

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2022/0434
Valid 23/09/2022

3, YORKSHIRE WAY,
GLOSSOP, DERBYSHIRE,
SK13 8SB

PROPOSED ORANGERY TO
REAR OF PROPERTY (FULL -
HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of Development
- Design Considerations
- Impact upon Residential Amenity
- Impact on Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site lies within the settlement boundary for Glossop as defined by the Local Plan policies map. The site relates to a two storey detached property which is located within a predominantly residential area. The site is accessed via a long driveway from Yorkshire Way to the front and benefits from private amenity space to the rear. The dwelling sits at a lower land level than No.1, and at a higher land level than No.5 Yorkshire Way.

PROPOSAL

This application proposes the construction of a single storey extension to the rear of the dwelling. The extension would project a maximum distance of 5m and would be full width. The extension would have a lean-to roof with a central projecting gable. It is proposed that the extension would be used as an orangerie.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Local Plan (Adopted 2016)

S1 Sustainable Development Principles
S1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
S5 Glossopdale Sub-area Strategy
EQ6 Design and Place Making

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

Residential Design (2005)
High Peak Design Guide (2018)

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 12: Achieving Well-designed Places

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/0002/6176 – First Floor Extensions – Approved – 12/01/88

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 28/10/22

Neighbour consultation period ends: 20/10/22

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

One letter of objection received:

Overlooking and loss of privacy

Garden and conservatory sit lower and side windows would directly overlook

Town / Parish Comments

None received

DCC Highways

No highway safety comments to make

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application proposes householder development to a property which is located within the settlement of Glossop as defined by the Local Plan Policies Map which lies within the Glossopdale sub area. Within such locations extensions to dwellings are acceptable, as a matter of principle. The main considerations in this instance whether the design is appropriate, whether an amenity issues would arise, and whether there would be an impact upon highway safety.

Design Considerations

Policy S1 states that new development will be expected to make a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities and where possible enhancing the environment which would be achieved by, inter alia, securing high quality and locally distinctive design. Policy EQ6 states that all development should be well designed and of a high quality and that this will be achieved by requiring development to be well designed to respect the character of the townscape, and requiring development to contribute positively to an areas character, identity and history in terms of scale, height, density, layout, appearance, materials and relationship with adjacent buildings.

Further guidance for extensions is contained within the High Peak Residential Design Guide SPD (2005), and the Design Guide SPD (2018).

The Residential Design Guide (2005) provides guidance in section 9, and states that extensions should be designed to be subordinate to the main house and that an extension results in a dwelling which is well designed in itself.

The Design Guide SPD (2018) at 5.5 states that extensions should harmonise with the parent building and should respect the dominance of the original building, being subordinate to it in terms of size and massing.

The NPPF also seeks to deliver high quality design in development and, at paragraph 134, states that development which is not well designed should be refused.

The application proposes a single storey extension to the rear of the property. The extension would project by a maximum of 5m from the rear of the building and would be full width of the existing property. The rear siting, and single storey nature of the extension would mean the proposals would not be prominent from public vantage points however it is acknowledged that glimpses of the proposals would be visible from Hathersage Drive to the east. While the extension, by means of projection is larger, it is unlikely to cause adverse harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Despite the single storey nature of the proposals the extension is large by means of projection and width. The proposals would result in the erosion of a large area of the existing private amenity space. The extension is probably at the threshold of what the site can accommodate while retaining an appropriate level of amenity space to not result in an overdevelopment of the plot. On balance, the extension is therefore unlikely to cause such adverse harm to the character and appearance of the host property to resist the proposals on these grounds alone.

Provided appropriate materials are used, the design and appearance of the extension is considered to be compatible with the host dwelling.

Amenity

Policy EQ6 requires development achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and 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.

The Residential Design SPD states, at 9.2, that extensions should *“be of a scale and be designed and positioned to avoid undue harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties. They must have regard to the orientation of adjacent homes, the number and position of windows and land levels. Excessive overshadowing of neighbouring habitable rooms windows, glazed doors and private garden/amenity areas should be avoided.”*

At 9.3.1 the SPD states *“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”*.

The application site is a detached two storey dwelling which is located within a row of properties on the southern side of Yorkshire Way. With regard to the relationship with No.1 Yorkshire Way, these two properties are similarly positioned with a shared rear building line. The application site is located at a slightly lower land level than No.1. To the rear of No.1 is a conservatory which is sited at towards the eastern boundary of that property. A rear facing principal opening is located closer to the application site. Given the offset between the two properties, the proposed extension would not breach the vertical or horizontal plane from this window and would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of this property through overshadowing, overbearing or loss of daylight.

However, the relationship with No.5 Yorkshire Way is noticeably different. The application site and No.5 are juxtaposed insofar as No.5 is set further forward than the application site. Furthermore, there is a considerable land level change between the two properties with the application site being set higher than No.5. To the rear of No.5 is a conservatory with brick wall adjacent to the application site, beyond this is the private amenity space of that property. Given the juxtaposition between the two properties, and the significant depth of the extension along this boundary it is considered that the proposals would result in an overbearing impact on the neighbouring property and its private amenity space. This would clearly be exacerbated by the difference in land levels resulting in a development which is more prominent from that property. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposals would have a detrimental impact on the outlook enjoyed by residents of that neighbouring dwelling to an unacceptable degree. This relationship is considered to be unneighbourly and would have an adverse impact on the amenity enjoyed by residents of that property.

It is acknowledged that there is some vegetation along the boundary. However this lies outside of the control of the application site and their removal would exacerbate the impact of the proposals further.

The application proposes windows within the side elevations of the proposed extension. Given the change in land levels and the low boundary fence with No.5, these openings have the potential to overlook the private amenity space of that property. If the application were to be approved, then it would be necessary to ensure that these windows are obscure glazed to preserve the amenity of the occupants adjacent from overlooking or loss of privacy.

Highway Safety

The proposal would not increase the number of bedrooms and as such there would be no pressure for additional off street parking arising from the development. In any event the site benefits from a long driveway off Yorkshire Way.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

For the reasons set out in this report, it is considered that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of No.5 Yorkshire Way due to overbearing, overshadowing and loss of outlook. The proposals would be contrary to S1 and EQ6 of the Local Plan, guidance contained within the Residential Design SPD, and the advice contained within the NPPF, and as such it is recommended that the application be refused.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

Case Officer: Declan Cleary

Recommendation Date: 15/11/2022

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council