

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2021/0063
Valid 15/02/2021

32 WEST DRIVE
TINTWISTLE

**PROPOSED TWO STOREY
SIDE & REAR EXTENSION
AND SINGLE STOREY REAR
EXTENSION.**

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of Development
- Residential Amenity
- Design

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site is a two-storey end of terrace house in a residential area of Tintwistle, within its built-up area boundary.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is to extend the house with a wrap-around front, side and rear extension, comprising a two-storey side element projecting to the rear, a single-storey front element spanning part of the original elevation of the house and the front of the side element, and a single-storey rear element. The extensions would provide an additional two bedrooms, increasing from three to five.

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

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 16/03/2021

Neighbour consultation period ends: 15/03/2021

Public Comments

None received

Town / Parish Comments

None received

Derbyshire County Council Highways

No objection subject to the applicant demonstrating and maintaining adequate off-street parking space clear of any obstructions to its designated use as any under provision may result in vehicles being parked on West Drive, or part on its footway, situations considered against the best interests of safe operation of the public highway. In order to meet current recommendations, off-street parking spaces should be of 2.4m x 5.5m minimum dimension with an additional 0.5m of width to any side adjacent to a physical barrier e.g. wall, hedge, fence, etc.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application site located within the built up area boundary for Tintwistle, 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, amenity and highways safety considerations.

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.

The proposed works are considered to be acceptable in design terms. Whilst the extensions will significantly increase the size of house, it is considered that the particular massing of the additions, with the front and rear extensions being single-storey in height, will avoid a sense of disproportionality. Whilst the two-storey side element will extend out from the full profile of the side elevation (rather than being set back from the front or down from the roofline), it is considered that this massing will not be harmful to the generally simple character of the existing house and row of terraced properties. It is noted that a similar addition has been made to a nearby end-of terrace house of the same original design, and it is considered that the resulting arrangement has not detracted from the proportions of the house.

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. Chapter 9 of the Residential Design SPD notes that extensions must avoid undue harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties, and that excessive overshadowing of neighbouring inhabitable rooms windows and private garden/amenity areas should be avoided. In particular, the SPD states:

9.3 Overshadowing

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.

9.3.1 Similarly an extension should not unduly reduce outlook from a main habitable room window or produce a tunnelling affect. To prevent this, extensions affecting neighbouring property should not normally extend more than 2.5 m from the rear of the affected home. All planning applications for domestic development should be careful to include scaled plans indicating the position of neighbouring property.

The proposed front extension is considered to be acceptable in amenity terms, not resulting in harm including in terms of overshadowing, loss of light or overbearing effect.

The rear extension would project 4m and due to its maximum height of 3.3m and the proximity to the boundary with the adjoining house at no.30, it would result in visual

intrusion and loss of light into the ground-floor rear facing window at no.30. This window is understood to serve a habitable room. It is considered that loss of light and visual intrusion would be extensive enough to comprise harm to the amenity of the adjoining house, particularly considering the impact on afternoon daylight which would result from the position of the extension to the west of the window. Due to the good size of the garden of no.30, it is not considered that the proximity and projection of the extension would result in a harmful overbearing effect to the neighbouring garden. For these reasons it is considered the rear element would be acceptable in amenity terms.

Further, the proposed two-storey extension would project in close proximity along a significant length of the shared boundary with the adjacent house at no. 34. Owing to the height and depth of the extension and its proximity to the boundary, this would result in a significantly overbearing effect on the rear garden of no. 34, and visual intrusion and some loss of light to its closest windows serving habitable rooms. This effect would be worsened due to no.34 being set forward from the application site, meaning that the extension would be more prominent when seen from no.34. The two-storey extension would be in breach of 45 degree cones drawn from rear windows at ground and first floor at no.34. However, it appears that the ground floor windows serve a small kitchen and a living room also served by a window at the front elevation, and the closest first floor window appears to serve a bathroom. The extension would also be in close proximity to a side-facing landing window. The effect on these windows is not considered to be harmful. The extension would also be visible from a rear-facing first floor bedroom window not served by any other windows. However, this window is set far away enough that the resulting visual intrusion would be limited.

It is considered that the proposed works would be unacceptable in amenity terms, due to the significant overbearing impact on the rear garden of no.34 and would therefore be in contrary to policy EQ6.

These issues were raised with the applicant and advice was given on amending the plans to avoid the harmful impacts, but the applicant declined to amend the plans.

Highway Safety

The comments from the Highway Officer are noted. The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms at the property from three to five. Parking guidance in the Local Plan notes that three off-street parking spaces should be provided for houses with four or more bedrooms. The property currently has space for two cars and, accounting for the space which would be taken up by the side and rear extensions, it appears that a third space could be provided at the front of the house without resulting in significant harm to the appearance of the site and the local area. In the event of approval, it is considered that this matter could be satisfactorily resolved by imposing a condition requiring details of the layout and appearance of an additional parking space.

It is therefore considered that, subject to such a condition, the application proposal would not harm highway safety and would comply with Local Plan Policy CF6.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The proposed scheme is considered acceptable from a design perspective and with no adverse impacts on highway safety. However, it would result in unacceptable harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposals would fail to accord with policy EQ6 of the Local Plan and the High Peak Residential Design SPD, and the application is recommended for refusal.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Refuse

Case Officer: Tom Hiles

Recommendation Date: 13/04/2021

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council