The development proposed is the erection of a single storey side extension to dwelling.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey side extension to the dwelling at 4 Steward Gate, Bamford S33 0BP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. NP/DDD/0222/0276, dated 21 February 2022, 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: 2205-Block; 2205-01; 2205-02 rev.E, January 2022.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the likely effect of the proposal upon the appearance of the existing dwelling and its immediate surroundings.

Reasons

3. The appeal extension would be built to the side of Mr and Mrs Ford's house, No. 4 Steward Gate in the gap to No. 5 next door. It would extend further back and beyond the rear wall to join with the existing rear extension.

4. The Council gave 2 reasons for refusing planning permission for Mr and Mrs Ford's proposed side and rear extension to their home at No. 4 Steward Gate. They said the extension would have a detrimental visual impact on the host dwelling and in wider landscape views. Their concern was that the extension would create a 'wrap-around', contrary to advice in their Design Guidance. The new extension would envelop and mask the corner of the original house. It would also create a non-traditional asymmetrical roof where it would join to the

existing extension. The proposed extension would be contrary to Polices GSP1, GSP3, DMC3 and DMH7 and the adopted Design Guidance.

5. The second reason for refusal said insufficient information had been provided to show that the development would achieve the highest possible standards of carbon reductions and water efficiency in order to mitigate the causes of climate change. That would be contrary to Core Strategy Policy CC1 of the Authority's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Climate Change and Sustainable Building' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. On the Council's first reason for refusal, I am not persuaded that any significant detriment to the existing appearance of the rear of the dwelling and its immediate surroundings would be caused by building the proposed extension. The appearance at the rear of this lower row of houses, which includes existing extensions, a variety of formal and informal garden layouts and a mix of utilitarian garages built at the bottom of the gardens has effectively lost the uniformity of the original dwellings in Stewards Gate. If seen against that background, the modest extension would be a minor and not unacceptable addition. I might have been more concerned about a possible adverse effect on the view from the road to the houses' frontage caused by some reduction of the gap between No. 4 and No. 5 had it been an issue for the Council. But they took the view that the extension would have an acceptable visual impact when viewed from the front elevation. That was because the proposed side extension would be set well back from the front wall of the dwelling and would therefore not be prominent. My conclusion on the first reason for refusal is that the proposed extension would be acceptable and would not be in material conflict with Design Guidance polices GSP1, GSP3, DMC3 and DMH7.

7. With regards to the Council's second reason for refusal, they noted that the proposal included a short statement regarding how it would address policy CC1, (Development needs to be resilient to the effect of climate change and use sustainable resources) - Supplementary Planning Document - Climate Change and Sustainable Building. They said the statement did not specifically demonstrate how the development would achieve the highest possible standards of carbon reductions and water efficiency, etc. The proposal therefore failed to meet the requirements of policy CC1. However, it is unclear as to what is specifically expected when dealing with a small-scale house extension as proposed here. The policy says that: "For other types of development such as extensions, renovations, and new portal frame farm buildings, there is no requirement in the Core Strategy to go beyond Building Regulations in terms of sustainability standards.". In the absence of a better indication of policy CC1 requirements and supposed deficiencies, I find the Council's second reason for refusal carries little weight.

8. In concluding the planning permission should be granted for the appeal extension, I also note there have been no local objections to the proposal. For the reasons given above, the appeal succeeds. The general condition limiting the duration of the permission is applied, (s.91 of the Act), as is a condition defining the amended scheme.

John Whalley INSPECTOR