

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2021/0114
Valid 08/03/2021

8 LARCH WAY
GLOSSOP

TWO STOREY SIDE
EXTENSION AND SINGLE
STOREY REAR EXTENSION

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of Development
- Design
- Amenity
- Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site is a two-storey semi-detached house in a residential area of Glossop, within the defined built-up area boundary. The house is surrounded on all sides by other dwellings. The house sits forward of its detached neighbour to the north side.

PROPOSAL

The submitted drawings indicate a two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension. The two-storey extension would project from the full profile of the side elevation and the single storey element would span the full width of the rear of the existing house and the side extension. The side extension would incorporate a small first-floor gable and an integrated garage. Other extensions of a reduced scale and layout have been made at neighbouring houses on the street.

PROCEDURAL NOTE

The application was originally registered and publicised as 'A two storey extension to side elevation comprising of a garage' despite the inclusion of a single storey rear extension. The description of development has been modified to include this.

Design and amenity concerns were communicated to the application prior to determination and amendments were suggested to overcome these matters. No response was received prior to completion of this report.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Local Plan 2016

S 1 Sustainable Development Principles
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 2018
Residential Design SPD 2005 Chapter 9 – Domestic Extensions

National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

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

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/0002/1839 - Extension To Form Garage And Dining Area. Approved,
30/08/1984

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 11.05.2021
Neighbour consultation period ends: 05.04.2021

Public Comments

None received

Town / Parish Comments

N/A

Derbyshire County Council Highways

No highway objections in principle to additional, ancillary living accommodation, subject to the provision / maintenance of adequate on site car parking in line with your Authority's Local Plan requirements.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application site located within a built up area boundary, 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 130 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.

The High Peak Residential Design Guide SPD (2005) and more recently adopted Design Guide SPD (2018) provides further useful design guidance for domestic extensions and alterations.

Paragraph 9.1 of the Residential Design Guide SPD states that *“extensions should be designed so as to subordinate to the main form of the house. It is important that the extension results in a dwelling that is well designed in itself.”*

Section 5 of the Design Guide SPD contains further detailed guidance for domestic extensions and alterations. Paragraph 5.5 states that *“all extensions should harmonise with the parent building. An extension should respect the dominance of the original building and be subordinate to it in terms of its size and massing. Setting back the new section from the building line and keeping the eaves and ridge lower than the parent building will normally help”*

The proposed two-storey side extension would continue the proportions of the main body of the house, maintaining the same eaves and ridge height and extending beyond the main front elevation of the house. Houses within the street scene are simple gable properties with small porches.

As such, this element would fail to achieve a proportionate and subordinate relationship to the size and layout of the existing house. The disproportionate side extension, and its projection forward of the existing front building line would be particularly apparent when viewed with the adjoining semi detached dwelling, having an unbalancing affect. It is noted that there are other examples of side extensions in the street scene which have been set back from the front wall and with a lower ridgeline. This ensures that the original dwelling can be read, with extensions having a subordinate appearance. As such, with the inclusion of the front facing gable the proposed extension would have an odd and uncharacteristic appearance when viewed in the wider street scene. It is considered that the two storey element would not be well designed and the proposal would therefore be contrary to policy EQ6 and the guidance in the HP Residential Design SPD and Design Guide SPD.

The rear extension is considered to be acceptable in design terms, being a proportionate addition in keeping with the character of the building.

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. In particular paragraph 9.3 states:

If the centre of a main habitable room window is affected by the heavily shaded area, i.e. overshadowed on both a vertical and horizontal plane, then the extension may well cause a significant reduction in the skylight received by the window.

Owing to the layout and scale of the proposed works, it is necessary to consider the impact on the adjacent neighbouring dwellings at no 6 and no 10.

The side extension would project forward of the front elevation of the neighbouring house at no 10 to the north and would intrude into the outward aspect of front facing windows serving a living room at ground floor and bedroom at first floor, neither of which are served by any other windows. The existing side elevation is placed at relatively close proximity to these windows, and it is considered that the proposed extension would result in a worsening of visual intrusion and loss of light to these windows. The extension would intrude further into a 45 degree line projected out from the centre of both windows. As this part of the extension would be positioned to the south of this neighbour, the affect of the scale and projection of the extension would cause a loss of light and shadowing effect.

The rear extension would project 3.3m from the rear elevation and set near to the adjoining neighbour's own rear extension/conservatory, extending around 0.3m beyond the rear elevation of the neighbour's existing rear conservatory. As such it is not considered that the extension would have any harmful effects on the amenity of no. 6. With respect to properties to the east, the house is positioned 24m from the rear elevation of 10 Lynne Close, even with the addition of the rear extension this would meet the Council's privacy requirements of 21m.

However, the effects on the neighbour at no 10 are considered to be unacceptable and as such the proposal is considered to be unacceptable in amenity terms and contrary to policy EQ6 and the Residential Design Guide SPD.

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 110 of the NPPF states that in assessing applications for development, a safe and suitable access should be achieved for all users. Paragraph 111 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 property currently includes off-street parking space for two cars, at the front and side of the house. The side extension would occupy part of this space and provide a garage measuring 2.4m by 4.8m internally, below guideline dimensions of 3m x 6m. Given the dimensional shortfall it is not considered that the garage should be taken to contribute to parking capacity at the property.

As extended the house would have four bedrooms, requiring provision of three off-street parking spaces to comply with minimum standards, which the property would not satisfy. Larch Way is a narrow street with limited capacity for street parking. As such it is considered that the minimum parking standards are necessary in this case, and the proposed arrangement would not satisfy the minimums. Only one off road parking space would be provided as a result of the siting of the extension which is consider insufficient for a 4 bedroom property. As such it is considered that the proposals would fail to maintain adequate on-site parking, resulting in pressure for on street parking and would therefore be contrary to paragraph 111 of the NPPF.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

Extensions to existing houses within the built-up area boundary area are acceptable in principle subject to their acceptability in terms of all other relevant planning considerations, which in this case are design, amenity and highways safety. As set out above, the proposal would fail to be acceptable in terms of these matters. There are no planning considerations which outweigh these matters. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the policies of the adopted High Peak Borough Council and the NPPF and the application is accordingly recommended for refusal.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Refuse

Case Officer: Tom Hiles

Recommendation Date: 05.08.2021

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council