

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2024/0175
Valid 26/04/2024

82 SUNNYFIELDS
SHEFFIELD ROAD
GLOSSOP

PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY
REAR AND FRONT
EXTENSION.
ROOF ALTERATIONS AND
REAR / FRONT DORMER
EXTENSIONS

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of development
- Design
- Residential amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site is a four-bedroom detached dormer bungalow in a residential area of Glossop, located on Sheffield Road, within the built-up area boundary. The dwelling is a set back from the road. The property previously featured large mature (but non-protected) trees at the front of the site, but these were removed prior to submission of the recent planning applications. Consequently the site is very open and prominent in street views.

Works have already commenced on site to build the extensions to the front and the rear of the property.

PROPOSAL

This application is a resubmission following the refusal of HPK/2023/0427.

The application proposes:

- At ground floor a full width extension to the rear of the property, measuring 4m deep and 12.2m wide. At first floor level to the rear a nearly full width dormer is proposed at first floor level which includes two windows and a Juliet balcony.
- To the front it is proposed to add 4sq.m to the ground floor and add a pitched roof which spans across the 10m width with a 6.1m ridge height and 2.55m to the eaves.
- A porch is proposed to be added to the front elevation which is 1.8m and 3.7m wide it has a pitched roof with a ridge of 3.8m.
- The main roof of the property will change from a hipped roof to a pitched roof with a gable roof to the front. The main pitch roof has a ridge of 6.4m and 2.6m to eaves.
- Three full length windows are proposed to the eastern elevation to provide additional lighting to the lounge.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

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

National Planning Policy Framework

Paragraph 11 The Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
Section 4 Decision-making
Section 12 Achieving well-designed places

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/2023/0427 - Proposed single storey rear and front extension. roof alterations and rear / front dormer extensions – Refused 06.03.24

HPK/2022/0534 - Proposed single storey rear and front extension. Roof alterations and rear / front dormer extensions – Refused 02.03.23 & Appeal dismissed - 07.08.23

HPK/2022/0236 - Proposed single storey rear and front extension. Roof alterations and rear / front dormer extensions – refused 21.10.22

HPK/0000/8304 – For proposed kitchen extension to house and detached garage – date unknown.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 06.06.24
Neighbour consultation period ends: 06.06.24

Public Comments

No comment received from neighbouring properties.

Cllr Hardy has written in to confirm that he supports the application and considers the design to be acceptable.

Derbyshire County Council Highways

No Objection.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application site located within a built-up area boundary, where new development will be directed in accordance with Policy S2. Accordingly, the general principle of development is considered to be acceptable, subject to design and amenity policies.

Extensive discussions have taken place between the applicant, agent and planning officers since the last application was refused HPK/2023/0427. The applicant commenced works on site prior to the appeal being determined in 2023. It was alleged by the applicant that some of these works were permitted development such as the rear extension; however, this is not the case as the proposal involves changing the height of the roof (greater than 4m) and therefore planning permission is required. Furthermore, works to the front of house require planning permission, as any works fronting a highway require planning permission including the porch as it larger than the 3sq.m allowed by the GPDO.

Design

Local Plan Policy EQ6 requires developments to be well designed and delivered to a high quality.

Section 12 of the NPPF places emphasis on the requirement for development to achieve good design and that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Paragraph 134 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 adopted High Peak Design Guide 2018 sets out the parameters which new development should respond to. All development, whether a house extension or larger building should be in accordance with paragraph 3.11:

There are some basic principles that need to be respected if the new is to harmonise successfully with the old. These relates to three main characteristics of traditional elevations:

- *A balance of proportions between the overall shape of the walls and the openings they contain.*
- *A high solid to void ratio in which the wall dominates.*
- *A simple arrangement of openings, usually in the form (often symmetrical) in the case of houses, and informal in the case of outbuildings.*

In respect to extensions, it states at paragraph 5.2 that:

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 buildings character. The aim should be to revitalise the building without altering its fundamental character.

Paragraph 5.5 continues:

All 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. Setting back the new section from the building line and keeping the eaves and ridge lower than the parent building will normally help.

Paragraph 7.5 states:

There are many traditional window patterns found locally. Nearly all however have a vertical emphasis to their overall shape as well as some degree of subdivision.

The Adopted Residential (SPD) (2005) paragraph 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.”

As previously noted, three previous applications have been refused for the site because the proposals were not subservient to the main dwelling house and dominated its appearance.

The proposals will significantly alter the appearance of the original house, which was originally built as a bungalow but has had a front extension and a dormer window added in the past. Although the original form has in part been lost by the works that have already commenced on site. The proposal to the front of the property is an improvement on the previous scheme which involved dormer windows and a significant first floor addition over the front. The extension to the front is mainly just squaring off by adding 4sq.m to the north west corner and the addition of a front porch. The main change to these extensions will be the addition of a pitched roof over the front extension (existing and proposed) and with the pitched porch in front of this. Therefore the view from the street will be significantly different.

Behind the front extension the roof form to the main part of the dwelling house will also change from hipped to pitched. The current hipped roof has a ridge height of 5.5m whereas the pitched roof will have a ridge height of 6.3m. Two rooflights are proposed on the front roof slope which will provide light to a bedroom and en-suite.

The rear extension is full width at ground level (4m deep and 12.2m wide) and almost as large at first floor level with a nearly full width dormer extension. This element is unchanged from previous applications. It is not an ideal design solution but was an element that was not criticised by the Inspector in the recent appeal decision. Ultimately the applicant has sought to maximise developable area of 1.5 storey property, requiring a large dormer extension to provide first floor accommodation rather than redeveloping the plot to provide a new 2 storey, which has resulted in the proposals being contrived to fit within the 1.5 storey parameters.

In the context of the three previous applications and planning appeal, the proposed scheme is considered an improvement and design is considered acceptable and satisfies with policies S1 and EQ6, the Residential Design Guide SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity

Local Plan Policy EQ6 requires development to achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and to not cause unacceptable effects by reason of visual intrusion, overlooking, shadowing, overbearing effect, noise, light pollution or other adverse impacts on local character and amenity.

Part 9 of the High Peak Residential Design SPD sets out the parameters against which residential extensions will be assessed. Whilst the extensions would be substantial and would increase the overall verticality of the building, they would be set sufficiently far away from the neighbouring properties to avoid significant harm to their residential amenity, including in terms of over overbearing effects, visual intrusion, overshadowing or loss of privacy.

The Juliette balcony would face towards the neighbouring house at the rear, which is set sufficiently far away (around 35m from elevation to elevation) to avoid a harmful level of overlooking.

The proposals therefore satisfy the requirements of local plan policy EQ6 with regards to residential amenity considerations.

Highway Safety

No alterations to access or parking arrangements are proposed. The proposal would involve the increase of bedrooms from four to five, resulting in to change to the requirement for off-street parking relative to the adopted guideline standards. There is sufficient area at the front of the property to accommodate three parking spaces. The proposal is not considered to give rise to any harm to highway safety.

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

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The revised scheme proposes extensions which are less harmful to the streetscene and more subservient to the main 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: 18.06.24

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council