



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2023

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26.10.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/D/23/3327391
64 Old Road, Tintwistle, Glossop SK13 1LHL

- 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 Emma Catterall against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: HPK/2023/0075 dated 20 February 2023 was refused by notice dated 21 July 2023.
 - The application is for proposed rear dormer extension and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the determination of this application a revised National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) was published in early September 2023 whose main focus was not directly relevant to this appeal. Nevertheless, I have determined this appeal in accordance with the revised provisions within the Framework.

Main Issues

3. The main issues is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the Tintwistle Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The village of Tintwistle appears to be an attractive and highly distinctive village typical of early industrial and agricultural settlements within the Pennine landscape here. The area is as such recognised as being historically important through the designation of the Tintwistle Conservation Area that aims to manage effectively much of the area's special architectural and historic interest.
5. I consider that much of this interest is obtained through the highly distinctive built form of the village as well as the relationship between these buildings and the landscape and streets that surround them. The Conservation Area would also appear to exhibit good survival of architectural details and, where modern change has occurred, these appear, for the most part, to have been sensitive to this character.

6. The proposal before me seeks to convert the roof space of an existing terrace property into a second floor bedroom. In order to obtain the required ceiling height it appears necessary, from the Appellant's point of view, to install a flat roof dormer to the rear roof slope of the house. The dormer would occupy a significant proportion of the rear roof slope, extending as it does from the eaves gutter line almost to the ridge of the house and would be clad in UPVC horizontal cladding.
7. In considering this appeal I am required by Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to give 'Special Attention' to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Tintwistle Conservation Area. This is reflected in The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework), which states that 'Great Weight' should be given to the heritage assets' conservation and also illustrates the positive contribution that heritage assets can make to the creation of sustainable and economically viable communities.
8. This is reflected in Policies EQ6 and EQ7 of the High Peak Local Plan that seeks to ensure proposals contribute positively to the character of the built and historic environment.
9. The appeal property appeared to me to be part of a highly distinctive row of likely mid 19th century terrace houses that help define much of the special character of the village, being as they are constructed upon a prominent hillside and close to the village green. This may explain why the buildings are considered to make a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area in the Tintwistle Conservation Area Appraisal.
10. In this regard what appear as small two storey cottages from the front become much larger from the rear when seen from Stocks Hill. In this location the roof form and rear elevation of this terrace, including that of the appeal property, is clearly visible and notable for being unarticulated with modern roof features.
11. I consider that this view is of note within the conservation area as it reinforces the village's development upon the hillside here and retains an appearance of simple, domestic and vernacular workers houses that help define the history and distinctiveness of the place.
12. In terms of alterations much of the roofscape was uncluttered with chimneys clearly retaining their dominance. Although some windows had been changed and other outbuildings constructed, for the most part the rear elevation of the terrace was still largely unspoilt.
13. The proposal before me however would introduce a large, box type dormer upon this prominent rear elevation. In so doing, it would alter the character of this terrace considerably, and would introduce a poorly designed, alien feature into the townscape here. Despite the Appellant's suggestion that the dormer would represent a modern design that would be appropriate, I do not consider that this proposed dormer either in materiality or design is anywhere near as contextual and sensitive as this location and setting demands and the proposal is clearly of an insensitive and poor design.
14. As such, due to the incongruous design, massing and out of scale intervention of this dormer I consider that significant harm would be sustained to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in clear breach of the Policy

direction contained within Policies EQ6 and EQ7 of the High Peak Local Plan and the guidance provided within the High Peak Design Guide and the Tintwistle Conservation Area Appraisal. As such, this appeal must fail.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, and taking into account of all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal

A Graham

INSPECTOR