



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2025

by **J Hobbs MRTPI MCD BSc (hons)**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/D/24/3350470

Uplands, Sugworth Road, Sheffield S6 6LE

- 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 Clarke against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref is NP/S/0324/0250.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and outbuilding and erection of a new linked garage, extensions and alterations to the existing dwelling, hard and soft landscaping, and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. A revised Proposed Site Plan¹ has been submitted with the appeal. The amended plan corrects a previous error by showing the proposed garage fully subterranean. The proposal shown on the Proposed Site Plan now reflects all other application drawings. I have determined the appeal based on the amended plan. As the amendment is minor and corrects a previous error, no party would be prejudiced by this approach.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including the Peak District National Park (PDNP); and
 - the effect of the proposal on protected species.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 (as amended), the two purposes of National Parks are to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage; and to promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of them by the public. The Act requires me to further these purposes. Moreover, paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in the

¹ Drawing No 752-PKA-XX-ZZ-DR-A-PL08 Rev. P2

National Parks. The Design Guide² identifies that traditional buildings in the Peak District have their own unique character. Given the climate and local materials, buildings are often robust, simple and horizontal in form. They are also intimately related to the landscape. The vernacular architecture contributes to the scenic beauty of the PDNP.

5. The appeal property is a large, detached dwelling which has an L-shaped plan form. The main part of the dwelling is two-storey and adjoins the former stable which is noticeably shorter. Both sections of the dwelling have a strong horizontal emphasis. The openings within the property tend to be small; consequently, the elevations have a high solid to void ratio. The appeal site gradually raises from the west to east. As such the hillside is prominent in views either side of the dwelling and behind the outbuildings. For these reasons, the appeal property is characteristic of traditional buildings within the PDNP. There are two modest outbuildings within the appeal site. The garage is finished with roughcast render and the summer house accommodates a significant amount of glazing. They are not characteristic of traditional buildings within the PDNP.
6. The eaves and ridgeline of the former stable part of the dwelling would be set down from the main section of the appeal property. Nevertheless, the proposed extension would significantly increase the scale and massing of this part of the dwelling. It would appear as a bulky addition and would compete with the dominance of the main section of the dwelling. Therefore, it would no longer appear subservient. Furthermore, when approaching the appeal property from the access road, the extended section would largely screen the main section due to its size and the surrounding topography. This would amplify the harm caused by a lack of subservience.
7. A significant increase in height without altering the footprint of the former stable part of the dwelling would make it appear squarer. Whilst the extended section would still have a horizontal emphasis, it would appear discordant to the main section of the dwelling due to the difference in form. This would also be contrary to the Alterations and Extensions SPD³ where it advises that raising the eaves and/or ridge to increase head height is generally unacceptable. For clarity, the SPD does not specify that this guidance only relates to the main section of a building.
8. Although existing doors and windows may be replaced without the need for planning permission, the proposal includes the creation of additional openings. A significant amount of glazing and timber panelling is proposed to the rear of the property. The extent of the glazing and the panelling would appear incongruous when viewed alongside the modest fenestration and stone finish of the original dwelling.
9. The removal of the existing outbuildings and the landscaping of the area around the existing garage would be a benefit of the proposal. However, the proposed garage would be of a significant scale and massing. Moreover, the proposed link between the garage and dwelling, despite being partially screened, would complicate the plan form of the property. The proposed garage would not be reflective of the modest domestic outbuildings often found in the PDNP. Also, the link would erode the simple plan form which is a defining feature of properties in the PDNP.

² Design Guide Peak District National Park Authority

³ Detailed Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document, Alterations & Extensions Peak District National Park

10. Even though, the appellant has adopted a “non-building” approach by proposing a subterranean garage and including a green roof, the large door and tall coursed stone wall would be conspicuous features when viewed from the access road. Furthermore, the scale of the proposed garage alongside the reprofiling of land would create a sense of enclosure around the driveway. It would appear as though the extended dwelling and proposed garage have influenced the landscape rather than being influenced by it, which is contrary to what would be expected in the PDNP.
11. Other benefits of the proposal include the removal of some Velux windows which are not characteristic of the area, and the matching of materials and stone detailing to the original building. Similarly, the proposal would be well screened from public views due to the surrounding topography and alignment of Sugworth Road. However, this would not be a benefit, rather it would reduce the extent of the harm. Together the benefits of the proposal do not outweigh the identified harm, even when considering the proposal would be well-screened from public views.
12. The appellant has highlighted several examples⁴ where the Authority has granted planning permission for large extensions. However, these examples tend to include extensions on one end of a rectangular property. As such, they would not disrupt the simple plan form. Furthermore, most of the examples include extensions which are well proportioned and match the original building. In any event, none of the examples are close to the appeal site and those extensions have been designed to conserve the local character of those areas. Therefore, they are materially different to the appeal proposal and do not set a precedent.
13. Likewise, the appellant has also highlighted a couple of examples where the Authority has permitted subterranean garages. In one example⁵, a large stone retaining wall was already present and would be extended to form part of the front elevation of the garage. On the other example⁶ there is a lack of context to identify the similarities between it and the appeal proposal. Therefore, these examples do not set a precedent for a subterranean garage.
14. I conclude that the appeal proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area, including the PDNP. Therefore, the appeal proposal would be contrary to policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3 and L1 of the Peak District National Park, Local Development Framework, Core Strategy Development Plan Document, October 2011 (CS) and policies DMC2, DMC3 and DMH7 of the Development Management Policies, Part 2 of the Local Plan for the PDNP, May 2019 (DMP). These policies indicate that particular attention will be paid to the degree to which buildings and their design reflect or complement the style and traditions of the locality; and extensions to dwellings will not be permitted provided that the proposal does not detract from the character or appearance of the original building; amongst other matters. The proposal would also be contrary to the Framework where it indicates that planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character, and they should allow upward extensions where they would be well-designed.

⁴ Planning Permission Refs. NP/S/0518/0445; NP/DDD/0818/0774; NP/HPK/0618/0533; NP/DDD/0119/0065; NP/HPK/0722/0888; NP/HPK/0617/0671; NP/HPK/0618/0842; and NP/DDD/1223/1434.

⁵ Planning Permission Ref. NP/DDD/1123/1412

⁶ Planning Permission Ref. NP/CEC/0818/0690

Protected species

15. The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) recommended that a further three surveys would need to be undertaken to establish the effect of the proposal on roosting bats. The Authority's ecologist agreed with this conclusion. A Protected Species Survey Report has been submitted as part of the appeal.
16. The Survey Report concluded that there was a small residual likelihood that roosting bats may be found during the proposed works so it would be necessary to agree a Precautionary Working Method Statement. This could be conditioned to any permission. The additional surveys were undertaken at optimal times of the year, within the survey window recommended within the PEA, and by suitably qualified individuals. Therefore, I have no reason to question the findings.
17. I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on protected species. Therefore, the proposal would comply with CS Policy L2 and DMP policies DMC11 and DMC12 which indicate development must conserve species of biodiversity importance, amongst other matters.

Other Matters

18. Part of the appeal site is within the South Pennine Moors Special Area of Conservation and Peak District Moors Special Protection Area. I have a duty under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 to assess any impact the proposed development would have on these areas. Had I found the proposal to be otherwise acceptable I would need to consider further the effect of the proposal on the integrity of them and the potential for mitigation, as part of an Appropriate Assessment. However, given the harm I have identified, and as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, it is not necessary for me to consider this matter any further.

Conclusion

19. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

J Hobbs

INSPECTOR