The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2012

by Chris Frost BSc(Hons) DipLD FLI CBiol MSB MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 November 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/D/12/2183558
48 Ferneydale Avenue, Buxton, Derbys SK17 9LW

- 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 Mrs B Watterson against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
- The application Ref: HPK/2012/0229, dated 17 April 2012, was refused by notice dated 25 June 2012.
- The development proposed is for alterations and an extension to a dwelling.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations and an extension to a dwelling at 48 Ferneydale Avenue, Buxton, Derbys SK17 9LW, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: HPK/2012/0229, dated 17 April 2012, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect the development would have on the appearance and character of the street scene and the locality.

Reasons

3. The proposed extension would occupy a space that exists between the house and its garage. The gap is around 3m wide. The proposed extension would perpetuate the hipped roof that currently exists and would be slightly set back from the existing front face of the house. This side extension would be accompanied by a frontal projection that would form a porch at ground level and an extended bedroom above. A rear extension would provide bedroom space at first floor level and an extended ground floor dining room. This rear extension would project about 4.5m from the rear of the dwelling but only 2m back from the existing garage.

4. The Council describes this as a cramped development but as it would occupy a relatively narrow gap between the house and its garage (beyond which there

are further garages) there is little to support this view. I accept that there are currently views through this gap to the open countryside beyond Ferneydale Avenue, but this opportunity would remain over the existing garage and adjoining garages to the north with the proposed extension in place. Accordingly, a significant gap between No.48 and its neighbour would remain.

5. The respect shown for the form of the existing dwelling, with the perpetuation of the hipped roof and matching eaves height would provide an entirely appropriate addition to the street scene and the forward projection at the front of the property would be subservient and would not appear excessive. The rear extension would not run alongside any existing boundaries and the single storey rear portion would serve to avoid any appearance of excessive height. As a whole the proposed extension would appear well mannered and well related to the dwelling and the street scene.

6. Saved policy GD4 of the High Peak Local Plan seeks to achieve development that is sympathetic to the character of the area and has no undue detrimental effect on the visual qualities of the locality or the wider landscape. Here there is no sound reason to consider that these objectives would not be respected. Similar requirements relating to respect for the character of an area are set out at saved policy H14. Again there is no sound reason to consider that this objective would not be met.

7. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) refers to good design as a key aspect of sustainable development. This supports local policies and the proposed development shows sufficient sensitivity in its design to meet this aim.

8. As the proposal would respect the relevant local policies that are consistent with The Framework and there are not other matters sufficient to suggest otherwise, there is no reason to withhold planning permission. No conditions are suggested but it is necessary to impose a time limit on commencement and for matching materials to be used in the interests of visual amenity.

Chris Frost

Inspector