
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2025 by L Clark MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A1015/D/25/3360068

37 Cranborne Road, Newbold, Derbyshire S41 8PF

- 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 Bethany Twibey against the decision of Chesterfield Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is CHE/24/00499/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension with rendered front, rear and side elevations.
-

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 and Main Issue

3. The Council's reason for refusal refers to the proposed materials for the two-storey extension, implying that they do not object to the scheme's other elements. I have no reason to disagree, and my recommendation focusses on the same, specifically its effect upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is an end terraced property in a group of four dwellings on a residential estate which is characterised by small terrace groups or semi-detached properties. Properties on the estate have a similar appearance and are set back from the roadside in line with one another with gable ends and constructed from red brick. Together, these elements combine to bring a pleasant consistency to the street scene which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposal would introduce render to the proposed extension and the existing property. This would create a substantial block to the end of the terrace that would negatively draw the eye. The use of render would make the development stand out unacceptably on the estate. It would consequently erode the uniformity that is currently experienced and therefore cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.

6. The proposal would not therefore meet the requirements of CLP20 of the Chesterfield Borough Local Plan 2020 which is concerned with the materials of a development respecting the character of its site.

Other Matters

7. Although I do not have the specific history of the examples provided, it is worth noting that the use of render is an exception to the norm that does not sufficiently change the character as I have identified it above. With this in mind, I am not led to recommending allowing the appeal. Any unauthorised development on other properties would not justify the harm that I have identified above and would, in any case, be a matter for the Council to address should they feel action is required. It is also for the Council to require any plan revisions because the appeal service cannot be used to evolve a scheme.
8. The appearance of the nearby school, the detached property opposite the appeal site and bungalows on the estate are singular developments that are clearly differentiated from the consistency of the properties that form part of the original housing estate and therefore these examples are not directly comparable to the appeal scheme. The same can be said for the examples provided that are not within the estate.
9. The proposal may provide some benefit to thermal efficiency, energy costs and carbon reduction. However, this would not be capable of outweighing the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area because of the proposal since it is unclear as to whether the proposed development would be the sole means of achieving this.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there are no sufficiently weighty material considerations to indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Clark

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR