



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2024

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A1015/D/24/3347681

23 Dale Bank Crescent, New Whittington, Chesterfield S43 2DN

- 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 Owen against the decision of Chesterfield Borough Council.
 - The application Ref CHE/24/00060/FUL, dated 12 March 2024, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2024.
 - The development proposed is removal of existing carport and erection of 2 storey side extension with render to walls.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a brick built two-storey semi-detached dwelling located within a residential area of mixed dwelling types. The appeal property is within a row of semi-detached dwellings of similar design.
4. The proposal is for a two-storey side extension, facilitated by the removal of an existing open side car port. It is proposed to create a garage and utility room at ground floor, with an additional bedroom at first floor. The extension will run from the existing dwelling to the boundary which is approximately 2.6m, without a set back to the front or rear, and would be faced in render.
5. As a result, the proposal is not subservient to the main dwelling, which unbalances the pair of semi-detached properties, creating a terracing effect, as well as affecting the visual gap between the pairs of semi-detached dwellings. The appellant has concerns regarding the useable space if setback/setdown was required, but I find that the harm to the character and appearance of the area would be far greater than any improvement to the appellant's personal situation by the additional space.
6. With regard to the use of render for the extension, this is not ideal, but in the event of an approval, this could be conditioned to use materials matching the host dwelling, to maintain the character and appearance of the area. I note the comments of the appellant in relation to nearby properties having similar treatments but the use of render in this particular line of properties would look discordant and out of place.

7. As such, I find conflict with policy CLP20 of the Chesterfield Borough Local Plan (2020) which, amongst other matters, expects development to promote good design and respect the character, form and setting of the site.

Conclusion

8. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no other considerations that outweigh this conflict. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR