



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2023

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23.01.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/D/23/3331591

2 Turnlee Drive, Glossop, Derbyshire SK13 6XA

- 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 Michael Joyce against the decision of the Kirklees Council.
 - The application HPK/2023/0217 dated 29 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as two storey extension to side and single storey extension to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey extension to side and single storey extension to rear at 2 Turnlee Drive, Glossop, Derbyshire SK13 6XA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HPK/2023/0217 dated 29 May 2023, and the plans submitted with it, subject to conditions set out below.

(1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

(2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan Sheet 1; Block Plans Sheet 2 (as amended); Proposed Plans Sheet 4 (as amended); and Proposed Elevations Sheet 5.

(3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the hereby approved development shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. Amended plans were received during the determination of the application detailing modifications to the front wall, and a revised Proposed Floor Plans showing the function of the room originally allocated as 'Bedroom 5/Office' as a 'Study'. I have considered the appeal on the basis of the amended plans.
3. Since the submission of the appeal the National Planning Policy Framework has been superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) (the Framework). However, in relation to this appeal the aims of both sets of policies are similar. No party would be prejudiced or caused any injustice by me proceeding with the appeal in light of this change in policy.

Main Issue

The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and area in general.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on a corner plot at the entrance to Turnlee Drive on the junction with Turnlee Road, the site comprises a semi-detached property within a predominantly residential area. The appeal property is located at a lower level than Turnlee Road with a large area of private amenity space to the side of the property separating it from the adjacent highway.
5. The Residential Design Guide SPD (2005) and the Design Guide SPD (2018) (the SPDs), highlights amongst other things that development should be subordinate and harmonise with the main form of the existing property and be well designed.
6. The proposed development incorporates a visual break between the principal elevation and ridgeline of the side extension and existing property. The proposal would be constructed and finished in materials that, together with fenestration detailing, are consistent to those of the existing property.
7. The Council contend that the width of the proposed two storey side extension should be no more than 50% increase compared to the existing property. The proposed development would exceed this.
8. The Council suggest reducing the proposed side extension by approximately 500mm would alleviate the visual effect of the development. I disagree. The proposed two storey side extension would not unbalance the semi-detached property nor would it be a disproportionate addition to the property, or the area in general.
9. Whilst the appeal site is in a visually prominent location, due to the positioning of the built form of the property adjacent (No. 1 Turnlee Drive), the proposed side extension would not encroach the building line closer to the highway. The proposed development would create a balanced entrance into the estate. This along with the difference in levels between the built form and Turnlee Road would minimise the visual effect of the overall development.
10. The Council do not raise concern with regard to the removal of the hedgerow and introduction of a low brick wall, the single storey rear extension or the raised decking, I do not disagree.
11. I find that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and area in general.
12. There is no conflict with Policies S1 and EQ6 of the High Peak Local Plan (2016) and the SPDs which seek amongst other things for developments to respect the character of the townscape and be subservient to the original building in term of scale, materials and relationship to adjacent buildings.
13. There is no conflict with the Framework which seeks amongst other things to ensure developments are of good design.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

15. I have imposed a standard condition relating to the commencement of development and a condition specifying the relevant plans as this provides certainty. In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area I have imposed a condition concerning materials.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR