



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 August 2023

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/D/23/3320167

3 The Sidings, Whaley Bridge, Derbyshire SK23 7HE

- 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 Robert Wallace against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
 - The application HPK/2022/0301, dated 28 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 19 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is part three-storey, part two-storey side extension and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development in the banner heading above has been taken from the Council's decision notice as it more accurately describes the development before me than the description provided in the planning application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. No.3 The Sidings (No.3) is a substantial three-storey house which forms part of a small residential development to the west of the railway line and north-west of Whaley Bridge train station.
5. The rear garden of No.3 is formed by a steep bank, split across two levels with a retaining wall to the side broadly up to first floor level. To the front of the retaining wall is an area of car parking with access an integral double garage on the flank elevation of No.3. It is proposed to construct a three-storey extension to the side that would project around 6.3m from this existing flank, accommodating a double garage at ground floor (accessed from the front), extended kitchen/dining/living area at first and large fifth bedroom at second floor.
6. The Council's guidance in the *Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (2005)* (SPD2) is that extensions and alterations to existing

- dwellings can have a significant impact on the appearance of a house and streetscene, and that extensions should be designed to be subordinate to the main form of the house.
7. No.3 has an existing three-storey facing gable to The Sidings and the front elevation of the proposed side extension has been set back slightly from this gable, but forward of the main part of the house. The eaves and ridge of the new roof would also be lower than those of the host house and the extension has been designed in materials to match, so a smooth render, facing stone and stone quoins. However, whilst I accept it successfully continues the architectural design and detailing of its host, its minimal set-back and width (half the width of the original house) results in a size of extension that would fail to appear subordinate to the main form of the house. There would therefore be a conflict with the SPD2 guidance.
 8. I observed on my site visit that the houses on The Sidings are similar in size and design, separated by a rear garden retaining wall which is set back from the road. There is a uniformity to the character and appearance of the streetscene and a rhythm to the spacing of the houses. At first floor, the proposed extension would project around 9m from the existing flank almost up to the boundary with No.4 The Sidings (No.4) to accommodate a shallow electric pool with green roof above, which has access from bedrooms at second floor. The second floor green roof would be enclosed with a glass balustrade and the corner of this part of the extension (and the ground floor bin store) would be clad in timber. The Sidings is a private road, with access through security gates, so I acknowledge that there are only semi-public views of the streetscene. However, together with the three-storey extension, the width of the first floor extension would appear unduly prominent and would erode the rhythm of spacing of houses on The Sidings. This would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the streetscene.
 9. The first floor timber clad element would be set well back from the principal elevation of No.3, with a glass balustrade that would sit above the eaves of the proposed three-storey extension. I saw on my site visit that timber has been used elsewhere along The Sidings to clad the retaining walls and whilst I note that SPD2 discourages the use of stained timber, I do not find its use on only a small part of the extension inappropriate here. The contrast in the use of timber, with the render and stone, and the height of the balustrade would, however exacerbate the size and prominence of the proposals.
 10. The proposed extension would incorporate the use of heat pumps, sustainable building materials and a green roof (at second floor). Whilst these are clear benefits of the proposal, I am not persuaded that similar benefits could not be otherwise achieved with a smaller extension and they are not sufficient, in this case, to outweigh the harm I identify above.
 11. Consequently, on the main issue I conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the local area. In addition to the conflict with SPD2 identified above, the proposals would also conflict with Policy EQ6 of the High Peak Local Plan (2016) which requires, amongst other things, all development to be well designed and to contribute positively to an area's character in terms of scale, layout and the relationship to adjacent buildings.

Conclusion

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

R Jones

INSPECTOR