



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 August 2026

by J Buxton BA(Hons) DipArch ARB RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 September 2026

Appeal Ref: 6011027

The Rising Rest Home, Primrose Lane, Simmondley, Glossop SK13 6LW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Julie Townsley of The Rising Care Home Company Limited against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
 - The application reference is HPK/2025/0423.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension to residential care home.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. During the course of the appeal the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on the 17 August 2026. Whilst the format has altered, any considerations that are material to this decision have not fundamentally changed. I am satisfied that this has not prejudiced either party and I have had regard to the latest version in reaching my decision.
3. Whilst concerns have been raised by neighbouring occupiers regarding residential amenity, highway safety and access arrangements, these matters do not form part of the Council's reason for refusal. Having regard to the evidence before me, I do not find that they would give rise to unacceptable harm. Accordingly, these matters are not determinative of the appeal, and I have focused my assessment on the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.
4. In light of the above, the main issue is the effect of the proposed side extension on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is an established care home and is a large stone detached building within a predominantly residential setting. The appeal building is noticeably larger than the properties to either side of the site, which are a mix of bungalows and two-storey dwelling houses. At present, a landscaped buffer along the side of the building provides visual separation between the care home and the adjacent residential use. The generous garden areas of both the host building and its immediate neighbours make a positive contribution to the open and verdant character of the area.

6. The proposed extension would be located within this landscaped buffer and would comprise a single-storey side extension providing additional communal space, sanitary and ancillary facilities for residents, together with office space. The expansion of the communal living space would be likely to improve the living conditions of residents and the day to day running of the home. In providing these benefits the appeal scheme would also make efficient use of the land.
7. However, the form and design of the proposed extension would fail to respond positively to the architectural character of the existing building. In particular, the dual-pitched roof arrangement results in a roof form that lacks a clear architectural relationship with the host building and appears awkward in its composition. As a result, rather than being read as a natural continuation of the existing built form, it would appear as an incongruous extension.
8. Furthermore, during my site visit I observed that the existing building is readily visible from Primrose Lane and Sunny Banks. Although the site lies at a lower level than Primrose Lane and benefits from some boundary planting, the building remains clearly perceptible in public views. In this context, the proposed extension would noticeably increase the width of the building, particularly when approaching along Sunny Banks, resulting in a more dominant and visually intrusive form of development. Also, from the access serving the site, the extension would appear as an awkward addition to the side of the building, reinforcing my concerns regarding its poor integration with the host property.
9. The proposed fenestration would further contribute to this disjointed appearance. The openings would not follow the established rhythm or proportions of the existing building and would fail to reflect the detailing evident elsewhere on the property. When considered as a whole, the relationship between the windows, walling and varying roof slopes would create a poor arrangement of elements that would sit uncomfortably alongside the appeal building. Whilst matching materials are proposed, material continuity would not overcome my concerns regarding the disjointed nature of the proposal, particularly in respect of its scale, detailing and roof design. These factors result in a development that does not integrate with or enhance either the host building or its surroundings, and therefore fails to respond appropriately to the established character and appearance of the area. The adverse effects in this regard would be substantial and would outweigh the benefits identified above.
10. I acknowledge the appellant's submission that the scheme was amended during the application process, including that the width of the extension was reduced. I also recognise that the ridge height would remain below that of the main building. However, these amendments do not overcome my concerns regarding the design, the scale of the footprint and its overall relationship with the existing building.
11. As part of my assessment, I have had regard to the Council's supplementary design guidance, including the High Peak Design Guide, which advises that extensions should remain subordinate to the host building and recognises that a point may be reached where further enlargement becomes harmful to a building's character. In this case, whilst the height of the extension would be subordinate, its sizeable plan form and lack of a coherent relationship with the design of the existing care home would result in a form of development that would appear out of scale with the host building and would detract from its overall composition.

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal proposal would fail to respond positively to the design and form of the existing care home. Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. As such, it would conflict with Policies S1 and EQ6 of the High Peak Borough Council Local Plan (2016), which seek, amongst other things, to secure high quality development that responds positively to local character and contributes to local distinctiveness.

Other Matters

13. In reaching my decision, I have had regard to the appeal site's proximity to the St James Conservation Area (SJCA) and to the statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. I note that the Council raised no heritage objection to the proposal and concluded that, due to the separation distance between the appeal site and the conservation area, together with the presence of intervening development, landscaping and changes in land levels, the proposal would not affect its significance. I have no reason to disagree with that assessment and therefore find that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the SJCA.
14. I have considered the appellant's submissions regarding operational requirements and the need for additional communal, sanitary and staff facilities. I recognise the important role played by the care home and the benefits that improved facilities could provide for residents, staff and visitors. I also note the evidence regarding infection control, accessibility improvements and enhanced facilities for residents. These considerations weigh significantly in favour of the proposal.
15. Whilst I note that the proposed layout has been developed to meet the operational requirements of the care home, the fact that a design may successfully fulfil a functional purpose does not necessarily mean that it represents good design in planning terms. In this regard, I find that the operational requirements of the business have resulted in an extension whose scale and form fail to respond appropriately to the existing building.
16. Whilst concerns have been raised by local residents regarding highway safety and access arrangements, the Council has not identified any conflict with development plan policies in this regard and there is insufficient evidence before me to conclude that the proposal would result in unacceptable highway safety impacts.

Conclusion

17. Whilst I attach significant weight to the operational benefits that would arise from the provision of improved facilities for residents and staff, these benefits do not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

J Buxton

INSPECTOR