



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 April 2023

by N Duff BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/W/23/3315502

30 Hall Street, New Mills, High Peak SK22 3BR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
 - The appeal is made by Mrs K Mackay against High Peak Borough Council.
 - The application Ref HPK/2022/0502, is dated 1 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolition of side sunroom and erection of single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of side sun room and erection of single storey side extension at 30 Hall Street, New Mills, High Peak SK22 3BR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HPK/2022/0502, dated 1 November 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing no. 201; Drawing no. 205; Drawing no. 207; Drawing no. 206.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council failed to determine the application to which this appeal relates. The Council have, however, since provided a decision notice and officer report with a reason for refusal of planning permission, had they retained jurisdiction to do so. The reason relates to character and appearance. The appellant has had the opportunity to respond to this in their final comments therefore, they would not be prejudiced by my taking these into account.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Hall Street is a predominantly residential street characterised by a mixture of detached, semi-detached and terraced properties of varying ages, some of which have had side extensions in close proximity to No. 30. The property is facing Hall Street and is located on the corner of Aldersgate which rises uphill from Hall Street, the majority of properties on Aldersgate have flat roof dormer windows on their front elevations.

5. The proposed ground floor extension would replace an existing conservatory on the side of the dwelling facing Aldersgate. The proposed extension would be of substantial construction and would have a glazed element to the front of the extension to provide the sunroom with a flat parapet roof. The majority of the extension would be constructed from matching materials to the main dwelling with a dual pitched roof and would reflect the character and appearance of the existing house.
6. The Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document SPD2 Adopted 2005 (SPD 2005) states that flat roofs should be avoided due to their often squat and ungainly appearance. This extension would not result in a squat or ungainly appearance. The flat roof element is modest, not excessive in height, and uses appropriate, contemporary materials therefore would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, therefore the proposal is not contrary to the advice set out in the SPD 2005.
7. Whilst the property is in a fairly prominent position on a corner plot, the extension would be set back from the front elevation and have modest single storey height. The height of the extension would step up towards the rear of the property which reflects the topography of the site and area, rising uphill. Due its size and design the proposed extension would not be bulky and would integrate well with the host dwelling and not dominate it. For these reasons, whilst the extension would be visible when viewed from the street, it would not be an incongruous addition that would be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the area.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area. Policies S1 and EQ6 of the High Peak Local Plan Adopted April 2016 require new developments to seek high quality design having regard to local character in terms of scale, height, appearance, and materials. I find that the proposal accords with the aforementioned policies and the principles of chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks good design sympathetic to the local area.
9. Having regard to the Residential Design Guide SPD (2018) it requires extensions to be subordinate in terms of style and massing and respect the dominance of the original building. For the reasons mentioned, the proposal is in accordance with the guidance contained within the SPD.

Other matters

10. I note that an extant planning permission exists for a side extension at the site. I have assessed the proposal before me on its individual merits and it is acceptable. Therefore, this does not affect the conclusion I have reached.

Conditions

11. To meet legislative requirements, a condition shall be imposed to address the period for commencement.
12. I impose a condition specifying the relevant drawings, which include details of materials, in order to provide certainty.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

N Duff

INSPECTOR