



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 October 2024 by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/24/3344694

Stone Cottage, Derwent Drive, Baslow, Bakewell, Derbyshire DE45 1RS

- 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 Jonathan Plant against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application reference is NP/DDD/0324/0236.
 - The development proposed is for alterations and extension to existing garage.
-

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.

Preliminary Matter

3. The site lies within the Peak District National Park thus I have also had regard to the statutory purposes of the national park designation.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effects of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the existing building, the host dwelling, and the area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, Corner House, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

5. The appeal property is a detached, two-storey dwelling located on a corner plot, on a residential street. The dwelling is set back from the road; there is a double garage to the front of the dwelling, next to the front and north-eastern boundary of the site, which is visible within the street scene. Neighbouring dwellings are generally set back from the road. There are trees and other vegetation to the front of dwellings. The siting of the buildings in relation to the road and the foliage contribute positively to the open and verdant character of the area.
-

6. Policy GSP3 of the Peak District National Park Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011 (CS) requires all developments to respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings that are subject to the development proposal. Policies DMC3 and DMH8 of the Peak District National Park Development Management Policies Part 2 of the Local Plan for the Peak District National Park 2019 (LP) require careful consideration to be paid to, amongst other things, scale, form, mass, and height. Alterations to existing outbuildings will be permitted provided that the changes conserve or enhance the immediate dwelling and curtilage, and any valued characteristics of the adjacent built environment.
7. The proposal seeks to add an extension to the side of the existing double garage, which would accommodate a store. It would also increase the height of the garage, to make space for a first-floor workroom. Alterations also include changes to the openings in the front and side elevations, additional openings at the first-floor level, three roof windows, and an external staircase to the side, which would provide access to the first floor.
8. The proposed development, due to the combination of the scale, form, and height of the extension, coupled with the alterations to the openings, would alter the garage to such an extent that would be harmful to its character and appearance. Notwithstanding the form of the host dwelling, the proposal, for the aforementioned details, would fail to appear as a proportionate, subservient addition. Whilst the extended garage would not compete with the host dwelling in terms of height, this does not justify the overall scale of the extension, as the height is only one of the elements that lead to the inappropriateness of the proposed development.
9. I noticed that the design of the garage doors within the surrounding area vary slightly. I also acknowledge the reason behind the change from two to one larger garage door. Furthermore, the garage door would not be overly prominent within the street scene. Thus, this element alone does not make the proposal unacceptable; it is the overall design which includes the scale, mass, form, and height that would lead to an incongruous outbuilding. Accordingly, the proposed extension and alterations would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing garage and the host dwelling.
10. The existing garage is partially screened by the existing front boundary wall and hedge, thus mainly its roof is visible within the street scene. Due to the overall mass and height, the extended garage would appear as a substantial outbuilding, which would considerably project above the hedge and reduce the openness to the front of the property. Thus, the proposal would fail to conserve or enhance the immediate dwelling, its curtilage, and the openness of the street scene, which is a valued characteristic of the locality. The proposed matching materials are not sufficient to mitigate the identified harm.
11. The appellant has drawn my attention to an existing quadruple garage block located within proximity of the appeal site. I do not find the proposal directly comparable with the neighbouring garage, particularly due to the difference in their siting in relation to the host dwellings and the street scene, as that garage does not project beyond the front elevation of the host dwellings. In any event, I have considered the development based on its own merits and site-specific circumstances.

12. To conclude on this main issue, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing building, the host dwelling and the area. Thus, the proposal fails to comply with the parts of Policy GSP3 of the CS and Policies DMC3 and DMH8 of the LP that relate to the effect of development on character and appearance. Accordingly, it would also be inconsistent with the first purpose of the national park designation, albeit to a very small degree.

Living conditions

13. The garage is located next to the side boundary shared with the neighbouring property, Corner House. The proposed development would extend the garage to the side, along the shared boundary with Corner House.
14. There is a timber fence, vegetation, and a large tree, which act as screening between the appeal site and Corner House. The neighbouring dwelling is set back from the boundary shared with the appeal site and sits at an angle in relation to it. The proposal, due to its height and mass would increase the prominence of the outbuilding when viewed from Corner House.
15. Notwithstanding this, given the siting of the Corner House, and the levels of screening between properties, I find that the proposal would not affect the outlook of the occupiers of the neighbouring property to such a degree that would be detrimental to their living conditions. As such, the proposed development is not contrary to the parts of Policy GSP3 of the CS and Policy DMC3 of the LP that relate to the effect on living conditions.
16. I note the Authority's reference to Policy DMH8 of the LP, however I do not consider this policy decisive to this matter, as it does not relate specifically to living conditions.

Recommendation

17. For the reasons given above the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan regarding the character and appearance of the existing building, the host dwelling and the area, and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight, that would indicate to the contrary. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andreea Spataru

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR