

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2023/0049
VALID 06/02/2023

48, HURST CRESCENT,
GLOSSOP, DERBYSHIRE,
SK13 8UA

PROPOSED EXTRA FLOOR
(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

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

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site lies within the settlement boundary for Glossop as defined by the Local Plan policies map. The application site relates to a two storey detached dwelling located on the junction of Hurst Crescent and King Cup Close. The surrounding area is predominantly residential comprising a mix of house types and designs. The site is accessed off Hurst Crescent with off street parking located to the front of the property with private amenity space to the rear.

PROPOSAL

This application seeks permission for the erection of an additional floor to the dwelling from two storeys, to three storeys. The proposed upwards extension would be full width and depth, and increase the eaves height from 5.6m to 7.8m, and ridge height from 7.8m to 10m.

The extension would create 3 new bedrooms at second storey level, along with a bathroom, en-suite and robe room. The existing first floor would retain three bedrooms while the ensuite would become a study and existing master bedroom would become a lounge. While the application suggests the proposal to be a 6 bedroom property, it would potentially be a 7-bedroom property should the lounge be used as a bedroom.

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
- CF6 Accessibility and Transport
- 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

No site specific history

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 03/03/23
Neighbour consultation period ends: 02/03/23
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

One letter of objection received on following grounds:

- Inadequate consultations
- Visual impact
- Detrimental harm of the street scene.
- Not in keeping with surrounding property types
- Inappropriate scale and massing of dwelling

Town / Parish Comments

None received

DCC Highways

The application proposes the creation of additional bedrooms within the premises; however, there is no proposal to increase on site parking provision. It is evident that the site has limited on site parking as existing, with further evidence that a parked vehicle(s) currently encroaches on to the fronting footway. The current situation is not ideal and is likely to be worsened with the provision of additional bedrooms at the premises and the associated increase in parking requirements. However, whilst both the existing and likely future parking situations are both not ideal, and could be improved, it is not considered that an objection to a likely increase in on street parking demand warrants an objection on this issue alone

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 is located within the Glossopdale sub-area. Policy S5 seeks to promote sustainable growth within Glossopdale through promoting and maintaining the identity of its settlements. Policy S1, which relates to delivering sustainable development, seeks to promote the effective use of land. The principle of householder development in this location is considered to be acceptable.

The main considerations in this instance whether the design is appropriate, whether any 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 relates to the construction of an additional floor to the existing two storey dwelling. The existing dwelling is located on a corner plot at the junction of Hurst Crescent and King Cup Close. The immediate context is that of two storey dwellings, or two storey dwellings with accommodation within its roofspace. There is some variety in roof heights however a consistent feature is relative uniformity in the eaves heights.

The proposed increase in height, through the raising of the eaves and ridge height both by circa 2.4m, would result in a prominent and incongruous form of development which is out of keeping with the surrounding streetscene, and would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Furthermore, as the dwelling is located on a corner plot, the site is more prominent, with both front and flank elevations clearly exposed. The mass of the proposed development would therefore be more apparent, with the siting exacerbating the impact that the proposed development would have on the streetscene. In addition, it is considered that the development would imbalance the entrance to King Cup Close with the dwelling on the opposite side of the entrance to the street being two storey.

It is acknowledged that there are three storey properties within the estate nearby, however these are appropriately sited and/or clustered and as such integrate satisfactorily into the character of the area.

In terms of the impact that the development would have on the host dwelling, by virtue of the proposals being an upwards extension, it would fail to represent a subservient extension to the host dwelling contrary to design guidance. Furthermore, it is considered that the effect of the proposals would result in a dwelling which would appear out of proportion by reason of its elongated elevations.

It is considered that the proposed extension would fail to respect the dominance of the host dwelling, and would represent an incongruous and disproportionate addition to it. Furthermore, the proposals would, by reason of its scale and nature, along with the siting of the dwelling, would cause undue harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene. The proposals are contrary to Policy S1 and EQ6 of the Local Plan, design SPDs and guidance contained within the NPPF.

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 proposed additional storey to the dwelling would include new principal openings to habitable rooms at second floor level. The rear garden of the dwelling is comparatively small compared to the size of the dwelling, and the distance that the proposed windows would be from the rear boundary would range from 6.2m and 10m. Beyond the rear boundary of the site is the flank elevation of No.1 King Cup Close. As the windows would face directly towards the flank elevation of this property, which does not contain principal openings, it is considered that the proposals would not result in a loss of privacy to that property. Furthermore, by reason of the siting of No.1, the proposals would not result in direct overlooking to the private amenity space of that property.

The application dwelling is oriented slightly towards No.50 and as such the windows would have a greater view into the garden space of that property than if the properties sat squarely with each other. The orientation is only marginal and, while

some greater overlooking may be perceived, it is unlikely that the impact would be so significant to resist the development on these grounds.

The proposed front windows would be over 25m from the dwelling opposite, and over public land, as such it is considered that the proposals would not cause harm to the amenity enjoyed by that property through loss of privacy.

The proposed extensions would be upwards and as such would not result in loss of light to windows within No.50, or result in unacceptable overshadowing to the amenity space of that property.

Front windows to No.2 and No.4 King Cup Close would face directly towards the flank elevation of the proposals. This would be at a distance of 16m at its closest which is considered to be sufficient to ensure that there would be no significant loss of daylight or overshadowing to those properties. It is acknowledged that the outlook for these properties would change, however given the spacing it is not considered to be so significant to result in adverse harm to those properties.

Highway Safety

The proposal would result in an increased demand for off street parking arising from a 6/7 bedroom property. The dwelling at present has two storey street parking spaces on the driveway and a garage, no additional off street parking is proposed. DCC Highways have observed that the site has limited on site parking as existing, and that these currently encroaches on to the fronting footway. DCC Highways advise that the current situation is not ideal and is likely to be worsened with the provision of additional bedrooms at the premises and the associated increase in parking requirements. However, whilst both the existing and likely future parking situations are both not ideal, and could be improved, it is not considered that an objection to a likely increase in on street parking demand warrants an objection on this issue alone. Therefore in the absence of an objection from DCC Highways, it is not considered that a refusal on these grounds could be sustained.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

It is considered that the proposals would fail to accord with the policies contained within the Development Plan and guidance within the NPPF, and as such it is recommended that the application be refused.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

Case Officer: Declan Cleary

Recommendation Date: 28/03/23

X *B.S. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council