



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 November 2023 by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/W/23/3323071

83 Sheffield Road, Glossop SK13 8QJ

- 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 Aveson against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
 - The application Ref HPK/2022/0027, dated 18 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is for the demolition of existing garage and erection of a three bedroom bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site relates to a parcel of land to the rear of a residential property that fronts Sheffield Road, next to a two-storey end of terrace dwelling that faces Pyegrove Road. The dwellings on the northern side of Sheffield Road, particularly within the section of the road located between Sunningdale Drive and Pyegrove Road, have long, open and undeveloped gardens to the rear. Their gardens separate them from the residential properties on Sunningdale Drive/Pyegrove Road and provide a pleasant open feel to the area. Two storey frontage dwellings prevail locally, as does development that addresses its street frontage in a conventional manner. This consistency and open feel contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area.
 5. The introduction of a bungalow in the location proposed, given its contextual sprawling footprint, would significantly shorten the garden of the appeal site, disrupting the established pattern of development and eroding the open qualities of the area. The bungalow would not be overly obvious from Sheffield Road due to its height and as such it would not be dominant. It would however be noticeable in the Pyegrove Road street scene due to its proximity to the back edge of the highway and use of a mix of materials and roof angles. The way it would present to Pyegrove Road would be unconventional, almost
-

- backward facing to the street scene. This, along with being a single storey building in amongst others at mostly two storey would result in an awkward and jarring presence, detrimentally affecting the consistency of the area.
6. There is some variety in terms of the exact siting of local dwellings in relation to the street, on Pyegrove Road, and in the amount and use of space to the front of dwellings. There is a mix of greenery with paved driveways. These elements would not however, with the above in mind, acceptably accommodate the appeal scheme. I am mindful of the fact that there are no listed buildings nearby and the appeal site is not in a conservation area, but this would not lessen the harm I have found.
 7. The proposal would not be sufficiently similar to the two other bungalows cited, particularly because of the difference in their form and siting in relation to neighbouring dwellings. No 76 Sheffield Road, whilst being wider than its neighbours, has a coherent form, consistent street scene presentation and set back and matches the materials and details of buildings immediately to the east. The gable feature of No 17 Pyegrove Road follows the building line of the terraced dwellings to the south while the rest of the bungalow follows the building line of the neighbouring dwellings to the north. It is also consistent in terms of materials with the dwellings located immediately to the north.
 8. Accordingly, the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore contrary to Policy EQ6 of the High Peak Local Plan 2016 which requires, amongst other things, that developments contribute positively to an area's character and identity in terms of scale, height, density, layout, appearance, materials, and the relationship to adjacent buildings and landscape features.

Other Matters

9. The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 requires consideration of the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. The proposal would be beneficial by providing single-storey ground floor accommodation for the elderly or those with physical disabilities. In this case, a relative of the appellant.
10. However, whilst dismissal of the appeal would negate the opportunity to live in single-storey accommodation, this is set against the unacceptably detrimental effect the proposal would have in terms of other planning considerations. Furthermore, it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that, if the appeal were dismissed, there are no other appropriate alternatives to provide accessible accommodation. It does not therefore follow that the appeal should succeed for this reason alone.
11. The development would contribute to the supply of housing within the area, but it seems common ground that there is no evidenced undersupply. There will also be some economic benefits, albeit small given the scale of the development. However, the proposal fails to accord with the relevant development plan policies relating to the character and appearance of the area. This conflict attracts considerable weight. The benefits advanced, taken together, would not be sufficient to outweigh that.

Recommendation

12. The appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight to find otherwise. I therefore recommend the appeal be dismissed.

Andreea Spataru

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR