The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2013

by Andrew Jeyes BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 February 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/D/13/2190936
34 Glossop Road, Charlesworth, Derbyshire SK13 5EZ

- 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 P Tupman against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
- The application Ref HPK/2012/0501 was refused by notice dated 7 November 2012.
- The development proposed is retention of repair works to unsound stone roof; replaced with Hardrow slate.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant, as part of the appeal, has proposed that either the appeal be allowed or a finding that planning permission is not required be made, as the development carried out is permitted development[1]. However, whether or not the development would be permitted development is not a matter for me to determine in the context of this planning appeal made under S78 of the Act against the refusal of planning permission. The Council has not therefore been invited to respond to these matters, and I have determined the appeal proposal based on the planning application made to the Council.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are: whether the replacement roofing material preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Charlesworth Conservation Area; and whether, if allowed, this would make it difficult for the Council to resist similar proposals in the future that would cumulatively impact on the traditional character and significance of the Conservation Area.

Reasoning

4. The planning application was made retrospectively and proposed the removal of existing stone roofing tiles and their replacement by Hardrow Slate tiles. The property, a semi-detached house in stone, is part of a line of development running down Glossop Road from the village centre. The property faces a road junction leading to a modern housing estate. This pair of semi-detached houses has the general appearance of a single unit, with a single central door to the front elevation with windows equidistant to each side; it is an asymmetric pair, with the adjoining property, No 36, including the front facing doorway or window above.

5. No 36 retains its original stone roof, which uses progressively reduced sizes of stone tiles up to the ridge, a traditional form of roofing within this Conservation Area. The

[1] Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) 1995 (as amended)

Hardrow Slate tiles are of thinner section, appear of more uniform size, and have a smoother and lighter appearance than the adjoining stone tiles. It provides a distinctively different appearance to the remaining stone roof of No 36, with a clearly defined junction where the two different roof tiles meet. This clearly divides the roof of the semi-detached houses into two distinct elements with no underlying design or architectural basis.

6. The building is seen as part of a line of traditional buildings running along the south-east side of Glossop Road down from the village centre and is also very prominent as a terminal feature in views from Lee Valley Drive opposite the site. Whilst there is a mix of roofing materials in the general area, including the use of replacement roofing materials, stone tiled roofs form a traditional element and are a recurring feature along this length of road. The Council point to the visual harmony of the area resulting from use of a limited pallet of building materials and this, in my view, contributes significantly to the character of the area. The other properties within the area which have been reroofed do not provide convincing evidence of the lack of impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

7. Whilst each application must be determined on its own merits, approval of this proposal without any policy or design justification would make it more difficult for the Council to resist similar proposals that, if allowed, would further add to the adverse impact on the Conservation Area.

8. The replacement roof has a negative impact on the appearance of this pair of semi-detached houses as it conflicts with the symmetrical, harmonious and traditional appearance of the building; it also has an adverse impact on the wider Conservation Area generally. It thus fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Charlesworth Conservation Area; it would, furthermore, make it more difficult for the Council to resist similar proposals.

9. This would be contrary to aspects of saved Policies BC1, BC5, BC6 and GD4 of the High Peak Local Plan 2005 and with advice in Supplementary Planning Guidance: *Residential Design*. These look for natural external materials that preserve or enhance the special architectural or historic character of conservation areas. These saved Local Plan policies carry substantial weight as they are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which clearly indicates that in relation to heritage assets, account should be taken of the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness and contributing to protecting and enhancing the historic environment.

10. For these reasons, and taking account of all other matters including representations, the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Jeyes

INSPECTOR