



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2023

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/D/23/3318746

1 Royle Avenue, Glossop, Derbyshire SK13 7RD

- 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 Craig Jackson against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
 - The application Ref HPK/2022/0429, dated 20 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is Lower ground floor garage and utility to be formed partially through excavation. Single storey side extension linking to two storey rear extension and loft room. Inglenook single storey extension to kitchen. Alterations to existing porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling occupies a large plot and is set well back from Royle Avenue, at a higher ground level. It has a somewhat unique appearance especially when viewed from the front due to the distinctive deep catslide roof slope to one side of the roof which contains a single front facing dormer. To the rear there is a previous two storey extension that has dual pitched roofs over it along with a flat roofed single storey extension. The appeal proposal includes a garage and storage/utility room that is identical to that which has been approved by the Council recently¹ and therefore is not a matter of contention between the parties, nor is the proposed Inglenook side extension to the kitchen.
4. The proposed single storey side extension would have a shallow double hipped roof with a valley in between. Visually this would contrast with the existing side gable of the original dwelling and that of the proposed two storey extension, appearing as an awkward and incongruous design in comparison and resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Whilst many views of the appeal dwelling are screened by established vegetation, vision of this side elevation of the dwelling is available across the frontages of the adjacent dwellings. In such views the elevation appears prominently in the street scene at a higher ground level, and the impact that would result from

¹ HPK/2022/0147

the roof in question would not be substantially lessened by the fact that the dwelling is set back from the public highway. This prominence would accentuate the visual impact that would arise and mean that there would be harm as well to the character and appearance of the area.

5. There are other dwellings on Royle Avenue that appear prominently in the street scene, many of which have hipped roofs, including hipped roofs on some dwellings that also have gabled roofs. My attention has been drawn to changes to the roofs of the dwellings at 12 and 14 Royle Avenue and to the hipped roof attached garage at 18 Royle Avenue, all of which I was able to view at my site visit. However, these offer only limited support to the inclusion of a hipped roof on the proposed single storey extension, as what is proposed would differ in that it would incorporate two hipped roof structures with a valley in between. As I have set out above, such an arrangement would be a visually harmful design.
6. The proposed alterations to the existing porch to the front elevation of the dwelling would result in a structure narrow in width and consisting mainly of glazing on the elevation that would face towards Royle Avenue. By reason of its narrow width, its extensive use of glazing and an awkward interface with the catslide roof and the front elevation of the dwelling in general, it too would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Whilst this element would be screened to some extent by existing vegetation, nonetheless the front elevation is still appreciable from the public domain, meaning that there would also be harm caused to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
7. As the appellant points out, there is no particular symmetry or balance in the current appearance of the dwelling, because of both its original design and the subsequent extensions that have taken place. Nonetheless, the design of the proposed extensions would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area, for the reasons I have outlined. The fact that the ground floor front bay window of the proposed single storey side extension would directly align with a proposed bay window in the front of the main dwelling, thus creating an element of balance and uniformity in appearance, also does not justify the overall harm caused.
8. The concern that the Council raises with respect to the two storey rear extension (and also with the footprint of the single storey side extension) is that it would be an overdevelopment of the appeal site, owing to the previous extensions that have taken place. In that respect, my attention is drawn to the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2005 (RDG) and the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (DG) 2018, both of which seek to ensure that extensions are subservient in size and appearance to the original dwellings to which they are attached.
9. However, the appeal dwelling is located on a substantial plot. Notwithstanding the guidance of the RDG and the DG, in this instance I concur with the appellant that what is proposed in terms of the additional floorspace would not be an overdevelopment of the dwelling, even on consideration of the earlier extensions that have taken place. The dwelling could in principle absorb additional floorspace, having regard in particular to the spacious surroundings in which it sits and its separation from other dwellings. I also consider that the rear dormer proposed would not have any significantly harmful visual impact.

That said, these findings do not overcome the specific design concerns I have outlined, and the harm that they would cause.

10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the double hipped roof of the proposed single storey side extension and the front porch alterations would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. Consequently, the proposed development would fail to accord with Policies S1 and EQ6 of the High Peak Local Plan 2016, where it seeks to protect character and appearance. There would also be a conflict with the aims of the RDG and the DG in the same regard, and with the National Planning Policy Framework where it aims to achieve well-designed places.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has been granted a Lawful Development Certificate (LDC)², which includes confirmation that a single storey side extension could be built under permitted development rights. However, I have not been provided with elevational plans of the development to which the LDC refers. Without the elevational plans it is not possible to understand the exact similarity between what the appellant could build and what they would end up building under the appeal proposal.
12. So, whilst the parties disagree as to the probability of the appellant undertaking the LDC development mainly owing to the fact that the elements of it could not be attached to one another, in any event it has not been demonstrated what would be built if the LDC scheme were to be implemented. That being the case, the previous LDC approval does not weigh in favour of my allowing of the appeal proposal, as I cannot be sure that to take such a course of action would be in preference to an alternative LDC development that would have the same or a worse impact.
13. I acknowledge that the appellant has made amendments to attempt to overcome the previous refusal of planning permission and the subsequent dismissal of an appeal against the Council's decision. However, I have set out above as to why the scheme subject to this appeal has not been successful in addressing all of the design concerns and the impact that they would have.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR

² HPK/2020/0415