

APPENDIX A

Appeal by M Hopkinson

Extension at 31 Queen Mary Road, Chesterfield.

CHE/17/00365/FUL

2/6147

1. Planning permission was refused on 7th July 2017 for the development of a second floor extension at 31 Queen Mary Road for the following reasons:

The proposed extension, as a result of its design that does not match the existing roof design of the dwelling and the majority of neighbouring dwellings, would produce a building which would be incongruous and out of keeping in the street scene. The proposal would be a negative impact upon visual amenity and be contrary to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Successful Places' (3.16 Building Design), policy CS18 of the Chesterfield Borough Local Plan and paragraph 17 ('always seek a high quality of design') and paragraph 58 ('are visually attractive as a result of good architecture') of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. An appeal against the decision has been determined by the written representation appeal method and has been dismissed.
3. The main issues is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding dwellings. The appeal property is one half of a semi-detached pair of properties within a small cul-de-sac containing a total of 6 dwellings. There are 2 pairs of two storey semi-detached dwellings, one two-storey detached dwelling and a single storey bungalow on the cul-de-sac. As a consequence of the layout of this part of Queen Mary Road the cul-de-sac provides a clearly defined context. Any assessment of the character and appearance is therefore limited in principle to the dwellings within the cul-de-sac. All roofs within the cul-de-sac are pitched. Within the cul-de-sac, 2 dwellings, Nos 33 and 37, have 2-storey side extensions which have both been sited and designed to be subservient to their host dwelling. The roofs to both extensions are not an identical match to

their host dwelling, but they are both pitched and therefore enable a harmonious design link retaining the prevailing roof type within the cul-de-sac.

4. The appeal proposal sought to add an upper storey to an existing single storey part of the building, therefore the siting of the built form of the extension has already been established. Although the proposed side extension would be marginally set back from the front elevation, it would be sited much forward than those present at Nos 33 and 37. This siting therefore increases the prominence of the proposal. The proposed flat roof would introduce a harsh and incongruous addition to the host dwelling.
5. From the entrance to the cul-de-sac the land gradually rises such that Nos 35, 33 and 31 are visible from main part of Queen Mary Road. At the time of the site visit, the existing hedging to No 23 provided some interruption to the view into the cul-de-sac and No 31. As it is not within the control of the appellant it would not be acceptable to rely upon its presence as a form of mitigation for the visual impact of the proposal. If the hedging was removed it would enable a full and uninterrupted view of No 31 from a much wider area thereby increasing its impact.
6. The appellant drew attention to No 43 Queen Mary Road which sits at the entrance to the cul-de-sac. This is a two storey flat roofed extension to No 43 and the inspector has had regard to its presence. However, No 43 is of a different design to No 31. The inspector had no evidence to understand its planning history and the reasons that the Council found it to be acceptable. This limits the weight the inspector can give to it in the decision making process. The presence of the flat roof at No 43 alone was not sufficient to justify allowing the appeal.
7. Reference was also made to No 68 Netherfield Road as an example of another flat roofed 2-storey side extension. The inspector noted that this scheme originally proposed a pitched roof but was amended during the application to a flat roof. The inspectors attention was drawn to the reference regarding 'exceptional circumstances' which led to a change in roof design. However, without any indication as to what these may have been, it limits the weight the inspector could give to this

scheme. On the site visit the inspector saw that the main roof of No 68 was predominantly covered with solar panels. The inspector did not agree that this 2-storey extension is prominent, it is substantially set back from the front elevation, thereby reducing its prominence in the streetscene. The character of Netherfield Road is more spacious and the dwellings are more modern. Consequently the inspector did not find No 68 to be a comparable scheme which would justify approval of the appeal proposal.

8. The inspector concluded that the proposed 2 storey side extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding dwellings. Accordingly, it fails to satisfy Policy CS18 of the Chesterfield Borough Local Plan, which seeks amongst other things, that new development responds to and integrates with the character and distinctiveness of the context. It would also be contrary to paragraphs 17 and 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which advise that proposals should secure high quality design and are visually attractive.