



PDA GROUP



PRICE DINSDALE ASSOCIATES LTD  
CHARTERED ARCHITECTS

**STATEMENT**  
To Accompany  
**PLANNING APPLICATION**

***EXTENSIONS TO DWELLING***  
At  
**26 HADDON ROAD, BUXTON SK17 7PP**

April 2014

***PROPOSED EXTENSIONS TO DWELLING***

At

**26 HADDON ROAD, BUXTON SK17 7PP**

Supporting Statement

April 2014

**This application seeks Consent for a revised scheme of reduced scale, following Refusal of Consent for Application No. HPK/2013/0521, determined on 18 November 2013.**

**Introduction**

The proposal seeks Consent to refurbish and extend a small semi-detached dwelling to form a family home with reasonable levels of accommodation.

At the outset, it is important emotionally, if not technically relevant to the Planning process, to appreciate that this property has been in the uninterrupted and happy ownership of the Applicant's family since it was constructed, well over fifty years ago. That is the primary reason why the Applicants wish to extend this property, rather than sell and buy a larger house in a different location.

The Applicant currently serves with HM Armed Forces, spending a considerable amount of time out of the country. However, at the end of his contract, he wishes to return to live in the family home in Fairfield. He therefore wishes to extend at both ground and first floor levels, to enhance the accommodation to provide reasonable, though not over-generous, space for his family.

He also wishes to undertake re-modelling of the principal elevation of the property, to incorporate a new covered porch and to change the design of the principal windows.

## Site

The property comprises half of a semi-detached pair of dwellings, in a street of similar properties in a long-established residential area of Buxton, and was constructed in the mid part of the last century.

The existing dwelling stands on an atypically deep plot, with generous rear garden space. However, the plot is narrow, and the internal accommodation is compromised by being substantially inferior in floor area to the majority of the dwellings on the same street, and in the immediate locality generally.

In common with many of the properties in the area built at this time, there was no specific provision for off-street vehicle parking, and so the original front garden and highway boundary wall have been removed to form a hardstanding area. Due to the narrowness of the plot, access alongside the building to a side or rear garage is not viable.

Many of the adjacent dwellings have acquired extensions of all types over the last three or four decades, including frontage remodelling, rear single and two storey extensions, conservatories, etc. The Applicant seeks Consent to undertake works similar to those already implemented elsewhere in the same street and locality.

Viewed from the street frontage, the property to the left of the Application site has had a large conservatory type structure added, which projects some four to five metres back from the rear elevation.

### **The Existing Dwelling**

The existing dwelling comprises a two storey semi-detached property entirely typical of its era, built of red clay facing brick lower walls, with roughcast render external finish above. Floors and roof construction are traditional, with timber joists and rafters, and the roof covering is of small format red clay tiles. External joinery is general in white upvc. Dwellings immediately adjacent are constructed of matching materials.

Internally, the accommodation comprises at ground floor level, a small entrance hall, one large "through" living room, a small kitchen, and lean-to outhouse. At first floor, there is a minute landing area giving on to three very cramped bedrooms and a small bathroom.

The small bedroom and kitchen are not of adequate size for reasonable average family use.

### **The Proposed Alterations/ Extensions**

The applicant wishes to extend the rear of the property, to the full width of the existing structure, at ground floor level, to produce a new kitchen/ dining area for family use.

He also wishes to build over part of the width of the proposed ground floor extension at first floor level, in order to replace the existing completely unviable third bedroom with a new double bedroom with en suite facilities.

He further wishes to remodel the highway frontage of the dwelling by replacing the principal windows with square bays, and including a reasonable sized porch area.

### **Pre-Application Consultation**

A pre-Application Consultation was undertaken prior to submission of Application No. HPK/2013/0521, and it was the opinion of the consulting Officer that the proposed works to the street frontage were entirely acceptable.

Some concern was expressed regarding the depth of the proposed rear two storey extension, in terms of the scale of the extension compared to the scale of the existing dwelling.

It appears from the report of the consulting Officer that the depth of the full-width ground floor extension was not a particularly contentious issue.

With regard to the two-storey element of the proposed rear extension, the Officer's response suggests that the length of this might be "disproportionate".

### **Description of Revised Proposals.**

The previous Application was primarily criticised for the scale of the rear single and two storey extensions. These have been significantly reduced in this revised Application:-

1. The footprint of the rear extension has been reduced to comply exactly with the current limitations on Permitted Development Rights. I.e, were this solely a single storey extension, it could be constructed without Planning Consent. Given the foregoing, there can therefore be no sustainable charge of significant loss of residential amenity to either of the immediately adjacent dwellings (Nos. 24 & 28 Haddon Road), resulting from the overall footprint of the extensions as currently proposed.
2. The proximity of the two storey portion of the rear extension to the site boundary implies that it would require Planning Consent irrespective of its length. Following the formal pre-App Consultation for Application No. HPK/2013/0521, enquiry was made of the Case Officer regarding a length for the two storey rear extension that would be deemed to be acceptable. The reply, given in an email dated 1 August 2013, as follows:-

“3m from the rear wall at two storey level would be at the limit of what may be acceptable”

We have accordingly restricted the rear projection of the first floor level rear extension to accord with this advice.

The second grounds for Refusal of Consent for Application No. HPK/2013/0521 related to the form and appearance of the proposed porch and canopy to the street frontage elevation.

However, a formal pre-Application Consultation was undertaken for that Application, and the Case Officer concluded that:-

“It is considered that a two storey and single storey rear extensions (*sic*), and a front porch in this location, are acceptable in principle.”

“There is no objection to the front porch”.

The second Reason for Refusal in the Decision Notice for Application No. HPKL/2013/0521 therefore either a) implies that the pre-Application process is fundamentally worthless, or b) constitutes an admission that the aesthetic impact of the proposed front elevation extension is entirely subjective, (rather than Policy-based), and hence objectively indefensible. Under the circumstances, we would respectfully suggest that the content of the pre-App renders the second Reason for Refusal in the Decision Notice for Application No. HPKL/2013/0521, unsustainable, and we have therefore retained proposals for the street frontage alterations unchanged from the previous submission.

## Conclusion

- The Applicants' wish to improve and extend this property, rather than purchase an alternative larger dwelling, are genuine and entirely understandable.
- The scale of the existing accommodation is not appropriate for the average contemporary family unit, although the overall plot is generously sized.
- There is no pre-Application objection to the remodelling of the street frontage.
- The footprint of the rear extension complies with that which could be constructed without the benefit of Planning Consent, under current Permitted Development Rights.
- The extent of the two storey rear extension does not exceed the length advised by the case officer during the pre-Application Consultation.

For the above reasons, we would respectfully request that Planning Consent for this revised proposal be Granted.

*PDA Group  
April 2014*

*PDA GROUP  
August 2013*



PDA GROUP



PRICE DINSDALE ASSOCIATES LTD  
CHARTERED ARCHITECTS

**STATEMENT**

To Accompany

**REVISED PLANNING APPLICATION**

For

***EXTENSIONS TO DWELLING***

At

**26 HADDON ROAD, BUXTON SK17 7PP**

April 2014

**APPENDIX I**

**Pre-Application Response to Application No. HPK/2013/0521**



**High Peak Borough Council**

*working for our community*

My Ref FG/P5452

Your Ref

18<sup>th</sup> July 2013

Mr P Dinsdale  
PDA group  
8, The Quadrant  
Buxton  
SK17 6AW

Dear Mr Dinsdale,

**Re: Pre application advice for a two storey and a single storey rear extension and front porch at 26 Haddon Road, Fairfield, Buxton.**

I refer to the above property and the proposed plans 1305.01, 1305.02 and 1305.03, submitted for informal comment prior to the submission of a planning application.

The property is located within the built up area of Fairfield, Buxton whereby proposals will be subject to the relevant policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and the High Peak Local Plan Saved policies (2008). In particular, policies H14 (Domestic extensions and ancillary buildings), GD4 '(Character, form and design)' GD5 '(Amenity)' and BC1 (External materials) and TR5 '(Access, parking and design)' are relevant to this proposal.

It is considered that a two storey and single storey rear extensions, and a front porch in this location are acceptable in principle.

However, with a rear projection of 5.3m at two storey level, it is considered that the rear extension is a disproportionate enlargement to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host dwelling. It is also considered that the rear extension will affect the amenity of neighbouring properties by virtue of shadowing and overbearing. I would advise that the rear projection of both the two storey and single storey extension is reduced to overcome the above concerns. There is no objection to the front porch.

An application can be made online at [www.planningportal.gov.uk](http://www.planningportal.gov.uk). Alternatively application forms can be downloaded from our website at [www.highpeak.gov.uk](http://www.highpeak.gov.uk). The current cost for a domestic application is £172.

If you require a set of application forms to be sent to your address please contact customer services on 0845 129 77 77.



**High Peak Borough Council**

*working for our community*

It may be advisable to contact Building Control to confirm if Building Regulations are required on telephone 0845 129 7777, extension 2172. .

Please note that this advice is an informal officer opinion, given without prejudice to any future planning application. A formal decision can only be secured through the planning application process.

Yours Sincerely



**Faye Plant**

Planning Officer, Development Control

When calling please telephone 0845 129 7777 Ext. 3656

PDA GROUP



PRICE DINSDALE ASSOCIATES LTD

CHARTERED ARCHITECTS

**STATEMENT**

To Accompany

**REVISED PLANNING APPLICATION**

For

***EXTENSIONS TO DWELLING***

At

**26 HADDON ROAD, BUXTON SK17 7PP**

April 2014

**APPENDIX II**

**Email from Pre-Application Case Officer dated 1 August 2013**

**Email to F Plant 1 Aug 2013**

Thankyou, Faye - we'll pass on your comments to our Clients.

Best wishes

Paul

---

**From:** Faye Plant [mailto:Faye.Plant@highpeak.gov.uk]

**Sent:** 01 August 2013 13:02

**To:** 'Paul Dinsdale'

**Subject:** RE: 26 Haddon Road, Buxton

Hello Paul,

I appreciate that my comments, and indeed comments on design in general may be subjective and seem to be unquantifiable, however a starting point would be the preamble to local plan policy H14 'domestic extensions and ancillary buildings' which explains that the scale should not be disproportionate to the original dwelling and that anything more than 50% will require particualry careful attention. Extensions should reflect the character and scale of the existing extension. Indeed where extensions affect a neighbouring property, 2.5m projection is given as a guide within the guidelines for design and layout of residential development.

In this particular case, I would anticipate that 3m from the rear wall at two storey level would be at the limit of what may be acceptable however this is only my informal opinion given without the benefit of a site visit and assessment on any development on the neighbouring dwellings.

I trust you find my comments useful if I can be of further assistance please contact me,

Regards,

Faye Plant  
Planning Officer  
Development Control  
High Peak Borough Council  
(HPBC: 01298 28400 ext 3656)

PDA GROUP



PRICE DINSDALE ASSOCIATES LTD  
CHARTERED ARCHITECTS

**STATEMENT**

To Accompany

**REVISED PLANNING APPLICATION**

For

***EXTENSIONS TO DWELLING***

At

**26 HADDON ROAD, BUXTON SK17 7PP**

April 2014

**APPENDIX III**

**LPA Decision Notice for Application No. HPK/2013/0521**



www.highpeak.gov.uk

**High Peak Borough Council**

*working for our community*

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990  
PLANNING AND COMPENSATION ACT 1991  
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE) (ENGLAND)  
ORDER 2010

FULL PLANNING APPLICATION

## REFUSAL

Applicant Mr Malcolm Hill  
c/o Agent  
Agent Price Dinsdale Associates Ltd  
8 The Quadrant  
Buxton  
SK17 6AW

Application no. HPK/2013/0521

Registered on 26/09/2013

Determined on 18/11/2013

---

High Peak Borough Council hereby **REFUSE** this application for **FULL PLANNING PERMISSION** for

**Proposed Remodelling and Extensions to Dwelling at 26 Haddon Road, Fairfield, Buxton**

in accordance with the submitted application, details and accompanying plans listed below for the following reasons:-

### Reasons

1. The proposed two storey and single storey rear extensions by reason of their size, siting and orientation would result in a loss of light, outlook and overshadowing to the adjoining semi detached property, to the detriment of the residential amenities of this property. As such the development fails to comply with Policies GD5 and H14 of the High Peak Saved Local Plan Policies 2008 and paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed front extension by reason of its siting and design would unbalance the semi detached properties, resulting in an incongruous extension, to the detriment of the visual character of the street scene. As such the development would be contrary to Policies GD4 and H14 of the High Peak Saved Local Plan 2008 and paragraphs 58-60 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

  
Michael Green  
Planning Applications Manager

High Peak Borough Council, Development Services, Municipal Buildings, Glossop, Derbyshire SK13 8AF  
Tel 0845 129 7777 or 01298 28400 Fax 01457 860290 Minicom 0845 129 48 76  
E-mail [planning@highpeak.gov.uk](mailto:planning@highpeak.gov.uk) Website [www.highpeak.gov.uk](http://www.highpeak.gov.uk)