The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 January 2013

by A U Ghafoor BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 January 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/D/12/2189812
3 King Edward Avenue, Glossop SK13 7QZ

- 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 William Meadowcroft against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
- The application Ref HPK/2012/0434 was refused by notice dated 3 October 2012.
- The development proposed as described in the planning application is *'2 storey side and single storey rear extension'*.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue to consider is the impact of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the street scene, having particular regard to the design of the two-storey side extension.

3. Number 3 is a semi-detached property located within a residential street. To one side it adjoins the neighbouring house and on the other side there is a pedestrian walkway, which runs to the rear of properties in Norfolk Street. The dwelling is visible from various public vantage points because of its location and positioning.

4. The appellant argues that the development would match the host dwelling's appearance and it would not affect on-site car parking. I agree that the single-storey rear extension, which is linked to the two-storey side extension, would be acceptable because of its design, limited scale and location.

5. On the other hand, the proposed two-storey side extension would be located about 0.8 metres from no. 3's boundary with the adjoining walkway and virtually occupy the full width of the gap. It would not be sufficiently set back from the front elevation and it would have a continuous ridgeline. I find that the two-storey side extension would visually unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings. This is because of its substantial bulk, massing and volume. Therefore the design, scale and size of the two-storey side extension would adversely affect the architectural style of the host dwelling. The resulting development would be out-of-keeping with the qualities of modest properties in the street scene.

6. Accordingly, the proposal would fail to comply with Policies GD4 and H14 of the High Peak Saved Policies 2008. Amongst other matters, these Policies seek to

ensure that the form and scale of extensions are sympathetic to the character of the surrounding area, and that there would not be a detrimental effect upon the visual qualities of the locality. These Policies are reflective of guidance found in paragraphs 56 and 61 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which the proposal would fail.

Other matters and conclusions

7. The occupier of no. 1 King Edward Avenue is concerned about the potential loss of light to the rear elevation and garden. However the limited scale of the single-storey rear extension would not materially reduce daylight or direct sunlight to the rear elevation of no. 1. The two-storey element would be set further away and its built-form would not overshadow the rear garden. The occupier of no. 5 is concerned about the removal of boundary treatments along the public walkway including established vegetation, but adequate boundary and landscaping treatments could be secured by way of planning conditions.

8. I agree with the Authority's planning assessment that the proposed development would not materially harm the living conditions of nearby residents. On balance, however, I conclude that these considerations do not outweigh my finding that the design, scale and size of the proposed two-storey side extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the area.

9. For all of the above reasons, and having considered all other matters, the appeal should not succeed.

A U Ghafoor

INSPECTOR