

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2023/0059
VALID 13/03/2023

27, POST STREET,
PADFIELD, GLOSSOP,
DERBYSHIRE, SK13 1EF

INSTALL DORMA ONTO THE
REAR OF THE PROPERTY
AND A MONO PITCH SINGLE
STOREY EXTENSION ON THE
REAR
(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 Padfield as defined by the Local Plan policies map. The application site relates to two storey mid terraced dwelling. The surrounding area is predominantly residential comprising two storey dwellings of similar character. To the rear of the site is the Padfield Community Primary School. The site benefits from off street parking to the rear within a shared parking area. The site has a small yard to the rear surrounded by a low level stone wall. The site lies within the Padfield Conservation Area.

PROPOSAL

This application seeks permission for the installation of a dormer window within the rear roof slope comprising slate blue cladding. The dormer window would provide an additional bedroom within the roofspace. The scheme also includes a single storey lean-to extension to the rear. The extension would project by 1.7m at full width of the property. Height to eaves and ridge would be 2.8m and 3.5m respectively. The extension would be constructed from gritstone walls and slate to match existing.

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)
Padfield Conservation Area Appraisal (2015)

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 12: Achieving Well-designed Places
Section 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

None

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 06/04/23
Neighbour consultation period ends: 13/04/23
Press Advert: 13/04/23

Public Comments

None

Town / Parish Comments

None received

DCC Highways

There are no highway safety objections to the application.

Conservation Officer

Objection. I have no issue with the small ground floor rear extension, however dormer elements are ill-advised as per the High Peak Borough Council Residential Design SPD 2. Dormers are an alien feature and not found on small historic workers terraces. Additionally, cladding; grey or otherwise, vertical or horizontal is ill-advised as per the High Peak Borough Council Design Guide SPD. I suggest the dormer feature be omitted from the scheme. It would be conducive to see material samples for the ground floor extension, namely apparent matching 'Gritstone' for walling and 'natural slate finish to the roof'.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application proposes householder development to a property which is located within the settlement of Padfield 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, having regard to heritage matters, whether any amenity issues would arise, and whether there would be an impact upon highway safety.

Design Considerations (including impact on Heritage Assets)

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

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.

Policy EQ 7 states that the council will conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. The application site lies within the Padfield Conservation Area, which is a designated heritage asset.

The application property is a mid-terraced unit which is located along Post Street which was incrementally developed with rows of terraced properties in the mid 19th century. The dwellings predominantly have small stone walled front and rear gardens and generally do not benefit from large enclosed private areas. It is considered that such matters are characteristic of the Conservation Area and contribute towards the significance of the heritage asset when considered as a whole.

The scheme proposes the enclosure of the rear yard and would result in the total loss of any rear amenity area. Whilst not an issue raised by the Conservation Officer, it is considered that the small rear yards, enclosed by walling is characteristic of the Conservation Area and it is considered that its total loss would fail to preserve or enhance the asset, causing harm to the character of the area. Furthermore, the rear yard is used for domestic storage which would be lost in its entirety and such its loss could result in domestic paraphernalia being store beyond the boundary. It is considered that this amounts to an over development of the plot which would also be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. This is a matter also explored further in the amenity section below.

The scheme also includes the installation of a roof dormer which would be sited within the rear roof slope. There are examples of dormers within the rear roof slopes of the surrounding rows of terraced properties. The Conservation Area appraisal acknowledges that *“dormers on the front of houses are particularly harmful to the strong, unified, sloping roofscape. There are a number of modern dormer extensions to the rear of properties. These are on the whole less obtrusive but they have damaged some of the interconnected views between streets”*. I note that concern has been raised by the Conservation Officer in this regard, however it is not considered that the rear dormer as proposed would damage further any of the interconnected views between the streets, and as such would not be unduly harmful subject to the use of appropriate materials. It is also noted that there is no Article 4 Direct relating to such development and these proposals, subject to conditions within the GPDO, are likely to be permitted development.

For the above reasons it is considered that the development would have caused less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage assets, and there are no public benefits of the proposals, individually or cumulatively, which would outweigh the concern identified. The development is considered to be contrary to Policies S1, S5, EQ6 and EQ7 of the Local Plan.

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 mid-terraced property and as such is closely related to the properties on either side. The proposed extension is modest in terms of its overall projection and it is not considered that it would result in any adverse harm to neighbouring properties through loss of light, overshadowing, overbearing or loss of privacy. The proposed roof light within the rear roof slope would not face towards dwellings and would not give rise to loss of privacy or overlooking.

Notwithstanding this, as observed earlier the proposed development would result in the entire loss of the rear yard which is used for domestic purposes, and it is the only semi-private area enjoyed by the property. While the wall provides an identification or establishing the extent of private area, the entire loss of this amenity space for the proposed rear extension would result in the occupants of the dwelling having no outside space for the storage of bins etc, which is considered to be unacceptable and contrary to the provisions of Policy EQ6.

Highway Safety

The scheme would not result in the loss of any existing off street parking areas but would result in an uplift in bedrooms. The site benefits from a parking area to the rear while parking on street is available which would be sufficient to meet the demand from the dwelling. DCC Highways have raised no objection to the development.

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: 04/05/23

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council