



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2024

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/D/24/3344047
17 Woodhead Road, Glossop SK13 7RH

- 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 & Mrs James and Sadie Fay against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: HPK/2023/0560 dated 21 December 2023 was refused by notice dated 2 May 2024.
 - The application is to raise roof level to provide accommodation at first and second floor and alterations to windows and doors.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached red brick bungalow standing upon a relatively steep plot to the upper parts of Woodhead Road as it approaches the town of Glossop. The bungalow is sited noticeably forward of other properties along this side of Woodhead Road and stands prominently on approach down the hill because of this. The Appellant's refer to this as an 'entrance building' and in this respect I concur that the site could offer the potential as something of a gateway site into the built up area.
4. I saw on my site visit that the vast majority of older buildings in and around Glossop are of local gritstone. Later developments appeared to utilise red brick with some elements of light render. Near to the site I saw that the majority of houses were of red brick, to both sides of the road, although the house immediately opposite was render, as was a gable elevation of a stone cottage nearby. Added to these were the houses of a new development named Kingsmoor Fields that could just be glimpsed on top of the hillside behind the appeal site itself which also used extensively areas of light render in their finish.
5. In assessing this appeal much has been made of the use of a render material upon a higher and, as a result, a potentially more prominent building in this location. It is true that render was traditionally used to cover up later

modifications, especially changes of material and this would be the intention here also. I also note that the Design Guide does not preclude such materials but does suggest its use should be limited and based upon the specific context of an area.

6. In this case I consider that there are two issues at stake. Firstly, the introduction of a larger building in this location, and secondly, the introduction of an equally large area of render to what would become a prominent gable elevation at this important point of arrival into the built up area of Glossop.
7. Although the proposed gable elevation would only be marginally higher than the existing bungalow, this is compared to the ridge of the bungalow's roof and not the eaves line. As a result, although the existing roof is visible, it is far more recessive than that of a gable. The prominence of this proposed elevation would therefore make the building much more visible and noticeable on arrival here. This in itself is not of such concern as the design is traditional and relatively proportionate, but when added to with a large expanse of light render, then this gable elevation would introduce a feature that would fail to fully respect the distinctive character of the area.
8. Therefore, through both the proposed render being applied here, combined with the noticeably higher and larger gable, the proposal would appear over dominant and would furthermore introduce a material that is not wholly characteristic of the area. The result would be a building effectively marking a gateway into Glossop that communicates that one is entering a place of rendered buildings and not one of the distinctive character that currently exists and dominates.
9. Although the proposed vertical timber windows offer considerable potential to improve this building the use of this render material undermines any such advantages. The Appellant has suggested that a condition could be used to control the material to the front, but I consider the issue at stake is somewhat more involved than this. As such I do not consider that a conditional approval would be sufficient in this case.
10. Ultimately, although there are ways to extend this property to such a scale and in the general form as proposed, the use of such largely alien materials upon such a large and prominent building in such a strategic location, would bring this scheme into conflict with Policy EQ6 of the High Peak Local Plan 2016 as well as guidance to improve design quality as contained within the High peak Design Guide 2018 and the Adopted Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document 2005, both of which reflect the importance of good design as advanced within the National Planning Policy Framework. As such the appeal must fail.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and taking into account of all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR