

Appendix A

Appeal by Mr J Wood

Extensions at 31 Somersall Park Road, Chesterfield.

CHE/18/00048/FUL

2/5145

1. Planning permission was refused on 29th March 2018 for the development of a side and rear extension at 31 Somersall Park Road for the following reasons:
The proposed extension as a result of its design that does not include a step back would produce a larger dwelling that would be out of character with the existing house and surrounding dwellings, which would appear out of keeping in the area and would be incongruous 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 issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area. The Council's concern was that as the side extension would be flush with the existing front building line, rather than set back, it would detract from the original form of the dwelling and would be overly dominant within the plot. No concerns have been raised with regard to the other elements of the proposal and the inspector therefore addressed only the design concerns raised with regard to the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.
4. The area is characterised by properties of differing sizes but relatively consistent period detailing. This property has a distinctive two storey bay to the front with a tiled hipped roof. These elements are common in the vicinity. The bay provides the property with a strong vertical emphasis to its design. To the side of this feature there would have been a relatively

narrow side element that contained the front door with a window above. This narrow element would complement the vertical emphasis of the wider main area of frontage and would, because of its limited width, remain subservient, ensuing that the full height bay remained the dominant design feature of the house.

5. The original proportions have been eroded to some extent by the existing side extension. It has increased the width of the area to the side to a similar width as the area of the feature bay. This has resulted in a change to the vertical emphasis of this section and this wider area now competes with the scale of the bay frontage. It emphasises the lack of design quality and uncharacteristic proportions of this side element.
6. This proposal would further extend the property to the side. It has been designed to assimilate with the first extension. This would result in a much more substantial area of unrelieved development with little design interest. In terms of scale, it would have a greater width than the bay front area. The increased height of the roof over this and the original extension would further emphasise its uncharacteristic proportions. The inspector considered that it would represent poor design in this particular context. It would also extend much closer towards the neighbouring property and the inspector agreed with the Council that without some set back and relief in the frontage, this would also detract from the existing relationship with that dwelling.
7. The particular detailing and scale of this proposal would fail to respond to and integrate with the character of the house and surroundings and would fail to respect local distinctiveness. It would therefore conflict with Policy CS18(a&b) of the Local Plan: Core Strategy 2013. As the policy generally accords with the design requirements of the *National Planning Policy Framework 2018*, the inspector afforded it considerable weight. The Supplementary Planning Document: Successful Places 2013 advises that buildings should be designed with sensitivity to their setting and should respect local characteristics and neighbouring buildings. This proposal would undermine the quality of the existing architecture and would fail to respect the original form and proportions of the dwelling.

8. Reference was been made to a number of other extensions in the area. It has not been made clear when these decisions were taken. The inspector did not find any to be entirely comparable with regard to the scale of the combined additions and the overall proposed design. The extension at 26 Somersall Park Road appears to be the most similar although the overall roof form differs and the scale of the side addition appears to be more in keeping with the original extension to the appeal property. It is not clear what circumstances existed that led to that decision or when it was taken. However, it does not represent a good reason for accepting this proposal which would be of an unsatisfactory design and would conflict with the development plan policy and the design guidance.
9. The inspector considered the matters put forward by the appellant and accepted that the concerns relate only to the side extension proposed. However, the matters put forward were not sufficient to outweigh concerns with regard to the design of the side extension.