

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2023/0373
Valid 04/09/2023

2 TURNLEE DRIVE
GLOSSOP

**TWO STOREY EXTENSION TO
THE SIDE AND SINGLE
STOREY EXTENSION TO THE
REAR. INSTALLATION OF
REAR TIMBER DECKING**

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

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

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site comprises a two storey 3no. bedroom semi-detached dwelling that forms a corner plot, orientated with the principal elevation facing south-eastwards, with the southern-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 extension 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 and installation of timber decking to the rear. This application is a resubmission following the refusal of planning application HPK/2023/0217 for similar proposals which was refused on the grounds of scale and having an over dominating appearance.

The resubmission application proposes side and rear extensions of a reduced scale to the refused scheme. The proposed two storey side extension is setback 0.3m from the front elevation, extends full depth (7.4m) and is 2.7m wide. The single storey rear extension is full width (7.5m) and 2.6m deep, with a mono-pitch roof. The

extensions will facilitate a reconfigured ground floor arrangement and create a new kitchen and dining area, utility, WC and study. Two additional bedrooms would be created at first floor level.

The timber decking has a width of 5.6m and a depth of 0.8m, with a finished floor level that is consistent with the rear elevation 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 consideration relevant to the determination of the application.

High Peak Local Plan 2016

S 1 Sustainable Development Principles
S 1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
EQ 6 Design and Place Making
CF 6 Accessibility and Transport

Supplementary Planning Documents

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

National Planning Policy Framework

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

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/2023/0217 – Two Storey extension to side and single storey extension to rear.
Rear Timber Decking – Refused 08.08.23

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 9/10/23
Neighbour consultation period ends: 9/10/23
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None

Town / Parish Comments: NA

Derbyshire County Council Highways

No Objection - Whilst it is proposed that the existing vehicular access to Turnlee Drive will be widened to accommodate the revised parking layout, as previously outlined in the response to HPK/2023/0217, the parking layout appears to be restrictive with some spaces likely being inaccessible due to obstruction by the spaces adjacent to the vehicular access.

Nonetheless, whilst the situation is not ideal and may result in vehicles being parked on Turnlee Drive this is an inconvenience and not considered to be unacceptable in highway safety terms.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application seeks permission for extensions and alterations within the curtilage of a residential property 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 Policy S2 where there is a focus for new housing and economic growth.

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

Design

LP Policy S1 sets out a number of sustainability principles which all new development proposals should incorporate in order 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 house, the 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 Design Guide SPD contains further guidance regarding residential extensions and alterations:

- 5.5 *All extension 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 133 of the NPPF state that development as 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.

Two storey side extension

The previous application was refused on the grounds of the size, scale and design of the extensions which dominated the original dwelling house on this sensitive corner plot location. The current application proposes a side extension of a significantly reduced scale. The two storey extension is set back 0.3m from the front elevation and extends to a depth of 7.4m and is 2.7m wide. The refused scheme proposed a side extension which was 3.4m wide which was more than 50% of the width of the house which would have resulted in an unbalanced, disproportionate addition.

The revised scheme proposes a side extension which is significantly reduced in width and now complies with the 50% of the width of original house standard. The proposed side extension is considered an appropriate size and scale and is subordinate to the original dwelling house. The proposals therefore comply with policies S1 and EQ6, the Residential Design Guide SPD and the NPPF.

Rear extension

The rear single storey extension extends the full width of the rear of the property (7.5m) and is 2.6m deep, which is the same dimensions of the rear extension proposed in the refused scheme (HPK/2023/0217). Officers raised no concerns about the design and appearance of the rear extension when determining the previous application as the rear extension is considered an appropriate size and scale. The rear extension also complies with policies S1 and EQ6, the Residential Design Guide SPD and the NPPF.

Minor alterations

The proposed decking area is identical to that proposed in the refused application and Officers raised no concern with the proposed decking previously. It is considered to be of an appropriate scale and appearance.

The plans also illustrate the addition of a new bay window to the front reception room and PV panels on the front roof plane (existing house and extension) and two

skylights and a sun tunnel on the rear roof plane. All of these works are considered permitted development under GPDO Part 1 Class C & Part 14.

A Gabion retaining wall is also shown wrapping round the property from front to back where two new car parking spaces would be created. These works are considered PD under GPDO Part 2 Class A.

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 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 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.

The raised timber decking, 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.

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

As per the previous application, the site plan shows the provision of four off-road car parking spaces to the front and side of property. As noted by the Highways officer, the spaces are not independently accessible, cars parked at the front of the property will be required to move to let vehicles parked at the side of the house out onto the road. Whilst the Highway Officer has acknowledged that this is not ideal, they have not raised a formal objection to the application, or indeed the previous application.

The application is therefore considered to be acceptable having regard to LP Policy CF6 and paragraph 110 of the NPPF.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The revised scheme proposes a significantly reduced side extension which is now considered in keeping and proportionate the dwelling house. The proposal will not result in any adverse amenity impacts and is an acceptable design. Accordingly the application is recommended for approval.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Approve

Case Officer: Rosie Dinnen

Recommendation Date: 30.10.23

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council