

## DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

---

HPK/2023/0148  
VALID 17/04/2023

12, STORTH BANK,  
SIMMONDLEY, GLOSSOP,  
DERBYSHIRE, SK13 6UX

PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY  
SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION,  
AND DEMOLITION OF  
EXISTING PORCH  
(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 of Simmondley, which lies within the development boundary for Glossop as defined by the Local Plan policies map. The application site relates to two storey detached dwelling located on a corner plot on Storth Bank. The surrounding area is predominantly residential comprising two storey detached properties. The site is accessed off Storth Bank, with off street parking to the front of the dwelling and private amenity space to the rear. An attached garage is located to the side.

### PROPOSAL

This application seeks permission for the removal of the existing single storey attached garage and construction of a single storey side and rear wraparound extension. The extension would project to the side by 2.55m, and to the rear by 3m. A lean-to roof is proposed with hip to the wraparound corner. The extension would be constructed from brick with a tiled roof. Submitted elevations indicate the front elevation to be rendered. The scheme would provide an extended kitchen/dining room, family room, bedroom and utility.

The scheme initially proposed a two storey side extension. However, this was deemed to be unacceptable due to the impact that the development would have on the character of the dwelling and area.

### 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**

None

### **CONSULTATIONS**

#### **Publicity**

Site Notice expiry date: 07/06/23  
Neighbour consultation period ends: 16/05/23  
Press Advert: N/A

#### **Public Comments**

One letter of support received

#### **Town / Parish Comments**

Neither

The Parish Council was concerned that this proposal is overdevelopment of the site: on a small estate plot the applicants propose a six-bedroom house with substantial rear single storey extension, which (a) will reduce further the already very small garden and (b) could increase on-street car parking (as on-site parking will be limited to three cars only). The Council noted the comments of the Highway Authority in this regard. A business is run from the property which could add to pressure on street parking. The Parish Council agreed not to object formally but that these concerns should be raised with the Planning Authority

#### **DCC Highways**

There are no highway safety objections to the applications; however, the application proposes alternative parking arrangements to the front of the dwelling as opposed to the existing parking spaces to the side of the dwelling. The applicant will require an extension to the existing footway crossing to allow vehicular access to the proposed parking spaces which will require authorisation under S184 of the Highways Act 1980.

## **OFFICER COMMENTS**

### **Principle of Development**

The application proposes householder development to a property which is located within the development boundary for 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 within a predominantly residential area. The application proposes to remove the existing attached garage to the side and its replacement with a single storey wraparound extension. The proposed extension is relatively modest in width and depth from the existing rear building line. Consequently, it is considered that the proposed extension represents a subservient addition to the host dwelling.

The extension would include a lean-to roof with hipped corner to the wraparound. It is noted that the roof pitch would be shallower than the existing property. The

existing dwelling has a gabled roof design, as such the roof would not be entirely consistent with that of the existing dwelling. Within the surrounding streetscene there are elements of lean-to roofs, albeit predominantly to the front of the dwellings. A gabled roof design, with pitch to match the existing is likely to be more prominent, eroding the openness of the street, and therefore harmful to that proposed. It is considered that the design of the extension is acceptable in this instance.

Concern was raised that a previously proposed two storey extension would be harmful to the host dwelling and the open character of the streetscene, given that the dwelling is on a corner plot. The scheme has therefore been reduced to single storey, with the extension following the side building line of the existing side extension. The proposals, as amended, therefore would cause adverse harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene.

The removal of the front porch is not considered to be a significant change as there are a variety in front door and porch designs to the dwellings in the area.

The scheme proposes the rendering of the front elevation of the existing dwelling and that of the extension. The remainder of the extension would be constructed in brickwork to match. The rendering of the front elevation would introduce a material which is not consistent with its surroundings, which is characterised by facing brickwork. It would therefore be necessary to attach a condition to any permission requiring materials to match and no render to the existing dwelling/extension.

## **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 to the side and rear. To the front and south side are public highways, with dwellings on the opposite side.

No.10 to the north, is set further back than the application site. As such the 3m rear single storey extension would not project beyond the rear building line of No.10 in a manner which would result in the loss of daylight to habitable rooms. Furthermore, the juxtaposition of such is that there would be no loss of outlook, overbearing or overshadowing to No.10.

The dwelling to the rear has a flank elevation facing towards the site while the extension is positioned at a distance which would not give rise to light, outlook or overbearing concerns to that property. Given the scale and spacing with properties on the opposite side of no amenity issues would result in harm to those properties.

New principal openings are located to the front and rear. To the front this would face over the public highway. To the rear windows would face towards the garden, rear boundary and flank elevation of the dwelling to the rear. No privacy or overlooking issues would arise.

The comments raised by the Parish Council, with regard to overdevelopment and loss of amenity space, are noted. However, it is considered that the dwelling would be approximately 6.8m in depth and 11.5m in width (circa 78sqm), which is considered adequate to meet the needs of the dwelling. Furthermore, the resultant garden space is not considered to be out of character or context with the pattern of development in the surrounding area.

### **Highway Safety**

The proposal would result in the loss of the existing garage space and, a further bedroom is proposed. The scheme proposes to provide three off street parking spaces to the front of the property which would be sufficient to meet the demands of the dwelling. The off street parking can be accommodated to the front of the property while providing some landscaping, which would be consistent with the character of the area. DCC Highways have raised no objection to the proposed development. It would be necessary to condition the delivery of the off street parking. No highway safety issues would arise.

Comment has been made that a business runs from the application dwelling. The applicants have advised that this is not the case. If the Parish Council have the evidence that a business is being run by the applicant from the dwelling, this would be a matter for the Council enforcement team to investigate.

### **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: 28/06/23**

X 

---

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

**On behalf of High Peak Borough Council**