

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2024/0336
Valid 13/08/2024

3 MOORSIDE CLOSE
SIMMONDLEY
GLOSSOP

DEMOLITION OF
CONSERVATORY AND
PROPOSED SINGLE STORE
REAR EXTENSION.

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site comprises a parcel of land to the west of Moorside Close, Simmondley, which lies within a relatively modern housing estate, flanked on either side by predominantly large detached properties with rear gardens.

The site itself contains No.3 Moorside Close; a two storey detached dwelling constructed in stone with a tiled hipped roof and its associated curtilage. The curtilage is made up of an area of hard standing to the front, a single storey ancillary garage which has since been extended upwards to form a two storey side extension with the main house; a conservatory, and a large garden to the rear.

The site is bounded by the highway to the east, and residential properties to the north (No.4 Moorside Close) and south (No.2 Moorside Close). Each property in this row is detached and has no uniform building line. The rear boundary to the west is shared with the rear garden boundaries of Nos.5, 7, and 9 Woodlea Road and the large rear garden of No.1 'Three Oaks' Simmondley New Road.

PROPOSAL

The application proposes demolishing the existing conservatory to the rear of the property and erecting a single storey rear extension with a flat roof and two roof lights, to create a large kitchen / diner.

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

Chapter 2: Achieving Sustainable Development

Chapter 12: Achieving Well Designed Places

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/0003/6739 Residential Development for 49 Units (Approved 13/05/98)

HPK/2018/0619 Conversion of existing garage into play room and first floor side extension over garage (Approved 08/03/2019)

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 14/10/2024

Neighbour consultation period ends: 04/09/2024

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None

Town / Parish Comments

None

Environmental Health

None

Derbyshire County Council Highways

No highway authority objections.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The property lies within the built up area boundary of Glossop, which is identified as a Market Town in the settlement hierarchy under Local Plan Policy S2 in recognition of it being a moderately sustainable location with access to services and facilities. Therefore, the principle of development is acceptable subject to a detailed assessment of relevant planning considerations.

Design

Policy S1 of the Local Plan sets out a number of sustainability principles which all new development proposals should incorporate in order to make a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities and to protect, and where possible enhance the environment.

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.

Policy EQ6 of the Local Plan states all development should be well designed and of a high quality that respects local distinctiveness and sense of place.

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.”*

chapter 9.4.1 states 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 proposed extension is single storey and modest in size, extending 3.32m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling, remaining largely subservient to the main dwelling house.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Residential Design SPD states flat roofs should be avoided, following discussions with the agent, it became clear other roof forms were considered, however, due to the presence of the rear first floor windows a pitched roof would not be possible without impacting these windows. Whilst it is noted the flat roof makes the extension appear somewhat contrived and bulky, due to the rear location it would not be visible from any public vantage points. As such, no harm would be caused to the street scene and in this instance the flat roof is considered to be acceptable.

The proposed materials are reconstituted stonework to match the existing dwelling, and concrete interlocking tiles to mimic the roof of the main dwelling house, with the introduction of ethylene propylene diene monomer (EPDM) roofing systems to overcome ongoing maintenance problems.

Accordingly, the siting, scale and proposed materials are considered appropriate and accord with the requirements of policies S1 and EQ6, 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 (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 property is a detached plot, sharing a border with No.2 and No.4 Moorside Close. The plans show proposed patio doors to the north elevation of the extension, which would result in overlooking into the conservatory of No. 4 Moorside. It is noted, the existing conservatory has double doors to the side, which results in some mutual overlooking between the subject property of No. 3 and the neighbouring No.4. However, the proposal would bring the patio doors approx. 3.8m closer to the conservatory of No.4. Resulting in a distance of some 8.75m between the proposed patio doors and side conservatory windows of No.4 Moorside, which does not satisfy the Council's privacy standards.

Given the above, it was suggested the applicant drop this feature from the proposal, following negotiations, the agent suggested these doors be obscure glazed as shown on the revised plans. The applicant suggested in addition to this they intend on extending the existing fence to the end of the boundary at a height of 1.8m from ground level. However, this element does not require planning permission and has not been assessed as part of this application. As such, it is recommended to impose a condition for the side elevation patio doors to be obscure glazed maintained for the life of the development to ensure that this privacy is retained.

The windows proposed on the west elevation overlook the rear garden of the property which is heavily screened by trees to the west, as such there are no privacy concerns regarding this element. There may be some overlooking into the garden space of No. 2, however, this is mutual between the two properties and due to the boundary fence this will be minimal. Additionally, the extension will result in a reduction in glazing compared to the existing conservatory, therefore improving privacy for the neighbouring garden.

Turning to the issue of over shadowing, given the single storey nature and orientation of the properties, there are no concerns regarding over shadowing or loss of light to No.4. The proposal sits only some 2.9m from the conservatory at No.2 Moorside, it is noted the existing conservatory is considered to be a lighter and less obtrusive structure than the proposed extension, with a high amount of glazing allowing some light to pass through. However, due to the change in ground levels, heavy boundary treatment and the fact the proposal sits to the north of No.2, no issues regarding overshadowing or loss of light will occur to this neighbour.

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

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. Therefore, the application is recommended for approval.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : **Approve with conditions**

Case Officer: Jennifer Robb

Recommendation Date: 11/10/2024

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council