



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2023

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/D/23/3319988

82 Sunnyfields, Sheffield Road, Glossop, Derbyshire SK13 8QP

- 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 Vincent Napolitano against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
 - The application Ref HPK/2022/0534, dated 28 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 2 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear and front extension. Roof alterations and rear / front dormer extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Work has been undertaken at the appeal dwelling, including the commencement of ground floor extensions. It would appear that there are some differences between what has been built and the plans provided, for example in terms of window sizes and positions. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined this appeal on the basis of the proposed plans that are before me. These have been confirmed as being drawings 003 Rev C, 004 Rev D and 005 Rev C.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is located on Sheffield Road, a main thoroughfare into and out of the centre of Glossop. At present there is a modestly sized dormer bungalow located on the appeal site, set back from the public highway. Although at the time of my visit the front elevation of the dwelling was heavily obscured by the presence of security fencing and the commenced front extensions, from what I could see and from the existing plans provided, its modest size and set back together with its overall unimposing design serve to substantially reduce the impact that the existing building has upon the street scene.
5. Other properties in the immediate vicinity are predominantly in residential use and there is great variation in the age of the buildings, their scales and their designs. There is a modern mid-twentieth century terrace immediately to one side of the appeal site and a more traditional, older, pair of semi-detached

dwelling to the other side. Elsewhere along Sheffield Road there are bungalows of a traditional design and larger stone-built properties that have a more imposing visual impact. As a result of this variation, there is no one defining character and appearance present, and the appeal dwelling is a contributor to this.

6. The appellant refers to the increase ridge height being proposed as approximately one metre higher than the existing ridge height, but it must be noted that the overall bulk of the dwelling would increase considerably. That said, I concur with the general premise put forward by the appellant that the appeal site could in principle accommodate a larger dwelling than currently exists without causing harm to the character and appearance of the area. The change of the roof type from a hip to a gable would also not cause harm in the context of the existing variation in roof types in the area already, and windows of other dwellings vary in size and in terms of the presence of cills and headers.
7. However, the design of the front elevation would be out of keeping with what presently exists on the appeal site and with the character and appearance of the, albeit varied, wider street scene. In particular, the split eaves level and associated relatively shallow sloping roof that would encompass much of the front elevation would be an awkward, incongruous and visually harmful design feature in the street scene. Front dormer windows are also not characteristic of the surrounding area, and their presence on the proposed development would further set it apart from its surroundings and contribute to the significant harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area as a result of the proposed front elevation.
8. The appellant considers that what is proposed would be a significant design improvement on the existing bungalow. In this respect they refer to the gable dormer windows and overall fenestration providing symmetry around the central projecting gable, and that symmetry is a feature of neighbouring dwellings to the west of the appeal site. Such symmetry is indeed lacking on the existing dwelling. They further consider that the split eaves add an interesting design feature within the street scene, and coupled with the setback from the public highway, is an acceptable design. Furthermore, they point out that there is a clear break from the traditional pattern of development between Nos 80 and 102 Sheffield Road.
9. I have considered each of these points in my assessment of the proposal but ultimately nonetheless I find that harm to the street scene would be caused as a result of the proposed development, for the reasons I have outlined. Although set back into the site, the proposal would still have a notable impact on the street scene. It would not therefore represent a design improvement in comparison to the existing dwelling, especially as the existing dwelling is a much more modestly sized building which has less of a visual impact as a result. The variation in the street scene increases the scope for different design solutions to be explored, but it does not justify the harmful impact that would occur directly from the design of the appeal development.
10. My attention has also been drawn to dormer windows present at Nos 42-46 and 60-62 Sheffield Road, which I was able to view at my site visit. These are not however dormer windows in the sense of being inserts into the roof planes of the dwellings on which they are sited and are not similar in their design or

appearance to what is proposed. In any event, they are limited in their number in comparison to the number of dwellings on this length of Sheffield Road, and they are not found in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. As a whole therefore, they do not establish front dormer windows as being characteristic of the street scene in which the appeal site is located.

11. The Council raises no specific objection to the visual impact of the rear dormer, and I find no reason to take a different view. It would maximise the floorspace provided but when compared to the existing rear dormer there would be no qualitative design improvement. This therefore is a neutral consideration in the assessment of what is proposed.
12. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. Consequently, the proposal fails to accord with Policy EQ6 of the High Peak Local Plan 2016, where it seeks to protect character and appearance. It would also conflict with the aims of the High Peak Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document 2005 and the High Peak Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2018 in the same regard. Furthermore, there would be a conflict with the aim of the National Planning Policy Framework in terms of achieving well-designed places.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR