Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2022

by Andrew Dale BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4TH January 2023

Appeal Ref. APP/H1033/D/22/3306916
2 Hawthorn Bank, Hadfield, Glossop SK13 2EY

- 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 Ms Rachel Sloman against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
- The application ref. HPK/2022/0065, dated 31 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2022.
- The development proposed is single-storey rear extension and 2-storey front extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single-storey rear extension and 2-storey front extension at 2 Hawthorn Bank, Hadfield, Glossop SK13 2EY in accordance with the terms of the application ref. HPK/2022/0065, dated 31 January 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 numbered/titled: HB-DWG-001 Existing Elevations (submitted with application); HB-DWG-002 Proposed Elevations (as revised in May 2022); HB-DWG-003 Existing Floor Plans (submitted with application); HB-DWG-004 Proposed Floor Plans (as revised in May 2022); HB-DWG-005 Existing and Proposed Roof Layout (as revised in May 2022); and HB-DWG-006 Site Location and Block Plan (submitted with application).

    3) Notwithstanding condition 2, the 2-storey front extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until an accurate elevation drawing and floor plan, tallying with each other and focussing on the north-eastern side wall of that front extension, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with that approved drawing and plan.

Preliminary matters

2. The appellant is clearly not happy with the planning process conducted by the Council. There are other administrative avenues available to address such concerns. My focus in this appeal is on the planning merits of the proposal.

3. The application was amended twice after its original submission, before the Council took its decision to refuse planning permission. The description of the proposed development was not adjusted on the Council's decision notice to reflect the final plans submitted in May 2022. It was, however, accurately described in the relevant Committee report and minutes. I have used the description set out in those documents in the heading and decision above.

4. The elevation drawing and floor plan, insofar as they relate to the narrow north-eastern side wall of the front extension, do not appear to tally with each other. The elevation drawing indicates there would be a ground floor window for the porch, but the floor plan suggests that there would be a secondary bedroom window. This minor discrepancy should not be fatal for the scheme and I have addressed the matter through a planning condition.

5. The Council's officers informally advised that the single-storey rear extension could have been carried out as permitted development. In any event, the Council did not raise any planning objections to the single-storey rear extension. I see no reason to disagree with that stance.

Main issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the proposed 2-storey front extension upon the character and appearance of the dwelling and the wider street scene.

Reasons

7. The appeal dwelling is situated within a residential cul-de-sac. This road and the wider housing estate of which it forms part appears to date from the 1960s. There is a sharp bend in Hawthorn Bank about halfway along its length.

8. It is proposed to add a 2-storey extension just 2.87 m wide and only about 1.50 m deep to the front of the semi-detached, 2-storey house at no. 2. It would be covered by a pitched roof with matching tiles, set at right angles to the main roof. The plans show a rendered finish for the walls of the extension.

9. There is a disjointed building line across nos 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10, after the bend in the carriageway. Nos 1, 2 and 3 are left to form a very short row of 3 houses on land that slopes upwards towards the junction with Higher Barn Road. It must be a moot point as to whether this run of only 3 houses forms such a notable series of building frontages as to merit any reference to a building line. To the extent that some observers may discern a building line, the porch and adjoining garage at no. 1 stand in advance of that dwelling's principal elevation. The proposed 2-storey front extension at no. 2 would also breach the building line but it does not automatically follow that there would be a failure to respect the dominance of the original building.

10. The 2-storey front extension would be just under half the width of the original 2-storey front elevation, be set down from the main roof ridge by a significant margin and possess little in the way of depth or projection. Even though the extension would not be set back from the building line, the original front elevation and the main roof would remain as the dominant physical features. The development would appear subordinate to the existing building, when viewed as a whole, in terms of size, scale, height and massing.

11. The scheme is shown to be carefully designed so as to create a feature front gable with an arched main entrance doorway. In some views, it would arguably read as an elevational change just as much as an extension. The important point is that the extension would result in a dwelling that appears attractive and well-designed in itself.

12. The use of render would be an appropriate innovation on a site that is not in a visually sensitive area and would complement the modern aesthetic of the estate. Render is a facing material found throughout the wider estate and is visible when viewing outwards across the estate from various vantage points on Hawthorn Bank. It is also common to find and entirely reasonable for there to be different walling materials on different parts of a dwelling. Nos 11 and 12 have pebble dash as well as dark red bricks across their front walls. Nos 5 and 10 include pale render and cladding panels respectively. Finishing the front extension in render would confirm the division between the original and new parts of the building and highlight the feature front gable.

13. The proposed 2-storey front extension would make a visually positive contribution to its context and location, exhibit a high standard of architectural design and be sufficiently respectful of and sympathetic to the parent building, local character and the established grain of development and street scene along Hawthorn Bank.

14. I find on the main issue that the proposed 2-storey front extension would not materially harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the wider street scene. As the development would be an example of high-quality design and complement the character and appearance of the dwelling and the locality, there would be no conflict with the broad aims of Policies S 1 or EQ 6 of the High Peak Local Plan 2016. The scheme would also pay sufficient regard to the advice in the Council's Supplementary Planning Documents (High Peak Design Guide 2018 and Residential Design 2005) and the National Planning Policy Framework, insofar as it relates to achieving well-designed places.

15. The scheme will enhance the quality of life for the occupiers of no. 2 by providing additional family living accommodation. This is a further factor that weighs in favour of granting planning permission. The Council, correctly in my view, did not identify an excessive loss of amenity for neighbouring properties for any reason or any adverse implications for highway safety. I saw that there are various double-storey front extensions to be found in the wider estate, as referred to by the appellant. However, the 3 examples provided (42 Lower Barn Road, 7 Ivy Croft and 2 Sandybank Close) are not part of the Hawthorn Bank street scene. I have sought to determine the appeal scheme on its own merits.

16. In addition to a condition setting a time limit for the commencement of development, a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the relevant approved drawings is necessary as this provides certainty. The third condition I have imposed deals with the matter I alerted the parties to in paragraph 4 above.

17. I have not imposed the Council's other suggested condition requiring matching materials as it would negate the benefit of this permission. Moreover, the materials to be used are clearly set out on drawing no. HB-DWG-002 Proposed Elevations (as revised in May 2022); this includes materials (facing brickwork

and roof tiles) which would still match those of the existing building, in addition to the "K-render" finish for the walls of the front extension.

18. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

Andrew Dale

INSPECTOR