

27 Warmbrook Road
Chapel en le Frith
High Peak
SK23 0NL

13th March 2024

Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN

REF: HPK/2023/0536

Dear Sir/Madam.

I would like you to consider my appeal in respect of the above planning notice, a refusal decision was given on 12th February 2024, my appeal is based on the following points:

1. *The existing dwellinghouse comprises a traditional end of terrace cottage that sits at the end of a row of four similar terraced cottage, characterised by natural stone walls and tiled roofs with chimney breast atop.*
 - a. This statement is incorrect, the row comprises of 6 cottages in total, no.67 is at one end of the row and at the other end there is a cottage of similar dimensions to our proposed plan for no.67. It is my view that this has been overlooked by HPBC Planning Dept, in that the extension would obviously change the front and side elevations of no. 67, however it would virtually mirror no.57 (See Figure 4: Terraced block adjacent #67 in attached Design and Access Statement). This would result in a balanced view from the local footpaths and roads including the A6.
 - b. There was concern raised that the property is visible from the A6 which is some distance across the fields, there is in fact a development currently under construction of approx. 80 dwelling, which when complete will virtually block and/or distract from any view of my property (See Figure 10: View from the A6 Hallsteads showing the setting of #67 in attached Design and Access Statement)
2. *The failure to set the ridgeline lower than the existing ridge and set the front elevation behind the existing principal elevation exacerbate design concerns.*
 - a. With respect to the concern that the extension would adversely affect the street scene, we took the decision to not step the extension down and up so as to not have a negative effect, this was taking into account the planner's previous comments regarding this. The front of the property would be constructed using the original sandstone that the properties were built from, this is from stone previously quarried from the land behind the property. From both Meadow Lane and the A6 it would appear seamless and of no detriment to the view. The following statement was noted in the attached Design and Access Statement in relation to a previous comment made from HBPC Planning Officer *'The current proposal shows a full house width extension of the existing terrace which is not subordinate to the host dwelling. This addresses the concerns under HPK/2022/0455 that the proposals were incongruous: what is created is a seamless addition which respects its host in a*

manner the existing adjacent properties along the terrace do. The extension reads as appropriate, proportionate and balanced on the street scene. Advice provided from HPBC has been noted and in this application then criticised.

- b. If we followed the guidance that the planner seems to believe we have disregarded, this would simply not be the case as it would be evident to all that it is an extension. Surely this is the purpose of guidance documents, they are there to ‘guide’ but in the instance where there is an improved alternative then this is taken into account.?
3. *As submitted, the creation of the sunk patio was considered to read as an odd, and heavily contrived aspect of development that would be visible in both short and middle distance views and fails to respect the traditional character and appearance of the dwellinghouse and its setting within a traditional row of terraced cottages. The agent has subsequently submitted revised plans (Ref: 200A) in order to address these concerns. The plans show no change to the scale, height and appearance of the proposed side extension but now shows the sunken patio to be situated to the rear of the extension.*
 - a. I accept it was an oversight on our part to not put the patio to the rear, currently the rear of the property has a sunken patio area, therefore the only change is that it would be extended to cover the whole of the rear elevation of the property.
 - b. All of the cottages have sunken terraces due to the topography of the land at the rear.
4. *As submitted, the creation of the sunk patio was considered to read as an odd, and heavily contrived aspect of development that would be visible in both short and middle distance views and fails to respect the traditional character and appearance of the dwellinghouse and its setting within a traditional row of terraced cottages.*
 - a. This comment is now redundant due to the revised plans, but I do struggle with the rationale behind it and would like to use it as an example. Surely, the concern that it would be visible is irrelevant and obviously misunderstood, if it sunken then it wouldn’t be at all visible unless you were stood next to it, and to do this you would have to be on my private land?
5. *The application follows extensive pre-application advice which concluded that a two storey extension of the scale height and mass proposed would unlikely be supported, and also follows a recent application (HPK/2022/0455) that was withdrawn in light of similar comments.*
 - a. For clarity, the application noted wasn’t withdrawn by me or my partner, it was withdrawn without our consent by HPBC Planning Officer for reasons I am unaware.
6. Following the consultation process there were no comments from any stakeholders with the exception of Chapel en le Frith Parish Council who expressed support for the application (see attached).
7. All previous concerns noted by HPBC Planning Officer in relation to the previous application have been addressed in the attached Design and Access Statement

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for considering my appeal, if you do require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above address or on 07980 325622.

Yours faithfully,

Ms NJ Parsons