

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2023/0070
Valid 16/02/2023

58 CHURCH STREET
GLOSSOP

SINGLE STOREY REAR
EXTENSION AND
ALTERATIONS TO WINDOWS
AND DOORS

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Heritage – Conservation Area
- Design

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

58 Church Street is an end terrace property of stone and slate located within the Old Glossop conservation area. The rear wall of the dwelling is rendered in white. The dwelling house has a small yard to the side of the property, with a parking area to the rear of the curtilage.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for a single storey rear extension. The proposed extension will extend 3 meters beyond the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse and will be 4 meters in width. It is proposed that the extension will have a dual pitched slate roof. It is proposed that the extension be of natural stone. The proposed rear window will be a timber framed sash window to match those of the host dwelling.

It is also proposed to replace an existing side window with a new doorway and window.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Local Plan 2016

S 1 Sustainable Development Principles
S 1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
EQ 6 Design and Place Making
EQ 7 Built and Historic Environment
CF 6 Accessibility and Transport

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 4 Decision-making
Section 12 Archiving well-designed places

Section 16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/0001/0997 For Proposed Re-Opening of Existing Window in West Gable Wall
APPROVED

HPK/0001/7173 For Proposed enlargement of kitchen window opening APPROVED

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 22/03/2023
Neighbour consultation period ends: 14/03/2023
Press Advert: 23/03/2023

Public Comments

None Received

Town / Parish Comments

N/A

Environmental Health

N/A

Derbyshire County Council Highways

No Objections

HPBC Conservation Officer

Heritage Statement does not considered to contain appropriate detail to fulfil NPPF
Para 194.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

LP Policy S 2, which states that development should be directed towards sustainable locations, including Market Towns such as Glossop. The site is situated within this built-up area boundary. Therefore the principle of the development is acceptable subject to consideration of the following policy.

Heritage

LP Policy EQ 7 states that the council will conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Paragraph 199 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Paragraph 194 states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should be consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

The application site is located within the Old Glossop conservation Area. The HPBC Conservation Officer has expressed that the heritage statement which has been supplied fails to meet the level of detail required under NPPF Para 194. However, in assessing the surrounding area it is considered that the proposal will present no harm the wider conservation area to surrounding listed building.

Adjacent to the application site is no. 56 Church Street a grade 2 listed building. Opposite the application site is Duke of Norfolk Primary School (Grade 2 listed), All Saints Church (grade 2 listed). Further along Church Street is the Bulls Head Public House (Grade 2 listed). To the east of the church and the public house are a number of other listed building along Church Street South, all of which are Grade 2 listed. It is considered that all of the surrounding listed building (excluding no. 56) are of a sufficient distance from the application site and would not cause any harm to the setting of these listed buildings. Furthermore, the proposed development is to the rear of no. 58 and will not be visible from the surrounding listed buildings (excluding no. 56).

No. 56 Church Street is was previous 2 cottages, of mid-18th century construction, with early 19th century and 20th century additions. The proposed rear extension to no. 58 will not make physical contact with the neighbouring listed building. However, proposed plans demonstrate that a gate may be installed between the side of the proposed extension and no.56. As no. 56 is a listed building and the description of development does not refer to the erection of a gate and fence to be connected to the listed building, an informative will be added to confirm that no consent is granted for this element.

Along the rear of no's 58 to 82 Church street there are a number of existing single storey rear extensions of varying size and age. The proposed extension is therefore not considered to be harmful to the setting of the no. 56 as other rear extension are present elsewhere along the rear elevations of the neighbouring row of terraces. The extension will following a number of other examples along this terrace of houses and therefore in its context will reflect the natural development of the terraced houses over time.

Overall the proposed extension would sustain the importance of the conservation area and the setting of the surrounding listed buildings.

Design

Section 12 Paragraph 130(c) of the NPPF states that development should be sympathetic to the character and history of the area, while not restricting change.

LP Policy EQ 6 states that all development should be well designed, of a high quality and respond to the areas character, history and scale.

The Adopted Residential (SPD) (2005) chapter 9 stats that "extensions and alterations to existing houses can have a significant impact on the appearance of a house, neighbouring property and the street scene. It is important, on all types of houses, that domestic development is carefully designed."

The High Peak Design Guide (SPD) Paragraph 5.5 states that all extensions should harmonise with the parent building, it should be subordinate to it in terms of its size and massing.

The proposed rear extension will be constructed of natural stone and slate to match the host dwelling. It is proposed to have a dual pitched roof with end gable facing the rear. A new window will be located in the rear gable which emulates the windows which are present on the existing front elevation. it is considered to emulate the character and design of the host building.

A public right of way runs along the rear of no. 56 – 82 Church Street, providing access to the rear of all properties. Along the terraces of no's 58 – 82 Church street there are a number of existing single storey rear of these terraces which are visible from this pubic right of way. The proposed development at no. 58 takes design notes from these other rear extension and is considered to be reflective of the character of the rear street scape. It will therefore, not be harmful to the view from the right of way, nor the wider streetscape.

Amenity

Section 12 Paragraph 130(f) of the NPPF states that development should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

LP Policy EQ 6 states that all development should achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and doesn't cause unacceptable effects by reason of vision

intrusion, overlooking, shadowing, overbearing effect, noise, light pollution or other adverse impacts on local character and amenity.

The Adopted Residential (SPD) (2005) paragraph 8.6.1 states that there should be 21 metres between adjacent inhabitable windows to provide an acceptable level of amenity.

The proposed new side doorway and window will replace an existing, clear glazed window. The proposed doorway and window will face the side wall of no.56. a small window of no. 56 is located in the vicinity of the proposed doorway, although it will not be located directly opposite this. Furthermore, the side windows along no.56 are obscure glazed, protecting their own privacy. The proposed doorway and window is therefore considered acceptable in terms of amenity.

The proposed rear extension will create some overshadowing to a doorway and small window on the rear of no. 60. It is thought that this rear doorway and small window serve a small kitchen at the rear of no. 60. Given the size of the neighbours kitchen (assuming it is the size of the application site) and as a non habitable room the impact on this would be minimal. The resultant overshadowing from the proposed extension is reflective of the tight knit positioning of other extension and the relationship to neighbouring properties.

No. 60 is located to the east of the application site, furthermore the rear elevations are all north facing. Due to this orientation the window and door on the rear of no.60 will receive little to no direct sunlight, due to the natural movement of the sun favouring the southern elevation of the dwellinghouse. Therefore the introduction of the proposed extension is unlikely to lead to a loss in sunlight to the rear of no. 60.

The proposed rear extension window will be approximately 16m away from the rear elevation of no 4 Thorpe Street. However the no. 4 is on an angle to the rear of Church Street as such no amenity concerns are raised.

Highway Safety

No highway objections have been raised by DCC. The proposed extension will reduce the size of the off-street parking space which is present at the rear on no 58. However there will still be space to the rear for an average sized vehicle to park off-street to the rear of the proposed extension.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The development is considered acceptable in terms of design, impact on heritage assets, amenity and highway safety. It is considered to be in accord with the relevant policies put forward in the Local Plan and the NPPF. Therefore, this application is recommended for approval.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Approval

Case Officer: Rachel Robinson

Recommendation Date: 11th April 2023

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council