

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2023/0171
Valid 03/07/2023

21 JOHN DALTON STREET
HADFIELD
GLOSSOP

LOFT CONVERSION WITH
2NO. DORMERS FRONT &
BACK

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design, Character and Appearance
- Amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application relates to No.21 John Dalton Street, Hadfield, a traditional and relatively attractive two storey property which sits within a row of four terraced properties of a similar character and appearance constructed in a natural stone with tiled roof.

The wider street scene is characterised predominantly by terraced properties. Nos. 4 and 6 John Dalton Street which sits within a row of terraces on the opposite side of the street further to the north have introduced small flat roof dormer windows to their principal roof slopes however both have not been the subject of any planning history.

A flat roof dormer window which has been added to a property on Hadfield Road is visible from the area of John Dalton Street immediately adjacent to the site, likely to have been implemented under permitted development rights.

The site lies within the built-up area boundary of Hadfield and is not constrained by any sensitive statutory designation.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks full planning permission to introduce 2no. flat roof dormer windows to the property. One dormer would be located on the front principal roof slope with the other located to the rear.

The plans show that the front dormer has a smaller volume when compared to the rear dormer. Both are shown to be finished in grey cladding panels with UPVC windows and GRP flat roof.

The front dormer extends outwards by 3m from the ridgeline with a height of 1.6m and width of 4.6m, equating to a total volume of approximately 22m³. The rear dormer is shown to extend by 4.2m with a height of 2.3m and a width of 4.5m, equating to a total volume of approximately 43.5m³. The rear dormer would occupy almost the hole of the roof slope.

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
EQ6 Design and Place Making

Supplementary Planning Documents

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

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

Achieving Sustainable Development	Chapter 2
Achieving Well Designed Places	Chapter 12

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

None

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 24th August 2023
Neighbour consultation period ends: 28th July 2023
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None.

Town / Parish Comments

N/A

Derbyshire County Council Highways

No highway safety comments to make.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

This application seeks permission for a roof extensions to an existing residential property that lies within the built-up area boundary of Hadfield. Hadfield is identified as a Larger Village within the settlement hierarchy under Local Plan (LP) Policy S2 where a moderate scale of development to meet local rural needs will be permitted. The site is not constrained by any statutory designation.

As such, the general principle of development is considered to be 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 (2005) relates specifically to domestic extensions. With regards to the roof plane, the following paragraphs are relevant to the assessment of this application:

- 9.4.1 *Appropriate extensions to the roofline can be made by extending the main roof to the side or by creating a secondary gabled roof at right angles. In view of their often 'squat' and ungainly appearance, the prevailing climate and ongoing maintenance problems, flat roofs should be avoided.*
- 9.4.2 *Dormers pose difficulties in terms of design and overlooking. They should be kept as small and simple as possible; they will often be unacceptable on the front elevation of houses, especially terraced properties.*

Chapter 5 of the Design Guide SPD refers to Extensions and Alterations. The following paragraphs are relevant to the assessment of this application:

- 5.2 *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 building's character.

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF states amongst other matters that new developments should add to the overall quality of the area, be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.

Paragraph 134 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 property sits as a mid terrace dwelling which lies within a row of four traditional two storey terraced properties. Their principal elevations and roof slopes are highly visible looking northwards from Hadfield Road, and southwards from Woolley Bridge Road.

Whilst it is accepted that there is evidence of front dormer windows in the street scene (Nos. 4 and 6 John Dalton Street), a review of the planning history shows that neither have been the subject of planning permission, and as such offer limited weight in the overall assessment of the proposal. It is considered that these examples do not set any precedent for front facing dormer windows due to their inappropriate design, use of materials and harm to the character of the host dwellings and wider street scene.

As with the neighbouring properties, the existing roof of the property is finished in traditional slate tiles. The proposed dormer windows would be finished in a grey cladding. Whilst the colour is broadly consistent with the slate roof of the host dwelling, the introduction of a contemporary material which is alien to the street scene and not traditionally found in the High Peak would result in a clear and incongruous conflict between existing roof materials and the proposed development.

Rear dormer windows can be permitted where they align with all relevant parameters under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B of the GPDO. However, due to its excessive scale and size and massing, the proposed dormer does require planning permission, and in effect, dwarfs, dominates and consumes the entirety of the rear roof slope, failing to respect the existing proportions of the roof slope and contrary to supplementary design guidance set out above.

The introduction of both flat roof dormer windows to the principal and rear roof would be very prominent from the public highway, including Etherow Way to the north and Hadfield Road to the south. Due to their siting, scale, massing and choice of materials, the dormers would result in highly unsympathetic and incongruous additions to the roof slope of the property which would adversely harm both the character and appearance of the building, and the wider street scene.

For the above reasons, it is considered the application in its current form to be in direct conflict with Local Plan Policies S1 and EQ6, the Residential Design Guide SPD (2006), Design Guide SPD (2018) and relevant paragraphs within Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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 is situated in a built up residential area. The front dormer is situated 11m from the nearest side boundary and would not directly front any habitable window. To the rear, the rear dormer window would be situated 21m from the rear elevation of No.4 Etherow Way, thus meeting minimum space standards.

Whilst the application is considered to be compliant with relevant policy and guidance with regards to potential impacts to residential amenity, this neither mitigates or outweighs the harm identified to the character and appearance of the dwelling and wider street scene.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

LP Policy S1a reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

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 2no. dormer windows (one to the front and one to the rear) at No.21 John Dalton Street, Hadfield. The general principle of development is acceptable given the sites location in the built-up area boundary free of any statutory designation.

However, having regard to all relevant local and national planning policies and other supplementary planning guidance, it is considered that the introduction of a dormer window to both the principal and rear roof slope would, by virtue of their, excessive scale and massing in the case of the rear dormer, their flat roof form, and by introducing materials that are wholly alien to the existing character and appearance of the building, would appear unsympathetic and incongruous additions to this row of attractive terraced properties. The dormers would be highly prominent from the street scene and would further erode the character and appearance of the street scene, contrary to LP Policies S1 and EQ6, the Residential Design Guide SPD, Design Guide SPD, and relevant paragraphs under Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

For these reasons the application is considered to constitute 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: 24th August 2023

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council