The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2012

by Sue Glover BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15 May 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/A/12/2168923
Land at the rear of 105 St Mary's Road, Glossop, Derbyshire SK13 8JB

- 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 Mr Alan Folkard against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
- The application Ref HPK/2011/0574, dated 18 October 2011, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2011.
- The development proposed is the construction of a detached dwelling on land behind no. 105 St. Mary's Road, Glossop.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Although there is some confusion in the Council's submissions about whether or not the site lies within the St James Conservation Area, the conservation area map provided by the Council clearly indicates that the site lies adjacent to but outside the conservation area boundary.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is therefore the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area in general and the setting of the St James Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The area is predominantly characterised by 2 and 3 storey traditional stone terraces with areas of open land at the rear. The appeal site is an area of unkempt open land at the rear of terraces fronting St. Mary's Road and Victoria Road. It is accessed via unadopted roads. Its former use is unknown, although it has been suggested from aerial images that it may have been informal garden land or allotments.

5. The open character of the site links in with the open land at the rear of a terrace to the north-east and further open land to the north. The spacious character contrasts with and provides a respite from the hard urban form of the stone terraces. The openness of the appeal site therefore makes a positive contribution to the setting of the conservation area.

6. The proposal has some traditional features and is of a modest size, but a single detached house with a forward projecting porch and attached garage would be in stark contrast with the strong linear form of the nearby terraces. It would reduce the spacious character of the appeal site and appear as an incongruous addition in this position. It would not take account of local distinctiveness and the pattern of buildings that shape Sefton Street and St Mary's Road.

7. I conclude that the proposal on account of its unsympathetic position, form and design would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the area in general and the setting of the St James Conservation Area. In these respects there is conflict with the objectives of Saved Policies BC5 and GD4 of the High Peak Local Plan.

8. Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework says that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

9. Although the access roads are in use by other development nearby, any additional traffic generated by a single dwelling house, including during construction would be small. It would add little in the way of any additional congestion or harm highway safety. I have also taken into account that the proposal would increase, albeit by a small amount, the housing stock of the area. These other matters however do not outweigh the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the area in general and the setting of the St James Conservation Area. The appeal does not succeed for these reasons.

Sue Glover

INSPECTOR