

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2022/0570
Valid 23/03/2023

48, HAGUE STREET,
GLOSSOP, DERBYSHIRE,
SK13 8NS

PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY
REAR EXTENSION

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design and visual impact
- Neighbour amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site is 48, Hague Street, Glossop, a stone and slate, end terrace cottage accessed via a ginnel between other cottages and with garden to the rear. The cottage has not been extended previously.

For the purposes of planning policy consideration, the application site is located within the Whitfield Ward and within Glossop Conservation Area, there are no protected trees which need to be considered. Whilst there are Listed Buildings nearby (as shown in purple on the map extract) the extension is to the rear of number 48 (shown with a red star) and will not be visible from nor adversely affect the setting or properties of heritage value)



PROPOSAL

To erect a single storey rear extension that will project 3 metres off the rear elevation of the property. The new extension will be flat roofed, and the side wall run along the boundary with the adjacent public right of way (PROW) – to ensure privacy a high level window will be inserted on this side elevation, with concertina doors on the rear elevation looking out onto the garden and back door on the side elevation facing No.46. The 45 degree code will be complied with in order to protect the amenity of the adjacent property (No 46).

The proposed palette of material finishes will be sympathetic to the host dwelling and be gritstone to match.

Note: The applicant has pedestrian right of access across the rear of the neighbouring property (No 46).

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

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
S5 Glossopdale Sub-area Strategy
EQ6 Design and Place Making
EQ7 Built and Historic Environment

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

Achieving Sustainable Development Chapter 2
Achieving Well Designed Places Chapter 12
Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment Chapter 16

Supplementary Planning Document

1. High Peak Design Guide
2. Glossop Conservation Area Character Appraisal SPD Adopted 2006
3. High Peak Residential Design SPD Adopted 2005

National Planning Policy Framework

Including sections -
12: Achieving well-designed places

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/2007/0735 Single storey extension and new windows - Refused

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 26 April 2023

Neighbour re-consultation period ends: 27/04/2023

Public Comments

No comments received.

Town / Parish Comments

No comments received

SMDC Conservation

Objection - the proposal sees a completely alien feature appearing to be 'stuck to' this traditional cottage and looks to irreversibly alter the character of this row of cottages, their footprints and therefore the context of the vicinity. I am concerned the proposal is not 'at home' here and contributes very little to the Conservation Area. Harm on heritage would equate to less than substantial harm.

Highways

No objection

Severn Trent Water

No comments received, informative will be inserted to inform applicant relating to sewer guidance information.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The site is located within the built up area boundary for Glossop where there is support in principle for a range of developments including housing and employment related proposals. Whilst there are no 'in principle' objections to the application, all other material planning considerations must be satisfied for the scheme to be supported. In this instance the considerations include design, visual impact, neighbour amenity, drainage, and parking provision.

Design & Visual Impact

Policy EQ6 refers to design and states that all development should be well designed and be of a high quality that responds positively to both its environment and the challenge of climate change, whilst contributing to local distinctiveness and sense of place. New development should be well designed to respect the character, identity and context of the High Peak's townscapes and landscapes. Policy EQ7 set out that heritage assets should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. Development should contribute positively to the character of the built and historic environment.

The NPPF requires the design of a development to add to the overall quality of an area, by being sympathetic to local character and by being visually attractive as a result of good architecture. Paragraph 134 states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and local design guidance.

The Council's Design SPD outlines the Council's expectations in respect of design and states that 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.

Para 195 of the NPPF states that "Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal." Paragraph 202 sets out that where a development would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage assets, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits.

The proposed single storey extension will project 3 metres from the rear elevation of the existing dwellinghouse and extend the full width of the original dwellinghouse. The extension will be constructed of materials to match and will have a flat roof. A high window will be positioned in the side elevation of the extension, and patio doors will be positioned in the rear elevation.

The proposed extension will fail to appear subservient to the existing dwellinghouse due to its design. The extension will be sited adjacent to the public right of way and will be visually prominent.

The conservation officer has objected to the principle of an extension to the rear of this row of cottage, she lists numerous listed buildings sited nearby and concluded that due to the collection of heritage assets within the Conservation Area being nearby, this makes for a sensitive setting, vulnerable to change. Whilst it is agreed that the site is a sensitive setting, due to its location within the conservation area, I disagree that this proposal has an adverse impact on the setting of the nearby listed buildings, the rear of number 48 turns its back on these heritage assets.

The extension is however considered to have an adverse impact on the character of the conservation area and host dwelling. The design of the extension comprising a flat roof and uncharacteristic fenestration i.e. patio door/horizontal slot window on the side elevation producing a high void to solid ratio would appear at odds with the traditional appearance of the dwelling and the row of terraced houses which it forms part of. Paragraph 3.11 of the Design Guide sets out that a high solid to void ratio in which the wall dominates should be achieved. This considered to be particularly important as the row of terraced houses have tradition vertically proportioned windows, which reflects the character of the surrounding conservation area. Moreover the high level window on the side elevation would be at complete odds with the vertically proportioned fenestration found on the host dwelling, and be highly

prominent when viewed from the public right of way. Overall, the proposed extension would adversely impacts on the conservation area. The extension will appear prominent when viewed from the public right of way (HP12/31/1) which runs immediately to the south of the dwelling, linking Charlestown View to Hague Street.

It is noted that there is a similar size extension to the rear of the cottage at the other end of this row of terraces, however this is distanced from public vantage points and has less impact visually on the conservation area.

The harm to the significance of the Conservation Area that would result from the proposed extension adjacent to the public right of way would be localised and therefore the effect on the Conservation Area as a whole is less than substantial. It would nonetheless represent an erosion of the Conservation Area's distinctive character. In circumstances where there is less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, in this case the Conservation Area, Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) identifies that harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

It is recognised that the proposed extension could be said to make more efficient use of the existing building by accommodating additional accommodation. However, Section 11 of the Framework makes clear that making efficient use of land should include taking into account the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and the importance of securing well-designed, attractive, and healthy places.

There would be limited economic benefit through a new build extension in the Borough (employment and procurement of materials during the construction period) such that these benefits would be limited in scale and kind, and consequently carry only limited weight. Ultimately the extension will be used for private benefit by the applicant.

The statutory duty in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is a matter of considerable importance and weight. The proposed extension would have a negative effect on the significance of a designated heritage asset and would result in less than substantial harm. There are no public benefits put forward to outweigh this harm.

In light of the above, it is considered that the design would have an unacceptable harmful effect on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Consequently, in that regard, it would not therefore accord with Policies EQ6 and EQ7 of the adopted Local Plan.

Note – the conservation officer references a previous refusal. This was not similar to this proposal and located in the ginnel on the front elevation and proposed to connect onto the listed property opposite “filling in” the alley between both properties.

Amenity

High Peak Local Plan Policies EQ6 and EQ7 seeks to secure development that does not result in unacceptable effects on the amenity of the area or heritage assets by

reason of visual intrusion, overlooking, shadowing, overbearing effect, noise, light pollution or other adverse impacts on the conservation area's character and amenity.

The proposed rear accords with the 45 degree rule so will not adversely affect the amenity of immediate neighbours. Overall there would be no adverse impact to residential amenity.

Highway Safety

No issues arise from the proposal.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

For the reasons outlined above, the development is considered not to accord with the relevant policies contained in the High Peak Local Plan (2016) and the NPPF. As such the application is recommended for Refusal.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

Case Officer: P. Twigg

Recommendation Date: 21.8.2023

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Council