

5 faDELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2024/0066
Valid 23/02/2024

35 FAIRY BANK CRESCENT
HAYFIELD

SINGLE STOREY REAR
EXTENSION

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

35 Fairy Bank Cres is a semi-detached dwellinghouse located in the Hayfield built-up area boundary. The dwelling is finished in pebbledash render with upvc windows. To the rear is a 3.4 by 3.4M outrigger.

The dwelling has off-street parking for 2 vehicles in tandem parking. This includes under a car port located to the side of the property.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for a rear extension. This will infill the existing outrigger to have it run the width of the rear elevation. The extension is proposed to have a single pitched roof with roof light and glazed rear doors.

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

HNT/2023/0008 Application to determine if prior approval is required for a proposed single storey rear extension measuring 3.4m beyond the rear wall of the existing dwelling, 3.74m maximum height and 2.5m to height of eaves REFUSED

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 02/04/2024
Neighbour consultation period ends: 21/03/2024
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None Received

Town / Parish Comments

N/A

Environmental Health

N/A

Derbyshire County Council Highways

No objection

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

LP Policy S 2 states that a moderate scale development which meets local needs should be allowed in large villages such as Hayfield. The above development is considered to be a moderate scale and is therefore acceptable in principle subject to consideration of the following policy and other material considerations.

Design

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.”

Paragraph 9.4.1 continues that “Appropriate extensions to the roofline can be made by extending the main roof to the side (a ‘catslide’ roof) 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.”

The High Peak Design Guide (SPD) at paragraph 5.5 states that all extensions should harmonise with the parent building and be subordinate to it in terms of its size and massing.

The proposed single pitched roof design and material finish complements that of the host dwelling. The proposal is slightly set in from the boundary with the attached neighbouring property providing a subordinate visual effect. This complies with the guidance of the Adopted residential design guide and the High Peak Design Guide. As such there are no design concerns.

Amenity

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 proposed rear extension breaches the 45 degrees in regards to a dining room windows (in the form of glazed rear doors) on the rear elevation of no. 37. The extension would breach this at a 50 degree angle.

During discussions for previous application HNT/2023/0008 the applicant considered a fallback position, whereby they could extend 3 M from the rear of the property, without adjoining the extension to the existing outrigger. While this would be unfavourable for the applicant it would be permitted development under the GPDO. This 3M extension would likewise breach the 45 degree angle.

In order to avoid a breach of the 45 degree angle the extension would be limited to an extension of 2.7M in depth from the original rear elevation, consequently the incursion into the 45 degree line amounts to 0.7m. This depth is below that which is typically accepted under the parameters of the GPDO (3m) and significantly below that which may be practicable under a further HNT application (a non attached extension at a depth of 6m). As such a valid fall-back position has been presented whereby the neighbouring amenity would be similarly breached.

Furthermore, the application site is located north-west of the adjoining neighbour no.37. As such no.37 benefits from the eastern morning sun, with minimal light being lost from the western setting sun. Overall it is considered that whilst the extension would intrude into the 45 degree line, this would amount to a minimal depth of 0.4m compared to what could be built under GPDO at 3m. Given these circumstances, the extension would not harm the residential amenities of the attached neighbour to a significant degree as to warrant a refusal of this application.

A side facing windows is proposed which will be located high in the wall (2m cill height) will be obscure glazed. This will not allow any overlooking into the neighbour amenity space to the rear and as such it will not present any privacy concerns.

Highway Safety

Off-street parking at the application site will not be altered, nor will the requirement for off-street parking be changed at the dwelling. 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 : Approval

Case Officer: Rachel Robinson

Recommendation Date: 22nd April 2024

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council