



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 March 2024 by T Bennett BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Katie McDonald MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/23/3333479

12 Eyam Woodlands, Grindleford, Derbyshire S32 2HF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Gavin Cox against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref is NP/DDD/0223/0124.
 - The development proposed is a small single storey side extension over existing garage (to extend accommodation at first floor level).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a small single storey side extension over existing garage (to extend accommodation at first floor level) at 12 Eyam Woodlands, Grindleford, Derbyshire S32 2HF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref NP/DDD/0223/0124, 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, 1122-13 1B (Proposed front east elevation), 1122-13 2B (Proposed gable south elevation), 1122-13 3B (Proposed rear west), 1122-13 10 A (Proposed first floor plan).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building.
 - 4) The recommendations in the Bat Roosting and Bird Nesting Assessment (Armstrong Ecology Ltd) (May 2023) shall be implemented in full prior to the completion of the approved works.

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.

Preliminary Matter

3. Since the determination of this application, the Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 20 December 2023. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been

amended. As a result, I consider that there is no requirement for me to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by taking this approach.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The property is a stone-built semi-detached dwelling, located at the end of a row of similar hipped roof paired dwellings, elevated and set back from the road. The simple massing and form of the row makes a positive contribution to the street scene, although there is a variety of dwelling types within the wider street. Indeed, the adjoining property, No 13, is of a different style and design and directly opposite is a row of terraced 3 storey dwellings. Within the row of paired properties, several have 2 storey side extensions, set back from the principal elevation that are visible within the street scene.
6. The property has a gable fronted stone garage to the side, set considerably back from the road. There is also a 2 storey rear extension. Both these extensions maintain the simple form and massing of the existing house. The proposal is to extend the 2 storey rear extension to the side, over the garage roof to its ridgeline, creating an en-suite. The front elevation would be set back marginally from the existing garage façade, which would remain unaltered. The roof would be hipped, matching the existing pitch of No 12, creating a small crown roof.
7. Owing to its location over the garage, the proposal would create a visually distinct side extension compared to other examples seen in the vicinity. However, this does not necessarily result in harm. The proposal would be considerably set back from the road, such that it would not be readily visible from the street scene unless directly facing the house. This is owing to the presence of No 13 and the host dwelling, resulting in it having very little prominence in the street. It would also be subordinate in its scale, height and position, matching the stone walling of the host property.
8. Maintaining the eaves line of the garage roof would sympathetically break up the massing of the façade. Additionally, whilst the roof design would be complex, it would harmonise with the existing dwelling's hipped roof and appear wholly in keeping. The remaining garage roof would have the appearance of a single pitch lean to, which would be congruent in this location.
9. Overall, the proposal would successfully integrate with the host property, resulting in a subordinate addition, that would not adversely harm the simple form and massing of the existing house.
10. Consequently, the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and street scene. This would accord with Policies DMC3 and DMH7 of the Development Management Policies document: Part 2 of the Local Plan for the Peak District National Park (May 2019). Together, these broadly seek to ensure proposals respect the form of existing buildings and the surrounding setting and do not detract from the character and appearance of them.

Conditions

11. The plans are listed for certainty. In the interests of preserving the character and appearance of the host property and street scene, a condition for matching materials would be necessary. Whilst the Council did not suggest a condition, the officer report refers to the recommendations in the Bat Roosting and Bird Nesting Assessment. These should be implemented in full to protect and enhance biodiversity.

Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and subject to the conditions above, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

T Bennett

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Katie McDonald

INSPECTOR