

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2024/0003
Valid 09/01/2024

10 HALL MEADOW ROAD
GLOSSOP

PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY
REAR EXTENSION

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Amenity
- Design

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

10 Hall Meadow is a detached bungalow, raised slightly above the highway. The application site is relatively small in size with off street parking for 1 vehicle. The dwellinghouse is finished in white render.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for a single storey rear extension. The extension will extend 3M from the rear elevation and run the width of the host dwelling. it will be finished in white render to match the host dwelling. a dual pitched roof will sit slightly below that of the host dwelling.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Local Plan 2016

S 1 Sustainable Development Principles
S 1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
S 2 Settlement Hierarchy
EQ 6 Design and Place Making
CF 6 Accessibility and Transport

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 4
Section 12

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

No previous site history

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 20/02/2024

Neighbour consultation period ends: 01/02/2024

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

Support (0)

Objection (0)

Neither(2)

- Concerns regarding side facing window of no.12
- Request for extension to be finished in white
- Concerns regarding side facing windows of no. 8

Town / Parish Comments

N/A

Environmental Health

N/A

Derbyshire County Council Highways

No objection

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

LP Policy S 2, which states that development should be directed towards sustainable locations, including Market Towns such as Buxton. The site is situated within this built-up area boundary. Therefore the principle of the development is acceptable subject to consideration of the following policy.

Design

Section 12 Paragraph 135(c) of the NPPF states that development should be sympathetic to the character and history of the area, while not restricting change.

LP Policy EQ 6 states that all development should be well designed, of a high quality and respond to the areas character, history and scale.

The Adopted Residential (SPD) (2005) chapter 9 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.”

The proposed extension will extend 3M from the rear elevation with a pitched roof. the roof pitched nicely mimics that of the host dwelling and front bay window. Therefore fits the character of the host dwelling. The ridge line is set below that of the host dwelling to appear subordinate in appearance. The proposed fenestration match the character of the host dwelling.

Overall no design concerns.

Amenity

Section 12 Paragraph 135(f) of the NPPF states that development should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

LP Policy EQ 6 states that all development should achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and doesn't cause unacceptable effects by reason of vision intrusion, overlooking, shadowing, overbearing effect, noise, light pollution or other adverse impacts on local character and amenity.

The Adopted Residential (SPD) (2005) paragraph 8.6.1 states that there should be 21 metres between adjacent inhabitable windows to provide an acceptable level of amenity.

1 Kingsmoor Road sits to the rear of the application site. The rear elevation windows of no.1 will be approx. 10 - 15M from the proposed rear windows of the 10 Hall Meadow. This is significantly below the recommended guidance distance. The applicant therefore proposes to install 2M fencing to the rear boundary to provide privacy for both dwellings. As the proposed fence will be located to the north of no. 1 Kingsmoor Rd, there will be no loss of light to these rear windows. As such this is considered acceptable.

No. 12 Hall Meadow Rd features a side facing window facing the application site. This window is a secondary window to a room otherwise served by a rear conservatory. This window will see some overbearing by the proposed extension. However, the applicant has a potential fallback position of a 4M rear extension under the provisions of the GPDO should the current proposal be refused. In which case the window in question would likewise suffer overbearing. Therefore given the potential fallback position and that the these windows are secondary the proposal is considered acceptable in regards to no.12. No.12 has a conservatory to the rear of similar projection to the proposed extension and therefore, no overshadowing of principal windows in the rear elevation will occur. No side windows are proposed facing that dwelling.

No. 8 Hall Meadow Rd have raised concerns regarding a side facing bedroom window which will suffer a lack of privacy. However the proposed side window which will face the bedroom of no.8 will serve a kitchen and utility area. This is a space in which minimal time is considered to be spent, minimising the potential for a lack of privacy. The other proposed side window which will serve a dining area will look out

upon no 8. However, this outlook is protected by some vegetation within the curtilage of no.8 and an existing boundary fence. However, some overlooking may still occur and therefore an obscured glazing condition would seem prudent given that the proposed windows will be secondary and thus there will be no loss of principal outlook. Given the limited distance between the elevations, there is some potential for overshadowing as a result of the proposed extension which is located to the east. However, previous planning application HPK/2014/0292 demonstrates that the neighbour's window in this location that would be affected serves a 'link' structure between the main dwelling and garage, as such is not considered to be a room in which much time is spent. Overall there are no amenity concerns.

Highway Safety

LP Policy CF 6 states that all development should deliver sustainable patterns of development by ensuring that it does not lead to an increase in on street parking to the detriment of the free and safe flow of traffic.

The proposal will not lead to an increase in bedroom at the application site, therefore will not increase the demand for off-street parking. Furthermore the existing provision for off-street parking will not be impacted by the proposal. As such there are no highway safety concerns.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The development is considered acceptable in terms of design, amenity and highway safety. It is considered to be in accord with the relevant policies put forward in the Local Plan and the NPPF. Therefore this application is recommended for approval.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Rachel Robinson

Recommendation Date: 5th March 2024

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council