

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2023/0217
Valid 30/05/2023

2 TURNLEE DRIVE
GLOSSOP

TWO STOREY EXTENSION TO
SIDE AND SINGLE STOREY
EXTENSION TO REAR. REAR
TIMBER DECKING

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design, Character and Appearance
- Amenity
- Parking Provision and Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application relates to No.2 Turnlee Drive, Glossop; a two storey 3no. bedroom semi-detached dwelling that forms a corner plot, orientated with the principal elevation facing south-eastwards, with the south-western gable facing onto Turnlee Road.

The site benefits from a relatively large curtilage with a small area located immediately to the front of the house, a larger space to the side of the house, with a large garden to the rear.

Boundary treatment exists in the form of a mature hedgerow immediately in front of the side gable although all three exposed elevations of the property are highly visible from the public highway and therefore any extensions or alterations to the existing property is sensitive to change and must be handled in a sensitive manner.

For the purposes of the Local Development Plan, the site lies within the built-up area boundary and is not constrained by statutory designations.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks full planning permission for a two storey side extension, and single storey rear extension. The plans also show the introduction of a raised timber decking platform with steps and railings. The description of development has been amended to include this aspect of development.

Following Officer comments, the applicant submitted a revised Site Plan showing minor amendments to the front wall, allowing easier manoeuvring of vehicles on to the driveway, and revised Proposed Floor Plans showing the function of the room originally allocated as 'Bedroom 5/Office' as a 'Study'.

The proposed two storey extension is shown to have a width of 3.4m, incorporating a small set back of 300mm behind the principal elevation with the roof being set a similar distance below the main ridgeline.

The single storey rear extension has a simple rectangular form that spans the entire width of the existing elevation, with a simple mono-pitch roof, extending some 2.7m outwards into the garden.

The timber decking has a width of approximately 5.6m and depth of some 800mm, with a finished floor level that is consistent with the rear extension sitting some 1.5m above the ground floor level of the garden.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Act 2004 requires proposals to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan taking into consideration any material considerations relevant to the determination of the application.

The Local Development Plan for this site comprises the High Peak Local Plan (2016). Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance documents and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) are also material considerations in determining applications.

High Peak Local Plan 2016

- S1 Sustainable Development Principles
- S1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- S2 Settlement Hierarchy
- EQ6 Design and Place Making
- CF6 Accessibility and Transport

Supplementary Planning Documents

Residential Design Guide SPD (2005)
Design Guide SPD (2018)

National Planning Policy Framework

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|
| Achieving Sustainable Development | Chapter 2 |
| Promoting Sustainable Transport | Chapter 9 |
| Achieving Well Designed Places | Chapter 12 |

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

None

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 27th July 2023
Neighbour consultation period ends: 27th June 2023
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None

Town / Parish Comments

N/A

Derbyshire County Council Highways

The proposed extensions will increase the number of bedrooms from 3 to 5 with space proposed within the site curtilage for a total of 4 parking spaces. The submitted plans do not appear to be to the scale indicated, therefore, it is difficult to assess if the sizes of the proposed parking spaces meet the recommended standards; however, the parking layout does appear to be very restricted with 1 space blocking the remaining spaces, leaving those remaining spaces inaccessible. For the spaces to be accessible, a number of manoeuvres will be required through the site access. This situation will not be ideal; however if the spaces are not utilised, with vehicles being parked on the roadside, this situation is considered to be more of an inconvenience rather than being detrimental to highway safety. You may wish to seek clarification of the proposed parking space sizes.

Based on the above comments, there are no highway authority objections to the application.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application seeks permission for extensions, alterations and domestic development all within the curtilage of the property on a site that lies within the built-up area boundary of Glossop. Glossop is identified as one of the larger Market Towns at the top of the settlement hierarchy under Local Plan (LP) Policy S2, where this area will be the focus for new housing and economic growth. The site is not constrained by any statutory designation.

As such, the principle of development is acceptable, subject to a detailed assessment of all relevant planning considerations.

Design Character and Appearance

LP Policy S1 sets out a number of sustainability principles which all new development proposals should incorporate in order to make a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities and to protect, and where possible enhance the environment.

LP Policy EQ6 states that all development should be well designed to respect and contribute positively to the character, identity and context of High Peak's townscapes, having regard to matters of scale, height, density, layout, appearance and materials.

Chapter 9 of the Residential Design Guide SPD contains the following guidance relating to domestic extensions and alterations that are relevant to the assessment and determination of this application:

- 9.0 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.*
- 9.1 Extensions should be designed so as to be subordinate to the main form of the house. It is important that the extension results in a dwelling that is well designed in itself.*

Chapter 5 of the more recently adopted Design Guide SPD contains further guidance in connection with proposed residential extensions and alterations, with the following paragraphs considered to be relevant:

- 5.5 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.*

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF states amongst other things that decisions should ensure that developments will add to the overall quality of the area; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture; and are sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.

Paragraph 133 of the NPPF states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.

The site lies in a visually prominent location at the junction of Turnlee Road and Turnlee Drive and therefore any extensions and alterations to the property, particularly to the side need to be handled in a sensitive manner.

Whilst the removal of part of a well-established hedgerow and introduction of a low brick wall would undoubtedly change the immediate character of the site and surrounding street scene, it would not be to its detriment, given that the predominant material in the locale is brick.

Turning to the two storey side extension, Officers welcome the fact that the extension incorporates a visual break between the principal elevation and ridgeline of the side extension and main dwellinghouse, in line with supplementary guidance. The side extension is also shown to be constructed and finished in materials that,

together with fenestration detailing, are consistent with those used in the proposed rear extension and the main dwellinghouse, which again is welcomed.

However, Officers have raised significant concerns with regards to the scale and massing of the proposed two storey side extension, as set out in an email to the applicant dated 23rd July 2023:

“...with regards to design, the side extension is too wide and appears as an unbalanced and disproportionate addition in relation to the main dwellinghouse. In order to read as a balanced extension, it should equate to no more than a 50% increase compared to the existing house. I calculate that the existing house has a width of 5.5m, and therefore a side extension, which currently is shown to have a width of 3.4m, should be reduced by approximately 500mm.”

The applicant subsequently responded stating that they are not prepared to accept this requested amendment and questions the policy justification in light of other examples of side extensions within the vicinity not achieving a maximum width that equates to 50% of the main house.

In response, Officers have made clear that each application for householder extensions and alterations are assessed and determined on their own individual merits having regard to relevant policies within the adopted Local Plan (2016), adopted Residential Design Guide SPD (2005) and Design Guide SPD (2018, and relevant paragraphs within the NPPF (2021). Extensions and alterations that have been approved historically at other properties in the vicinity will likely have been subject to a different policy context. In any event, each application is assessed on its own individual merits.

This site comprises a corner plot and is therefore far more sensitive to change than other properties in a linear pattern of development. It is a highly visible dwelling being easily read from Turnlee Road to the south. Whilst there is no definitive prescriptive policy that requires a maximum width of a side extension to equate to 50% of the width seen the main house, the policy considerations set out above requires extensions and alterations to read as subordinate and secondary structures that respect the dominance of the main house with the resultant dwelling being well designed in itself, and in a manner that contributes positively to the character of the site and wider street scene.

By exceeding a width of more than 50% of the width of the main house, the extension would read as an unbalanced, disproportionate addition, that fails to respect the scale, massing and dominance of the main house. The extension would unbalance the semi detached dwellings and as a consequence would harm the character and appearance of the main dwelling, and the overall character of the street scene, contrary to Local Plan Policies S1 and EQ6, relevant paragraphs under Chapter 9 of the Residential Design Guide SPD, relevant paragraphs under Chapter 5 of the Design Guide SPD, and relevant paragraphs under Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

Despite repeated attempts to contact the applicant to secure revised plans that align with and address the above concerns, no response or indeed revised plans have been forthcoming, and as such Officers are left with no alternative but to recommend

refusal on grounds of poor design and the resultant harm to the character and appearance of the site and wider street scene.

Amenity

LP Policy EQ6 requires all new development to have a satisfactory relationship with existing land and buildings and protects the amenity of the area, which includes residential amenity of neighbouring properties. Aspects of residential amenity include impacts such as a loss of sunlight, overshadowing and overbearing impacts, loss of outlook, and loss of privacy.

The High Peak Residential Design Guide SPD requires extensions to preserve the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, having regard amongst other things to the relationship between existing and proposed development, the positioning of windows, and the change in land levels.

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF states that planning should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

The site shares a boundary with No.4 Turnlee Drive – the other part of the semi-detached block – which has a rear elevation that is characterised by a small lean-to extension which leads on to an area of timber decking. There is no record of any planning history associated with this neighbour and thus this decking may or may not be lawful, depending on how long it has been in situ.

The single storey rear extension, which follows the same finished floor level as the main house and has a depth of 2.7m, would potentially conflict with the 45 degree line taken from the centre point of the bi-fold doors. However, given the fact that the dimensions and height of the extension falls within the parameters permitted under Class A of the GPDO (if solely constructed behind the original dwelling), it is not considered that the extension in its own right results in any adverse harm to the residential amenity of No.4 Turnlee Drive.

Turning to the introduction of raised timber decking, this would sit very slightly below the finished floor level of the extension, having a depth of some 800mm which is just about large enough to function as an amenity space (i.e. chairs and table). The boundary fence with No.4 is staggered, and there would as a consequence be a degree of overlooking from this decking to the neighbouring garden. However, due to the change in levels and sloping topography of both gardens, there is already a degree of overlooking from the rear patio, and on balance, it is considered that there would not be any further harm with regards to overlooking and privacy caused by the introduction of the modest area of raised decking, that warrants a reason for refusal that could be sustained at appeal.

With regards to other neighbouring properties, there is a clear and sizeable distance between the two storey side extension, single storey rear extension to neighbouring properties. The extension would look towards the rear garden of number 1 Turnlee Close and have a similar relationship to the rear garden as the existing dwelling. As such it is considered that the extension would not give rise to any significant adverse

harm to this neighbour having regard to overbearing impacts, loss of sunlight or loss of privacy, having regard to the minimum separation distance of 21m.

As such, having regard to the above analysis, and notwithstanding the adverse harm identified in so far design, character and appearance, the application is considered to be compliant with Local Plan Policy EQ6, the Residential Design Guide SPD, and the NPPF, with regards to potential impacts on neighbouring residential amenity.

Highway Safety

LP Policy CF6 seeks to ensure that development can be safely accessed in a sustainable manner and that all new development is located where it can be satisfactorily accommodated within the existing highway network and provides suitable off-street parking provision in accordance with guidelines set out under Appendix 1 of the Local Plan.

Paragraph 110 of the NPPF states that in assessing applications for development, it should be ensured that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users. Paragraph 111 goes on to state that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

The site plan subject of assessment within this report shows the provision of 4no. car parking spaces which are set out parallel to the public highway, which as referred to by the Highways Authority, would involve a number of awkward manoeuvres within the site, which could result in vehicles being parked on the roadside. Whilst this raised concerns from Officers, it is concluded that in light of the Highways Authority not raising any formal objections, any reason for refusal on grounds of highway safety could not with any confidence be sustained at appeal. The application is therefore considered to be acceptable having regard to LP Policy CF6 and paragraph 110 of the NPPF.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

LP Policy S1a reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It states that planning applications that accord with relevant policies in the Local Plan will be approved without delay.

Paragraph 11 of the NPPF sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision taking, this means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or, where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission, unless:

- the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or

- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

The application seeks permission for extension and alterations to an existing residential property that lies within the built-up area boundary of Glossop on a site that is not constrained by any statutory designation. The general principle of development is therefore supported subject to a detailed assessment of all relevant planning considerations.

Whilst despite minor concerns there are not considered to be any substantive grounds for refusal with regards to potential impacts on residential amenity or highway safety. However, officers have identified adverse harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and wider street scene as a result of poor design, owing to the excessive and disproportionate width of the proposed two storey side extension, particularly given its highly prominent and sensitive location on a corner plot.

Despite repeated attempts to engage with the applicant to address these concerns and secure a set of revised plans that can be supported, the applicant has refused this request, and as such it is left to the Council to determine the application in its current form.

With this in mind, the application is judged to result in adverse harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and wider street scene as a consequence of poor design arising from an excessive and disproportionate width of the proposed two storey rear extension, contrary to LP Policies S1 and EQ6, the Residential Design Guide SPD (2005), Design Guide SPD (2018) and relevant paragraphs under Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

As such, the application constitutes an unsustainable form of development contrary to LP Policy S1a and paragraph 11 of the NPPF and is thus recommended for refusal.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Refuse

Case Officer: James Stannard

Recommendation Date: 8th August 2023

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council

