



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2025

by **P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/D/25/3372743

Woodcock View, Chapel Brow, Charlesworth, Derbyshire SK13 5HH

- 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 D Winterbottom against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
 - The application reference is HPK/2025/0104.
 - The development proposed is the extension and remodelling of the existing house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the extension and remodelling of the existing house at Woodcock View, Chapel Brow, Charlesworth, Derbyshire in accordance with the terms of the application, reference HPK/2025/0104, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location plan; Site plans 15771 P11 Rev A, 15771-P12A, 15771 P13 Rev A and 000001 DWB 00 04 DR D 00010 P01; Floor plans 15771 P14, 15771 P15 Rev A and 15771 P16 Rev A; Elevations 15771 P22 Rev A, 15771 P23 Rev A, 15771 P24, 15771 P25 Rev A, 15771 P26, 15771 P27, 15771 P28 Rev A, 15771 P29 Rev A, 15771 P31 Rev A and CGI's Rev A; Materials as proposed (excluding conservatory).
 - 3) No development above ground level shall take place until samples of all external facing materials; and details of hard surfacing, windows and boundary treatments, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 4) Prior to the commencement of any above ground works to the garage or rear extension, a Biodiversity Protection and Enhancement Plan, including a timetable for implementation, including any tree, scrub or hedgerow clearance, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. This shall include measures such as soft landscaping proposals for the garage roof and garden areas; a detailed lighting strategy; roost features; bird boxes; bee bricks; and habitat piles. The measures shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan and timetable and shall be retained thereafter.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The proposal would result in a major refurbishment, including extensions, to this large, detached property. The house lies within the settlement of Charlesworth which is excluded from the Green Belt. Much of the settlement lies within the Charlesworth Conservation Area but this dwelling is excluded from it. It does however lie adjacent to the conservation area boundary and is prominent on the approach to the settlement from the south. The council's officers recommended that the proposal be accepted but the planning committee resolved to refuse the application on the basis that it would be disproportionate in size compared to the original dwelling and the height, scale and massing would have an adverse impact upon the character of the landscape.
4. The proposal includes a number of elements, including the raising of the roof of the main existing part of the dwelling; a rear extension; and a garage extension to the side. I have considered each element in turn.
5. The proposed garage would be set at a low level to the side of the property. Given the boundary treatments and its position, it would have little wider prominence and would sit comfortably against the existing side elevation. The greater extent of driveway has not been raised as a concern, and I am satisfied that with appropriate materials this would be acceptable.
6. Raising the lower section of the main area of roof would align it with the existing higher part of the property. The existing higher section of roof and its associated gable, has the greatest impact on the conservation area and this relationship would not be significantly altered. The more unified roof form would have an acceptable appearance and would not, in any event, be highly prominent given its alignment with the existing higher roof area and given that it would be set against the backdrop of the rising ground beyond it.
7. The works to the rear of the property would be of a significant scale but would appear as subservient elements when viewed alongside the scale of the existing property. The new elements would not be prominent in views and would be set against the backdrop of the rising ground beyond. The design would be of a high standard. Overall, the design of the proposal has been well thought out.
8. It is proposed that the walls of the additions would be of matching stone and the new roofs would be of slate tiles. Subject to these more appropriate materials, replacing the existing areas of uncharacteristic render, the refurbishment would be beneficial with regard to the character and appearance of the property overall and would have no significant adverse impacts on the surrounding area.
9. The property at present is at odds with the character of the conservation area. It is a relatively modern outlier and given its scale and position above the settlement, it is a prominent feature when viewed from within the conservation area. However, as suggested by the council's officers, the proposal would not result in harm to the setting of the conservation area or the nearby listed church. It would remain prominent but would be of an enhanced design and improved materials. Its greater scale would not add significantly to its prominence due to the main gable being

retained and the works being situated beyond that prominent element of the property.

10. Whilst the proposal would alter some views from the settlement and views when arriving into the settlement, the perceived changes would be minor and would not result in unacceptable harm, particularly given that a previously proposed conservatory has been omitted from the current plans. I have also considered the potential for overlooking of the properties below. These are overlooked to some extent by the existing high-level balcony but the opportunities for overlooking would increase. However, given the layout of the neighbouring properties and position of outbuildings, this would not result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of those residents.
11. Given the above, the proposal would not result in conflict with the landscape, design or heritage requirements of policies EQ2, EQ6 or EQ7 of High Peak Local Plan 2016; the Design Guide: Supplementary Planning Document 2018; or the Landscape Character: Supplementary Planning Document 2006. It would similarly not conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework as the development is likely to function well and given the materials proposed, has the potential to add to the overall quality of the area. As there are no other matters that weigh significantly against the proposal, I allow the appeal.
12. I have imposed conditions relating to the commencement of development and the details of the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. The approved plans include details of materials, but I understand that a condition requiring samples of facing materials, tiles and surfaces has been agreed as a pre-commencement condition. Given the scope of the works, I have amended this to require that the materials are agreed prior to above ground works.
13. I have also imposed conditions that address issues such as nesting birds; a lighting strategy; and biodiversity enhancements, to safeguard nesting birds, avoid disruption to bat activity and to enhance biodiversity, to satisfy the aspirations of Local Plan policy EQ5.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR