



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 July 2025

by **Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/D/25/3365180, 15 Mount Street, Glossop, Derbyshire SK13 8DT

- 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 Alexander Barnes against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is HPK/2024/0370.
 - The development proposed is described as 'render over the red brick to the upper 2/3rds (approximately) of the front elevation and finish in a white colour. Apply dark grey/anthracite splitface slate finish to the lower half of the front elevation. Render over the red brick of the rear elevation, to the section above the existing rear extension, and finish in a white colour. Render over the red brick of the rear elevation of the existing rear extension and finish in a dark grey/anthracite colour'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the proposal set out in the heading above is taken from the planning application form and refers only to those elements identified by the appellant as requiring planning permission.
3. The appellant's statement of case and the description of development refer to rendering and painting the rear elevation, whereas the appeal drawings indicate the partial use of splitface slate. I am required to determine the appeal based on the submitted drawings, as did the Council.

Main Issues

4. In accordance with the statutory duty, the main issues in this appeal are firstly, whether the proposed works would preserve or enhance the character or appearance, and significance, of the Glossop - St James Conservation Area (the conservation area) which is a designated heritage asset; and secondly, if harm to the significance of the heritage asset is found, whether this harm would be outweighed by any public benefits.

Reasons

5. The Council's St James Character Statement (SJCS) divides the conservation area into 3 sub-areas. Mount Street is located in Area 1: Hollin Cross Lane/St Mary's Road. In accordance with the SJCS, the significance of Area 1 can be characterised as containing high density two-storey housing developed in a regular street pattern. In the main, the houses are constructed of local gritstone with blue slate or stone flag roofs. Many of the earlier properties open directly onto the

pavement, whereas others have small forecourt gardens. In Mount Street, there are examples of both types of property. The terraces on either side of the appeal property (No 15) stand at the back of pavement, with plain gritstone facades. Nos 13 and 17 have rendered gable ends. The area's common design features and the materials used create a cohesive whole and give the area its preserved appearance.

6. It is important to retain the character and appearance of the conservation area through sensitive development which preserves the authentic historic character of individual houses, their terraces and the wider street scene in terms of their design and materials. Unsympathetic alterations can harm the overall cohesion of a conservation area.
7. No 15 is a detached house with a rear extension. It has a small front garden and is set back behind the neighbouring frontages. Unlike its neighbours, it has gable facades to the front and rear and comprises red engineering brick with a slate roof. Its appearance is out of keeping with the predominantly gritstone dwellings in Mount Street and the wider conservation area. Due to these differences, the effect of the appeal property on the character and appearance of the conservation area is neutral. Adaptation of such buildings may be acceptable where the proposed works would enhance a related heritage asset.
8. In summary, it is proposed to apply white render on the upper parts of the front and rear elevations with splitface slate tiles below. The appellant contends that the proposed alterations would 'soften' the appearance of No 15, allowing it to blend more appropriately with the neighbouring properties. It is suggested that the splitface slate would reflect the material used on the majority of the roofs and that the render would reflect the rendered gables of the adjoining properties.
9. However, the proposed use of slate as a facing material on a main elevation is not characteristic of the conservation area, or the wider High Peak area, where it is predominantly used on roofs. Moreover, render is also an uncharacteristic material which is generally restricted to end gables, as seen to either side of No 15. Whilst there are a limited number of examples of rendered frontages in the locality, their entire frontage is rendered. Furthermore, the proposed combination of render and splitslate cladding would visually divide the elevations horizontally. In combination, the proposed materials would result in a somewhat stark, incongruous and overtly contemporary appearance which would be uncharacteristic and amplified in views of No 15 alongside the traditional facades of the neighbouring terraces. I conclude that the proposed elevational alterations would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area, whereas the existing appearance of the building, although different to its neighbours, is neutral.
10. Precedent examples provided by the appellant include the use of similar materials on what appears to be a detached and significantly larger building. The more open and undeveloped context of this building is materially different to that of No 15 which stands in a densely developed row of similar houses within a conservation area. The examples of rendered and painted terraced houses do not feature the use of splitface slate and therefore could not reasonably be considered to set a precedent for the appeal proposal. Little weight can therefore be given to these examples. But in any event, planning appeals are required to be assessed on their own individual merits, having regard to their unique contexts.

11. I further conclude that the identified harm would amount to less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset. Whilst I find that this harm would be at the lower end of the spectrum, in accordance with National Planning Policy Guidance; “where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.”
12. The appellant states that the proposed render and tile finishes are required to address structural vulnerabilities. These includes holes drilled in the elevations which have compromised their integrity by allowing water ingress and potentially leading to structural deterioration over time. In addition, he states that the render would improve the insulation properties of the walls, leading to enhanced thermal efficiency and reduced heat loss.
13. It is acknowledged that these works would have positive environmental and structural benefits for the appeal property. However, there are other means by which the appellant’s objectives could be achieved, without causing the harm to the conservation area that has been identified. In this regard I note that the Council suggested the use of an alternative cladding product that has been used successfully in the District, prior to determining the planning application. Whilst the appellant set out his detailed justification for rejecting that proposal, I am not convinced that there are no other acceptable alternative solutions. Accordingly, I conclude that the harm to significance is not outweighed by public benefits. Furthermore, the appeal proposal is not necessary to secure the optimum viable use of the appeal property as a home.
14. For the foregoing reasons, the proposal is contrary to Policies EQ6 and EQ7 of the High Peak Local Plan 2016, the High Peak Design Guide, the SJCS and guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework. In summary, these local policies and design guide, as well as the national guidance, require development to be of a high quality that responds to its surroundings and, in respect of conservation areas, require that it contributes to its sense of place whilst sustaining and enhancing the character or appearance and significance of heritage assets.
15. In terms of other matters raised, the appellant states that he would have been willing to fully render the property and omit the use of slate on the elevations. Nonetheless, I am required to determine the appeal proposal as it was considered by the Council.
16. The appellant raises concerns about a number of procedural issues that arose during the determination of the planning application. However, these are not matters for consideration in this appeal and are more appropriately dealt with under the Council’s own complaints procedures.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR