The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2023

by Elaine Moulton BA (Hons) BPl MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/D/22/3311927
Hillside, 7 Beech Rise, Whaley Bridge SK23 7EQ

- 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 David Shelmerdine against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
- The application Ref HPK/2022/0041, dated 26 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 31 October 2022.
- The development proposed is single storey rear extension and front balcony.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension and front balcony at Hillside, 7 Beech Rise, Whaley Bridge SK23 7EQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HPK/2022/0041, dated 26 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: Location Plan, Block Plan, Drawing No. 6522/3/B, and Drawing No. 6522/4.

   3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modern two-storey detached house of a simple design located within a cul-de-sac containing a small number of similar houses and bungalows. All the properties on Beech Rise, including the appeal property, have mature and well-maintained front gardens which, with the trees to the rear of the appeal site, create an attractive, sylvan character and appearance to the street scene.

4. The appeal site is in an elevated position above the majority of the surrounding properties. Nonetheless, its offset location, to the rear of properties on Linglongs Avenue, and the intervening landscaping ensure that the appeal property is not prominent within the street scene.

5. The proposals include a single storey rear extension. The Council has raised no objections to this element of the appeal proposals. Based on the information before me, I agree that, due to its small scale and position at the rear of the property, it would not be harmful to, or compromise, the character and appearance of the appeal property or the area.

6. The proposed balcony would have a limited impact on the appearance of the appeal property due to its fully glazed and lightweight nature. The proposed French doors and enlarged adjoining window would be seen through the balcony and would differ from the more horizontally emphasised windows on the remainder of the front elevation. Even so, the proposed door and window would have a symmetry that would not unacceptably diminish the quality or integrity of the appeal property.

7. Overall, the proposed alterations to the windows and balcony would be sensitive, would complement and harmonise with the host building and contribute to the character and appearance of the street scene in a positive way.

8. I noted on my site visit that there are no other properties on Beech Rise with front balconies. However, my attention has been drawn to some balconies at the front of other properties in the wider area. The introduction of a balcony at the appeal property would not introduce a feature that is totally alien within the area, therefore.

9. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the appeal property or the area. It would not, therefore, conflict with Policies S1 and EQ6 of the High Peak Local Plan (2016), the Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document and the Design Guide which, amongst other things, set out criteria for high quality design and suitable building form. It would also accord with the design objectives set out in chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time limit condition limiting the lifespan of the planning permission I have also, in the interests of certainty, attached conditions specifying the approved plans. A condition relating to matching materials is also necessary to ensure that the appearance of the new development would be satisfactory.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Elaine Moulton

INSPECTOR