The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2011

by David Kaiserman BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 2 August 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/D/11/2154363
38 Ash Grove, Chinley SK23 6BQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Dr P G Ballard against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
- The application Ref. HPK/2011/0031, dated 24 January 2011, was refused by notice dated 15 March 2011.
- The development proposed is the conversion of garage at ground floor level to form playroom with bedroom extension at first floor level; garage extended by one bay to maintain double garage; and single storey extension to side elevation to form new utility room.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for conversion of garage at ground floor level to form playroom with bedroom extension at first floor level; garage extended by one bay to maintain double garage; and single storey extension to side elevation to form new utility room at 38 Ash Grove, Chinley SK23 6BQ, in accordance with the terms of the application, ref. HPK/2011/0031, dated 24 January 2011, 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 approved plans numbered 01-13 inclusive, dated November 2010 (plan ref 01) and October 2010 (the remainder).

(3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the street-scene.

Reasons

3. 38 Ash Grove is a detached two-storey house on a modern open plan estate of similar dwellings. It occupies a prominent plot on the corner of Stockton Drive. The

only element of the appeal scheme to which the Council object is the physical extension of the existing garage, which the appellant wishes to carry out in order to maintain a double garage after completion of the partial conversion of the existing one to form a playroom.

4. The garage would extend 3.5m into what is presently an open grassed area to the north of the house. This would reduce the space between the dwelling and the highway edge to around 2.4m, which would be somewhat less than what is generally found in the estate as a whole. In my judgement, however, the scheme would not significantly compromise the open, informal character of the estate's layout, especially given the considerable variation in the shape, size and orientation of the small green spaces around the dwellings.

5. I have concluded that the scheme would have an acceptable impact on the street-scene, in broad compliance with "saved" Local Plan policies GD4 and H14. In allowing the appeal, I have imposed a condition requiring materials to match the existing, and one tying the permission to the approved plans.

David Kaiserman

INSPECTOR