

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2023/0089
VALID 13/03/2023

10, BRAMBLE BANK,
GLOSSOP, DERBYSHIRE,
SK13 8TR

PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY
REAR EXTENSION (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 two storey detached dwelling located at the end of a cul-de-sac. The surrounding area is predominantly residential comprising two storey detached and semi-detached properties of varying design. The site is accessed off Bramble Bank, with off street parking to the front of the dwelling and private amenity space to the rear.

PROPOSAL

This application seeks permission for the removal of the existing conservatory and its replacement with a single storey rear extension. The extension would project by 4m at a width of 4.1m. The extension would have a gabled room design with a height to eaves of 2.7m and height to ridge of 3.7m. The extension would be constructed from brick with a tiled roof.

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

HPK/2002/0421 – Conservatory to rear – Approved – 05/07/02

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 06/04/23

Neighbour consultation period ends: 05/04/23

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None

Town / Parish Comments

N/A.

DCC Highways

No objection.

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 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.

The High Peak Design Guide (2018), at 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 High Peak Residential Design SPD (2005), at 9.0 states 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”*, and at 9.1 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”*.

The existing property is a fairly large detached dwelling with an existing conservatory extension to the rear. The application proposes to remove the conservatory and replace it with a brick and tile extension, albeit on a slightly larger footprint. The proposed single storey extension is modest in scale and proportion and would represent a subservient addition to the host dwelling. The extension would include a gabled roof which is a consistent design approach with the existing property. While it is noted that the roof pitch would be lower than the existing property, it is not considered that this would amount to any considerable concern given the rear siting of the extension. The proposed materials includes brick and tile are considered to be appropriate and sympathetic to the original property. Although the extension includes an apex window on the rear elevation which would not be sympathetic to the fenestration found elsewhere on the dwelling, it would be similar to the existing conservatory. On this basis, and in this particular case, it is considered acceptable.

The proposed rear extension would not be prominent from public vantage points, and when viewed from neighbouring properties would appear adequately proportioned.

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 application site is a detached property with detached dwellings located either side. There are no dwellings to the rear of the site. No.12 Bramble Bank is positioned perpendicular to the application site and would not be affected in any way by the proposed extension.

No.8 Bramble Bank is set at a slightly lower land level than the application dwelling. The proposed extension would be sited close to the shared boundary with No.8

which is defined by a close board fence which is in the region of 1.5m in height from the application site side. The extension would project along this boundary by 4m with heights to eaves and ridge of 2.7m and 3.7 respectively. Due to the land level changes the extension would appear more prominent in height than the existing conservatory when viewed from No.8. With these factors the extension would result in an element of overshadowing on No.8, and particularly given the orientation of the properties.

However, the proposal does seek the removal of an existing conservatory. That conservatory measures 3.7m in depth, 2.5m to eaves and 3.5m to ridge. The proposed extension would be marginally larger than the existing conservatory. Given the existing site conditions it is not considered that the extension would result in such significant additional harm through overshadowing or be unduly overbearing.

To the rear of No.8 are principal openings serving habitable rooms. It is considered that the extension would be set sufficient distance from the nearest window not to give rise to loss of light to that room.

New openings would be sited to the rear and southern side elevation and as such would not result in overlooking to No.8. It is noted that the existing conservatory is fully glazed in its elevation facing No.8 whereby views over the existing fence and into the rear garden would be possible. The removal of openings from this side elevation would be a betterment to the existing site condition in this regard.

Overall it is considered that the extension would not cause any significant harm to the amenities of number 8 to warrant refusing this application.

Highway Safety

The proposal would not result in the loss of parking spaces or any uplift in bedrooms. No highway safety issues would arise, and no objections have been received by DCC Highways.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

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

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Case Officer: Declan Cleary
Recommendation Date: 04/05/23

X *J. Colley*

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council