

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2024/0206
Valid 21/05/2024

51 POST STREET
PADFIELD
GLOSSOP

SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION
TO THE REAR ELEVATION

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Residential Amenity
- Conservation Area

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site lies within the built up area boundary of Padfield as defined by the Local Plan policies map, and also sits within the Padfield Conservation Area. The application site of 51 Post Street relates to an end of terrace coursed stone dwelling house with a generous garden to the rear. The property is situated on the North West side of Post Street which runs between Padfield Main Road and Platt Street. The dwelling is situated over two stories with a driveway.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks permission for a single storey extension to the rear elevation of the property, with the inclusion of three sky lights, to enlarge the existing kitchen. The proposed extension would infill the space between the side elevation and the rear two storey outrigger.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Local Plan 2016

S 1 Sustainable Development Principles
S 1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
S5 Glossopdale sub-area Strategy
EQ 6 Design and Place Making
EQ7 Built and Historic Environment
CF 6 Accessibility and Transport

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

Residential Design (2005)
Padfield Conservation Area Appraisal (2015)

National Planning Policy Framework

Chapter 2: Achieving Sustainable Development

Chapter 12: Achieving Well Designed Places

Chapter 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

None

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 24/06/2024

Neighbour consultation period ends: 07/07/2024

Press Advert: 13/06/2024

Public Comments

None

Town / Parish Comments

None

Environmental Health

None

Derbyshire County Council Highways

None

Conservation Officer

04/07/2024:

Objection:

“The Heritage Statement is weak does not meet paragraph 200 of the NPPF (2023) and therefore there is not a sufficient level of detail accompanying the scheme. Further, there are no existing plans that accompany the application. There are only proposed drawings.

I cannot assess this with large portions of information missing. I suggest revisions are made or withdrawal.”

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The property lies within the settlement of Padfield as defined by the Local Plan Policies Map which is located within the Glossopdale sub-area. Policy S5 seeks to promote sustainable growth within Glossopdale through promoting and maintaining the identity of its settlements. Therefore, the principle of development in this location is considered to be acceptable subject to a detailed assessment of relevant planning considerations.

Design and Heritage (Impact on Conservation Area)

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.

Section 16 Paragraph 205 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

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

LP Policy EQ 7 states that the council will conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

The Adopted Residential Design Guide (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 site lies within Padfield Conservation Area. The application property is an end of terrace unit which is located along Post Street which was incrementally developed with rows of terraced properties in the mid-19th century. The dwellings predominantly have small stone walled front and rear gardens. It is considered that such matters are characteristic of the Conservation Area, and contribute towards the significance of the heritage asset when considered as a whole. However, with this being an end of terrace dwelling, it boasts a more generous enclosed rear garden.

The proposed extension is modest in size, extending approximately 4m from the rear of the dwelling, and approximately 2.4m in width, which infills the space between the side elevation and the rear two storey outrigger. The proposed materials are coursed stone to match the existing dwelling, with Velux windows, French doors to the rear and a slate roof to mimic the host dwelling.

I note that concern has been raised by the Conservation Officer. However, given the nature of the extension being single storey and the fact the extension will be infilling the space between the side elevation and the rear two storey outrigger, the proposed extension will not be visible from the front of the dwelling. The extension can only be seen from the detached converted chapel building to the North East of the site, the adjoining property also has an adjoining two storey outrigger which obscures the view of the proposed extension. Therefore, there would be no impact on the street scene and the proposal would not harm the significance of the Conservation Area.

With all of the above considered, the siting, scale and proposed materials are considered appropriate and accord with the requirements of policies S1, EQ6, and EQ7, the Residential Design Guide SPD and the NPPF.

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 Design Guide (SPD) (2005) paragraph 8.6.1 states that there should be 21 metres between adjacent habitable windows to provide an acceptable level of amenity.

The proposal includes French doors situated on the rear (west) elevation of the extension, however, these front on to the rear garden and therefore, matters relating to overlooking and privacy would not arise. The extension would not project beyond the existing outrigger and therefore there would be no overshadowing or overbearing impacts on the attached dwelling. Given the distance to the neighbouring flats to the other side, coupled with the single storey nature of the proposal it is not considered that there would be any overbearing impacts of loss of light on the windows in the side elevation of the adjoining building.

A new first floor window is also proposed but this would serve a bathroom rather than a habitable room and is likely to be obscure glazed. However, sufficient distance would be maintained to the properties to the rear to avoid any loss of privacy and therefore a condition is not considered necessary.

As such, it is considered that the introduction of the side extension would not give rise to any overbearing impacts, overshadowing, loss of outlook or loss of privacy. 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

The proposal will not lead to an increase in bedrooms at the application site, therefore, will not increase 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 and the proposal complies with local plan policy CF 6.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of design and amenity and will not result in any adverse amenity impacts and is of acceptable design and is considered to be in accordance with the relevant policies put forward in the Local Plan and NPPF. Additionally, it is considered the proposal would not detract from and have no adverse impact on the character of the Conservation Area. Therefore, the application is recommended for approval.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Approve

Case Officer: Rosie Dinnen/ Jennifer Robb
Recommendation Date: 16/07/2024

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council