

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2021/0106
Valid 15/03/2021

26 THE CROFT
HADFIELD
GLOSSOP

PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR
EXTENSION OVER GARAGE,
REAR CONSERVATORY &
GARAGE CONVERSION

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of Development
- Design
- Amenity
- Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site is a detached three-bedroom two-storey house in a residential area of Hadfield within the built-up area boundary, with an attached single garage and a single parking space. Neighbouring houses are of a similar design.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is for a first-floor extension above the garage, to convert the garage into habitable space (including replacing the garage door with a window), and for a rear conservatory spanning the main body of the house, projecting 3.5m rearward and with a sloping roof with a maximum height of 3.7m. The extension would be faced in brick and roof tile to match existing. The extension would provide a fourth bedroom. A proposed site plan indicates the provision of three parking spaces at the front of the property.

Revised plans were received following design feedback, incorporating a slight setback and set-down to the first floor side extension.

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

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: 11/5/2021
Neighbour consultation period ends: 15/4/2021

Public Comments

None received

Town / Parish Comments

None received

Derbyshire County Council Highways

No highway safety comments to make based on the proposals as submitted. Please append an advisory note on the basis that the existing vehicular access will need to be widened to facilitate access to the proposed frontage car parking.

Environmental Health Officer

No observations to make. However please bring the following informative to the applicant's attention:

This development is situated within 250 meters of a historic landfill site. Because of the potential risk to human health, before development the applicant should ascertain whether gas protection measures are required. If necessary, a gas impermeable membrane should be incorporated within the structure along with a ventilated sub floor area. Any services entering/leaving the structure should be located above the gas impermeable membrane or alternatively, adequate seals will need to be provided if the membrane is to be breached. The details of the gas impermeable membrane and with particular attention to the joins with any existing structure and seals around any services, plus details of the sub-floor ventilation should be submitted to Approved Building Control for approval prior to the works being carried out

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, highways 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, rear conservatory and alteration of the existing garage would be acceptable in these terms. All of the elements would be subordinate additions, sympathetic to the appearance of the existing house in terms of form, architectural character and external materials. The first floor side extension would comprise a side-facing gable which would be slightly set back from the front elevation of the house, with the roofline set down slightly from the main roof, distinguishing the original and additional elements of the house. The general massing of the house as existing and as proposed would avoid a terracing effect which might otherwise result from extending to two stories in height in close proximity to the boundary. This effect would also be mitigated by the change in ground levels between the property and its neighbours. The neighbour to the east, number 28, is positioned on slightly higher ground level than the application sites and it is noted they to have a similar extension to that proposed.

The proposed provision of three parking spaces would result in the loss of remaining green space at the front of the property, which would be somewhat detrimental to the character of the area, but as this is an alteration which can be made without planning permission it is not considered that the application could be reasonably resisted on this basis.

Overall the proposed extensions considered to compliment the host dwelling and would not have a harmful effect on the character of the street scene. The development therefore complies with Policy EQ6 and the adopted Design Guide.

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. Part 9 of the High Peak Residential Design SPD sets out the parameters against which residential extensions will be assessed.

The proposals are not considered to result in any harm to residential amenity in terms of these issues. The first floor extension would project forward of the front elevation of the neighbouring house at no.28, and its side elevation would be placed close to, but not intrude into, a 45 degree cone projected from the centre of a first-floor window at no. 28. No 28 has no side facing windows and the first-floor extension would not give rise to any other amenity effects to this neighbouring property.

The conservatory would be placed close to the boundary with the neighbouring house at number 24, with a solid side elevation. This would impose on the aspect from a ground-floor rear facing window at 24, but it is understood that this window serves a small kitchen and as such this is not assessed as a habitable room, and any loss of light or visual intrusion to this window is therefore considered to be acceptable. Whilst the wall elevation of the conservatory would span 3.5m off the boundary with the rear garden of number 24, it would be built on an area at a lower elevation than most of the neighbouring garden, and it is considered that the resulting arrangement would not cause a harmful overbearing effect or loss of light to the garden. It is also noted that number 24 has a rear conservatory of a similar depth proposed, but of a different design.

With respect to number 28, a set of doors would open towards this neighbour, but due to the staggered position of the houses, the doors would face towards the side elevation of this neighbour and a close boarded fence along the boundary. As such there would not be no overlooking as a consequence of the proposed fenestration.

Overall the proposed extensions would not give rise to any unacceptable impacts on the neighbouring properties and is therefore considered to be compliant with Policy EQ6.

Highway Safety

Policy CF6 seeks to ensure that development can be safely accessed in a sustainable manner and that all new development is located where it can be satisfactorily accommodated within the existing highway network.

Paragraph 108 of the NPPF states that in assessing applications for development, a safe and suitable access should be achieved for all users. Paragraph 109 goes on to state that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

The highway officer's comments are noted. The proposed parking spaces would satisfy minimum requirements for a four-bedroom house and it is considered that this provision would reasonably reduce the likelihood of on-street parking resulting from the increased occupation of the property. Subject to the provision of additional parking the proposal is unlikely to result in harm to highways safety.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The proposed scheme is considered acceptable in principle and in terms of design and impacts on residential amenity and highway safety, and as such the application is considered to be in accordance with 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: 19/05/2021

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council