

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2024/0397
Valid 19/09/2024

34 PARK ROAD
HADFIELD
GLOSSOP

DEMOLITION OF EXISTING
SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION
AND ERECTION OF
REPLACEMENT SINGLE
STOREY REAR EXTENSION

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design, Character and Appearance
- Amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application relates to No.34 Park Road, Hadfield, a two storey terraced property which lies southwest of the public highway, and benefits from a modest rear garden, bounded on either side by residential properties, with No.36 situated to the south-east and No.32 located to the north-west with the latter experiencing a notable change in land levels and finished floor levels between comparable to the application site.

The site is located within the built-up area boundary of Hadfield and is not constrained by any sensitive statutory designation.

PROPOSAL

The application in its original form sought permission for extensions and other aspects of domestic development within the curtilage. However, owing to concerns raised by Officers, the application now proposes the removal of an existing single storey extension and a replacement, supplemented by a narrow external landing and flight of steps.

As such, the suite of plans subject to assessment within this report is as follows:

- Site Location Plan (Ref: 24(13)010)
- Proposed Site Plan (Ref: 24(13)020 Rev A)
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan (Ref: 24(13)200 Rev D)
- Proposed First Floor Plan (Ref: 24(13)201 Rev A)
- Proposed Rear Elevation (Ref: 24(13)210 Rev A)
- Proposed Side Elevation (Ref: 24(13)211 Rev C)
- Proposed Internal Side Elevation (Ref: 24(13)212 Rev C)

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Act 2004 requires proposals to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan taking into consideration any material considerations relevant to the determination of the application.

High Peak Local Plan 2016

S1 Sustainable Development Principles
S1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
EQ6 Design and Place Making

Supplementary Planning Documents

Residential Design Guide SPD (2005)
Design Guide SPD (2018)

National Planning Policy Framework 2023

Achieving Sustainable Development Chapter 2
Achieving Well Designed and Beautiful Places Chapter 12

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/0000/8899 Proposed Vehicular Access (Refused)

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 24th October 2024
Neighbour consultation period ends: 10th October 2024
Neighbour re-consultation period ends: 11th November 2024
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

1no. neutral comment has been received in connection with the application that raises the following issues:

- Seek clarification on what is stated on the revised Site Plan in relation to No.36 Park Road

1no. objection was received in connection with the plans as originally submitted that raised the following concerns:

- Procedural matters relating to annotations stating 'Do not Scale' on drawings
- Introduction of timber cladding not in keeping with area
- Raised patio triggers overlooking and privacy issues

Town / Parish Comments

N/A

Environmental Health

No comments to make

Derbyshire County Council Highways

No objections

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application seeks full planning permission for extension and alterations to an existing residential property that lies within the built-up area boundary of Hadfield, identified as a Larger Village under Local Plan (LP) Policy S2 that is capable of accommodating development of a modest scale. The site is not constrained by any sensitive statutory designation.

Given the nature of proposed development and planning policy context set out above, the principle of development is considered to be acceptable subject to an assessment of all material considerations.

Design Character and Appearance

LP Policy S1 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.

LP Policy EQ6 states that all development should be well designed to respect and contribute positively to the character, identity and context of High Peak's townscapes, having regard to matters of scale, height, density, layout, appearance and materials.

The High Peak Residential Design Guide SPD (2005) and more recently adopted Design Guide SPD (2018) contains further design guidance for extending and altering domestic properties. Extensions and alterations should respect the scale and height of the parent building reading as a subordinate and secondary addition and respecting the character and appearance of the building through an appropriate choice of materials.

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states amongst other things that decisions should ensure that developments will add to the overall quality of the area; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture; and are sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.

The existing rear elevation is characterised by a rather unsympathetic single storey lean-to extension, with the main house constructed, like its neighbour No.36 in a traditional gritstone.

In assessing the proposal in its original form, Officers raised concerns with regards to its design and appearance as expressed by way of an email dated 09/10/2024, which stated the following:

“Whilst I acknowledge that a wholly unsympathetic two storey flat roof extension has been introduced at No.30, there is no planning history for this aspect of development, and is therefore likely to have been added either without consent, or before planning history records go back to in 1974. The presence of unsympathetic development does not condone further unsympathetic development from being approved.

There are three issues relating to Design that are problematic and require attention. The first is the choice of materials at first floor level which are completely unacceptable. Any extension should be constructed from matching gritstone in its entirety.

A secondary issue is the height of the eaves shown in the rear extension comparable to the main house. The eaves should be raised so that there is consistency between existing and proposed.

Third, (notwithstanding potential harm to residential amenity) the privacy screen shown to be 1.8m high is in fact 3.0m above finished ground floor level, and therefore requires planning permission in its own right. This aspect is not at all characteristic of this row of terraced properties and is not appropriate.”

In response to these concerns, the applicant decided to re-design the scheme so that the proposal simply amounts to a replacement single storey rear extension, supplemented by a flight of steps and landing area providing access to the garden area.

These plans show a significant improvement in design terms comparable to those originally submitted with the extension now reading as a subordinate and secondary addition that respects the proportions and dominance of the main house, and, owing to the unsympathetic appearance of the existing extension, and that the replacement extension would be finished in a high quality natural stone with tiled roof, is judged to result in a modest visual enhancement.

As such, in its final revised form, the application is considered to satisfactorily address initial concerns raised by Officers and neighbouring residents, and now aligns with the design principles set out under LP Policies S1 and EQ6, relevant Supplementary Design Guidance and relevant paragraphs under Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

Amenity

LP Policy EQ6 requires all new development to have a satisfactory relationship with existing land and buildings and protects the amenity of the area, which includes residential amenity of neighbouring properties. Aspects of residential amenity include impacts such as a loss of sunlight, overshadowing and overbearing impacts, loss of outlook, and loss of privacy.

The High Peak Residential Design Guide SPD requires extensions to preserve the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, having regard amongst other things to the relationship between existing and proposed development, the positioning of windows, and the change in land levels.

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that planning should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

The application in its original form generated significant concerns from both Officers and neighbouring residents, which were expressed in the email to the applicant on 09/10/2024, which stated the following with regards to potential impacts to amenity:

“..there is a significant change in levels between the rear amenity area of No.34 and that of No.32. I would therefore like to see some Section drawings showing the change in levels, the boundary treatment, and the proposed elevations.

Raised patios are unlikely to be acceptable to the rear of terraced properties where the relationship with the neighbour is so close, even more so when there is a change in land levels. The proposed patio would, irrespective of the privacy screen, still result in harmful overlooking into the rest of the neighbouring rear gardens on both sides, and given that the privacy screen is not acceptable in design terms, would be worsened should this be removed.

As such, the raised patio and privacy screen would need to be omitted in order for the application to be successful.”

The site is bounded on both sides by residential development with rear gardens not benefiting from much in the way of boundary treatment. As such, this site is highly sensitive to any domestic extensions, alterations and other development.

The applicant responded to these comments by omitting the proposed raised patio area, and in light of the extent of the extensions also being reduced, satisfactorily addressed these initial concerns.

The extension does not project significantly beyond the adjoining neighbours extension and sufficient distance is maintained to the boundary to the other side to avoid any overshadowing of principal windows arising from the slightly greater projection when compared to the existing extension.

As such, in its revised form, the proposed single storey rear extension, by virtue of its modest scale and height, lack of habitable windows in any side elevation, and reducing the external landing area to that which cannot realistically be used for amenity purposes, prevents any overlooking, overbearing or privacy impacts, and as

such, the latest plans are found to comply with LP Policy EQ6, the Residential Design Guide SPD, and paragraph 135 of the NPPF in that regard.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

LP Policy S1a reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It states that planning applications that accord with relevant policies in the Local Plan will be approved without delay.

Paragraph 11 of the NPPF sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision taking, this means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or, where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission, unless:

- the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

The application seeks full planning permission in its revised form for the removal of a single storey rear extension and replacement of a similar single storey extension, supplemented by a flight of stone steps and narrow external landing.

Owing to a change to the description of development and submission of revised plans, the application has been subject to a full neighbour re-consultation, and assessed following the conclusion of this period.

Having regard to the latest set of revised plans, the application is considered to be of a high quality design that will result in a modest visual enhancement of the site, by virtue of the choice of high quality materials, and having a modest scale and height. Similarly, the proposed single storey extension would not result in any harm to residential amenity, thereby addressing initial concerns raised by Officers and neighbouring residents.

As such, in its final revised form, the application is considered to constitute a sustainable form of development and in line with LP Policy S1a and paragraph 11 of the NPPF is recommended for approval subject to appropriate conditions.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Approve with Conditions

Case Officer: James Stannard

Recommendation Date: 18th November 2024

X *B.S. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council