

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2024/0359
Valid 05/09/2024

37 EDEL HOUSE PARK
CRESCENT
GLOSSOP

DEMOLITION OF EXISTING
PORCH AND ERECTION OF
NEW PORCH AND
ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING
WINDOW AND DOOR
OPENINGS AND THE
CREATION OF NEW ONES

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

37 Park Crescent, also known as Edel House, is a detached dwellinghouse of red brick and hung tile fenestration. The dwelling is located within the Glossop built-up area boundary, adjacent to the open countryside. A public footpath runs along side the north and west boundaries of the application site. The dwelling has low boundary treatments comprising of a timber fence, low stone wall and red brick wall to the front.

The application site has an integral garage which can accommodate one off street vehicle. The dwelling also benefits from a large driveway which can accommodate a further two vehicles.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for a front porch and alterations to existing window and door openings. It is proposed to remove the existing front porch. This will be replaced with a single storey porch and front extension. The porch will be of brick to match the host dwelling with a single pitched roof. It is also proposed to replace the ground floor rear openings with three glazed doors. It is also proposed to install a Juliet balcony in the side elevation of the first floor bedroom and a first window on the northern elevation to serve an en-suite. One first floor window on the front elevation would change from a horizontal proportion to a vertical proportion.

Revised plans have removed cladding, render and a single storey side extension from the proposed scheme. Accordingly a revised description has been agreed with the agent.

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

Design Guide SPD 2018

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/0000/7758 three detached houses WITHDRAWN

HPK/0001/1830 For Proposed Erection Of 2 No Dwelling Units APPROVED

HPK/0002/3644 Single Storey Extension At Gable And Internal Alterations
APPROVED

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 30/10/2024
Neighbour consultation period ends: 04/10/2024
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

Neither (0)
Objection (0)
Support (1)

I fully support this application to improve the property, which is designed in keeping with its direct neighbour and other local properties which are rendered on Kingsmoor Fields and Hall Meadow Rd.

Town / Parish Comments

n/a

Environmental Health

n/a

Derbyshire County Council Highways

No objection:

The submitted plans appear to indicate that the existing garage is to be significantly reduced in size with the effect that the garage will not be a suitable size to accommodate a vehicle. However, it is considered that there is suitable parking provision available to the front of the dwelling with or without the use of the garage. It is considered that the proposed alterations and extensions will have no highway impact, therefore, there are no highway authority objections to the application.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

Local Plan (LP) Policy S 2 states that development should be directed towards sustainable locations, including Market Towns such as Glossop. The site is situated within this built-up area boundary. Therefore, the principle of the development is acceptable subject to consideration of the following considerations.

Design

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

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

The High Peak Design Guide (SPD) (2018) paragraph 3.9 continues that new buildings should use facing materials that either match or complement those of the surroundings. Under certain circumstances, new materials can sometimes be used as a foil to more traditional materials to highlight and bring out their qualities.

Paragraph 7.20 continues that lime render was used over porous or inferior rubble stonework to give added protection to the wall. From the 18th century onwards, however, it was sometimes used for aesthetic reasons – to give a building more presence and a smarter appearance closer to fashionable look of stucco. The use of traditional renders has a role in sensitive locations such as in conservation areas and on listed buildings although they have maintenance implications. Elsewhere, modern

through-coloured acrylic render systems may be acceptable in certain circumstances.

Paragraph 7.24 continues that there is no tradition of external timber boarding in High Peak.

Revised plans removed a disproportionate single storey side extension as well as proposed render and cladding from the proposed scheme. It was considered that these elements were contrary to the high Peak Design Guide (SPD).

The revised scheme proposes a single storey porch and front extension. This extension reads as a porch and bay window, with single pitched roof. This appears subordinate in nature to the host dwelling and is of materials to match. As such the design of the porch is considered acceptable.

It is also proposed to install a Juliet balcony into the side elevation of the existing front projection. This will be viewed from the road when approaching the application site from the south (figure 1). Park crescent is made up of a number of dwellings of differing styles. No. 31 and 33 have a number of mis matched side facing windows (figure 1). Side elevations within the High Peak are characteristically blank, with minimal fenestration details. However, figure 1 demonstrates that this is not the case in regards to Park Crescent, which has a number of dwelling houses with side facing windows. As such the proposed juliet balcony is considered acceptable in this case.



Figure 1 – google street scene of no 29 – 37 Park Crescent

Moreover the addition of a small window to the first floor of the north elevation would compliment the existing windows and would not harm the character of the property. The revised window on the front elevation at first floor, whilst having vertical emphasis would sit above the front door and although at odds with the horizontal

windows on the front elevation would not be so harmful as to justify a refusal of this application.

Overall the proposed extension and revisions/addition of windows would not harm the character of the property or the wide street scene.

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

The proposed front extension will replace an existing bay window and porch. Due to the location of the front extension it will not cause overlooking or overshadowing of any neighbouring dwellings and inhabitable rooms.

The proposed juliet balcony will overlook the street scene, and neighbouring driveway. The balcony will not cause overlooking into any inhabitable rooms or amenity spaces. As such there are no amenity concerns. With respect to the proposed window to the northern elevation this would overlook a wooded area and therefore cause no overlooking or loss of privacy to any neighbour.

Highway Safety

LP Policy CF 6 states that all development should deliver sustainable patterns of development by ensuring that it does not lead to an increase in on street parking to the detriment of the free and safe flow of traffic. CF6 further requires applicants to submit details of parking which included the proposed parking provision based on an assessment of the parking needs of the development.

DCC Highways have not objected to the scheme, stating that the driveway is large enough to accommodate the parking needs of the host dwelling, in addition to the existing garage. As such there are no highway safety concerns.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

Following the receipt of revised plans the development is considered acceptable in terms of design, amenity and highway safety. It is considered to be in accordance with the relevant policies put forward in the Local Plan, Design SPD and the NPPF. Therefore this application is recommended for approval.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Approved

Case Officer: Rachel Robinson

Recommendation Date: 9th January 2025

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council