



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2025

By S Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/D/25/3373906

9, Ramsden Close, Glossop, Derbyshire SK13 7BB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Lorie McManus against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
 - The application reference is HPK/2025/0163.
 - The development proposed is for the demolition of an existing, elevated conservatory and its replacement with a new elevated Garden Room on the same footprint.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the demolition of an existing, elevated conservatory and its replacement with a new elevated Garden Room on the same footprint at 9, Ramsden Close, Glossop, Derbyshire SK13 7BB in accordance with the terms of the application reference HPK/2025/0163, subject to the following conditions: -
 - (1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - (2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: 2448 11C (proposed plans); 2448 12C (proposed elevations); 2448 13C (proposed elevations) and submitted location and site plans.
 - (3) The external boarding shall be cedar cladding.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and area in terms of the proposed external material.

Reasons

3. No. 9, Ramsden close is a split-level property with landscaped gardens to the front and rear, set within a residential area of similarly detached dwellings.
4. It includes a conservatory at the rear and at first floor level with a flat roof, all of which is supported on stilts which are approximately 2.84 metres high with an open space underneath. It consists of mainly full length glazing contained within Upvc frames and has a flat roof. It has a height of approximately 2.7 metres and is about 4 metres wide by 2.5 metres long. On my site visit, I was able to note similar structures to neighbouring properties.

5. The proposed development is to demolish the conservatory and to replace it with a similarly designed garden room, again on stilts to approximately the same height and floor area. The proposal is to incorporate cedar cladding around the proposed glazing.
6. The appellant states that the reason for the proposed change is that the Upvc cladding leaks, is thermally inefficient and is an unsustainable, very slowly degradable material.
7. Therefore, the proposal is to use vertically hung, preservative treated, exterior quality cedar cladding for those areas which are not glazed. This would be mainly on the side elevations and where the glazing would be reduced from the current design where they are fully glazed.
8. The local planning authority (LPA), in its officer report, considers that there are no 'in principle' or design objections to the proposal, and given the existing extension, I have no reason to disagree. The LPA's objection is that it considers that the proposed external cladding would appear as incongruous and alien to the character and appearance of the host property which has currently white cladding and fenestration, similar also to the appearance of the immediately adjacent properties.
9. The Council's Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2018 (SPD) considers that there is no tradition of external timber boarding in the Borough, though it also supports the sustainable use of recyclable materials, and also designs which reduce the demand for energy and which improve energy efficiency. It specifically argues against the use of Upvc for windows and doors.
10. The applicant has referred to several other planning decisions where cladding has been considered to be acceptable, including one such appeal decision which has been determined since the adoption of the SPD. However, I am not able to determine, on the information before me, how comparable these are to the current appeal proposal, and therefore, I can only afford them limited weight, other than to acknowledge that timber cladding has been allowed elsewhere within the Borough. In any event, I have determined the appeal upon its individual merits.
11. The essential character and appearance of the extension is related mainly to its size, bulk and overall design, and these are matters not in dispute. I appreciate that the use of cedar cladding would have a different appearance to the white windows and doors in the property, but when this is assessed as part of the overall design, and when account is taken of the existing extension which it would replace, I consider that overall, there would be a neutral impact upon the character and appearance of the host property. So far as the wider area is concerned, I was able to see on my site visit that it is hardly visible, if at all, from the public domain.
12. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal proposal would accord with policy EQ6 of the High Peak Local Plan 2016, and with chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2025, both of which require development to be of high quality which contributes positively to an area's character in terms of appearance. When considered overall, it would not conflict with the general aims of the High Peak Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2018.

Conditions

13. I have imposed the standard time condition and, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty, a condition relating to the approved plans. I have found it necessary to impose a condition relating to external materials for the avoidance of doubt

Conclusion

14. There are no material planning considerations that indicate that the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be allowed.

S. Hartley

INSPECTOR