

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2021/0080
Valid 16/02/2021

6 LYNNE CLOSE
GLOSSOP

PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY
REAR EXTENSION

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of Development
- Design
- Amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site is a semi-detached bungalow within a residential area of Glossop and within its built-up area boundary. The house is surrounded by its attached neighbour to the north, a similar bungalow to the south side, and other dwellings at the rear (west).

PROPOSAL

The application seek permission for a single-storey rear extension projecting 4m rearwards, with eaves height of 2.6m, with a pitched roof with a maximum height of 4.0m. The extension would be placed around 0.25m from the side boundary. Proposed facing materials are brick and roof tiles to match existing.

Revised plans were received during determination, reducing the height of the roof to that which could be undertaken under permitted development rights, as noted below.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Local Plan 2016

S 1 Sustainable Development Principles
S 1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
S2 Settlement Hierarchy
EQ 6 Design and Place Making
CF 6 Accessibility and Transport

Supplementary Planning Documents

High Peak Design Guide
Residential Design SPD
Appendix 2 – Guidelines for the Design and Layout of Residential Development

National Planning Policy Framework

Paragraph 11 The Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
Section 4 Decision-making
Section 12 Achieving well-designed places

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

None relevant

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 16/03/2021
Neighbour consultation period ends: 16/03/2021

Public Comments

None received

Town / Parish Comments

None received

Derbyshire County Council Highways

No objection

Network Rail

No comments

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application site located within the built up area boundary for Glossop, where new development will be directed in accordance with Policy S2. Accordingly, the general principle of development is considered to be acceptable, subject to design and amenity policies.

Design

Local Plan Policy EQ6 requires that all development should be well designed and of a high quality, responding to its environment and challenge of climate change – whilst also contributing to local distinctiveness and sense of place.

Paragraph 127 states amongst other matters that new developments should add to the overall quality of the area, be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.

It is considered that the proposed extension would be acceptable in design terms, being a subordinate addition with a gable roof form which would be sympathetic to the character of the existing house. Although the plans show a rear window which would extend into the apex of the roof, a type of fenestration details which is not found on the existing dwelling or surrounding area, the rear elevation would not be visible from the wider area or street scene. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposal would comply with the requirements of policy EQ6 and NPPF paragraph 127.

Amenity

Local Plan Policy EQ6 requires development to achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and to not cause unacceptable effects by reason of visual intrusion, overlooking, shadowing, overbearing effect, noise, light pollution or other adverse impacts on local character and amenity.

Owing to the scale and layout of the extension and relative distance to the detached neighbouring property to the south (no.8), the proposed arrangement would not result in any harm to the amenity of that dwelling, including in terms of overshadowing and overbearing effects.

The extension would be placed in close proximity to the boundary with the adjoining house (no.4) and one of its rear-facing windows, which is the sole window serving a bedroom. The projection of 4m would mean that the window would experience some loss of light and visual intrusion to the interior of this bedroom, and it is considered that the extent of these effects would be harmful.

However it is noted that, aside from the 4m projection, an extension of the same dimensions could be undertaken under permitted development rights (following the revision of the design to reduce the maximum height to 4m).

Further, it is noted that extended permitted development rights could potentially allow for the current proposal to be undertaken without planning permission, subject to the prior approval process. The prior approval of the proposal in amenity terms would only be required if a neighbouring occupant objected to the prior approval application. As no objections have been received to the current application, it is considered to be reasonable to assume that no objection would be received to a prior approval application for an extension of the same dimensions and design, and it is considered that it would be unreasonable to require the applicant to go through the prior approval process in these circumstances. For these reasons it is considered that a refusal of planning permission could not be sustained on the basis of these amenity considerations. It is therefore considered that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of the requirements of policy EQ 6.

Highway Safety

The Highway Officer has raised no objection. Vehicle access and parking arrangements would not be affected. It is therefore considered that the application proposal would not harm highway safety and therefore complies with Local Plan

Policy CF6.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The proposed scheme is considered acceptable from a design perspective and in terms of highway safety. Whilst the extension would result in some harm to the amenity of the neighbouring occupants, it is not considered that a refusal of planning permission could be sustained on this basis. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed extension is acceptable in terms of the relevant policies of the Local Plan and paragraphs of the NPPF and is recommended for conditional approval.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Approve

Case Officer: Tom Hiles

Recommendation Date: 09/04/2021

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council