

## DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

---

HPK/2023/0121  
VALID 30/03/2023

19, WISTERIA WAY,  
GLOSSOP, DERBYSHIRE,  
SK13 7ER

PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY  
REAR EXTENSION AND TWO  
STOREY SIDE EXTENSION  
WITH ASSOCIATED INTERNAL  
ALTERATIONS  
(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

---

### MAIN ISSUES

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

### DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site lies within the built up area for Glossop as defined by the Local Plan policies map. The application site relates to two storey end terraced dwelling within a predominantly residential area. The application site forms part of a recent housing development within a site which was granted on appeal for approx. 100 houses. An area of open space and the SUDS for the estate lies to the front of the site, while landscaping lies to the south. Beyond the southern boundary is a public right of way (Glossop 155) and the properties on Heath Road.

### PROPOSAL

This application seeks permission for the construction of a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension. The side extension would be staggered in width with the front width being 1.8m before stepping out to an increased width of 2.1m. Eaves and ridge heights are proposed to match the existing dwelling.

The single storey extension would project by 2.9m at a width of 4.3m. The height to eaves and ridge would be 2.7m and 3.6m respectively. The extension would have a lean-to roof.

The proposed extensions would provide an extended open plan kitchen, dining, living area, an extended w/c and laundry room, and a store. The first floor accommodation would provide a third bedroom and en-suite.

### RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

#### High Peak Local Plan (Adopted 2016)

- S1 Sustainable Development Principles
- S1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

S2 Settlement Hierarchy  
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/2015/0120 - Proposal - All Reserved Matters Relating to Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale – Approved – 31/07/2015

HPK/2013/0327 - Outline permission for proposed residential development of up to 150 dwellings including affordable housing, highways works, public open space and associated works. Refused and allowed on appeal - 12/06/2014

### **CONSULTATIONS**

#### **Publicity**

Site Notice expiry date: 18/05/23  
Neighbour consultation period ends: 26/04/23  
Press Advert: N/A

#### **Public Comments**

Two letters of objection received from neighbours:

Upper floor windows on the south elevation of the property, one serves the master bedroom. The intention will be to remove obscuring film or change glass in the future.

The houses elevated position will impact privacy to gardens and property on Heath Road.

works are very close to the boundary of the property and that the elevated position means significant load changes onto the retaining wall to the South.

Land Drainage must also be demonstrated to ensure runoff is not diverted to the properties to the south, down the hill.

The previous building brought houses very close to the boundary of No.3 Heath Road, in an elevated position which made a dramatic change to our outlook. The

proposed changes bring the end wall of the property even closer which has a further negative impact.

In addition the planned window openings would seriously impact on privacy giving clear line of view into windows both upstairs and downstairs.

### **Town / Parish Comments**

N/A

### **DCC Highways**

There are no highway safety objections to the application.

### **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. Policy S5, which relates to the Glossopdale sub-area, seeks to promote sustainable growth 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 is contained within the High Peak Residential Design Guide SPD (2005), and the Design Guide SPD (2018).

The adopted High Peak Design Guide 2018 sets out the parameters which new development should respond to. In respect to new development, it states at paragraph 5.2 that:

*Alterations need to be undertaken with care. Insensitive changes can easily spoil a building. The key to a sensitive approach is to take note of what is there already before preparing the design and to work with and not against the buildings character. The aim should be to revitalise the building without altering its fundamental character.*

Paragraph 5.5 continues:

*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 Adopted Residential Design Guide (SPD) (2005) paragraph Chapter 9 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.”

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 property is an end-terraced property of recent construction, the site lies to the south of the housing estate and is sited perpendicular to the southern boundary, beyond which is residential development on Heath Road. The dwelling was constructed as part of the housing development for Land at North Road which was granted outline planning permission at appeal. Reserved Matters, which included layout, was approved in 2015. The application dwelling is referred to as unit/plot 18 in that layout.

The proposed single storey extension is considered to be subservient to the host dwelling and appropriately designed, as such no concerns are raised with regard to this element from a design perspective.

The application dwelling is an end terrace in a group of three dwellings. Each unit within the terraced grouping, and semi-detached properties further to the north, are consistently proportioned and uniformed. The proposed two storey side extension would follow the front building line, and would have eaves and ridge heights which match the existing dwelling. Consequently, it is considered that the proposed side extension would fail to provide any subservience to the host dwelling. Furthermore, by reason of its design, resultant width and new windows, it is considered that the extension would imbalance the terraced grouping which would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.

The estate was laid out to provide a buffer between the development and the boundary with Heath Road to the south. The proposed side extension would erode this undeveloped gap resulting in built form unacceptably close to the site boundary and green corridor adjacent. This is considered to represent an overdevelopment of the plot which would cause undue harm to the character and appearance of the area.

It is noted that the definitive map shows a footpath to the south of the site (Glossop 150), although this does not appear to be heavily used. Notwithstanding this, the development would be unduly close to this PROW which would exacerbate the harm on the character and appearance of the public realm.

Condition 20 attached to the RM approval states that *“Notwithstanding what is shown in the approved landscaping scheme, development shall not commence (apart from site clearance) until further details of enhanced landscaping along the southern site boundary have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The additional landscaping shall be implemented as approved before the dwellings on Plots 18, 34 and 35-45 inclusive are first occupied. The additional landscaping shall be maintained in accordance with the provisions of condition 21”*. There was a requirement under the RM consent to provide landscaping to the south of Plot 18 (19 Wisteria Avenue). It is not clear whether details pursuant to this condition was ever approved, and whether the landscaping was implemented. The side extension would remove any opportunity for meaningful landscaping along this boundary.

For the above reasons it is considered that the development would have an adverse and unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area. The development is considered to be contrary to Policies S1, S5, and EQ6 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.

In considering amenity issues with Heath Road, the report for the Reserved Matters application observed:

*Local plan policies are also concerned with ensuring new development respects the amenity of existing residential properties and their occupiers. In this case, the properties most likely to be affected are those along the northern side of Heath Road, the western side of Bexley Close and Heath Cottage. The property most likely to be affected by the development is No.3 Heath Road. The remainder of Heath Road tapers away from the application site in an easterly direction which extends the degree of separation from the proposed development.*

*The house closest to the rear elevation of No.3 Heath Road is a two storey terraced house on land that is set approximately 2.5m higher. It is a blank gable apart from an obscure glazed window at ground floor level serving a w/c. Following negotiations, this unit has been set back a further 3m from the rear of No.3 (16m compared to 13m previously).*

*The Council has a supplementary planning document entitled “Guidelines for the Design and Layout of Residential Development” which recommends minimum separation distances between new and existing development in order to protect*

*residential amenity. As a guide, a distance of 21m between the habitable room windows of adjacent dwellings will provide an acceptable level of amenity. Where there is a difference in ground levels then the distance should be increased by 1m for every 0.5m increase in elevation. This only applies to instances where there are habitable room windows in each affected elevation. There is no policy guidance where an end elevation containing no habitable rooms faces a corresponding elevation incorporating such rooms, as in this case.*

*Other local planning authorities have guidance that concerns this type of situation which may be helpful when considering this case. A 12m separation distance is normally sought where site levels are equal. Where levels differ, the degree of separation should increase by 1m for each 1m increase in elevation. Applying this approach here the separation distance should be 14.5m. The proposed distance of 16m would exceed this. In addition, the re-siting of this property has created space within the plot that could be subject to additional planting, further softening the potential impact of the building. On that basis, it would be difficult to sustain a reason for refusal in respect of loss of amenity to No.3 Heath Road.*

The relationship with No.3 Heath Road was clearly a matter of close attention in the consideration of the approved layout. This application would bring the development closer to No.3 Heath Road and, given the land level changes between the two properties, it is considered that the proposed development would have an overbearing impact on the amenity space of that property, whilst also affecting the outlook enjoyed by properties. While some landscaping would be retained between the two properties this would not be sufficient to mitigate the concerns highlighted. Furthermore, this is indicative of the over-intensive nature of development which is a concern raised in the design section.

Comment has been raised with regard to the installation of windows within the flank elevation. Indeed, condition 23 attached to the RM decision states, *“Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved drawings, there shall be no windows inserted within the flank elevations of the dwellings on Plot numbers 18, 34 and 45.”*, which was attached in the interest of amenity. While this removal of permitted development rights is noted, the windows could be conditioned to be obscure glazed and non-opening which would mitigate any concern with regard to loss of privacy or overlooking. It is accepted that there would be a perception of overlooking arising from the additional windows although it is not considered that the development could be refused on such grounds.

With regard to the rear extension, this would be sited immediately on the site boundary shared with No.17. To the rear of that property, at ground floor level is an opening which serves a habitable room. The extension could potentially breach the 45degree standard from this opening, with regard to loss of light. However, the extension appears to be within the parameters of permitted development and as such a refusal on loss of light, overshadowing on that property could not be sustained.

To conclude, it is considered that the extension would have an adverse effect on the living conditions of No.3 Heath Road through overbearing, and loss of outlook and would be 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 front which would be sufficient to meet the demand from the dwelling. DCC Highways have raised no objection to the development.

## **Other matters**

Concern has been raised by third parties with regard to land stability and drainage from the property. Ensuring the development does not affect the retaining wall, and the routing of drainage, would be matters considered under Building Regs.

## **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: 18/05/23**

X 

---

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

**On behalf of High Peak Borough Council**