

## DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

---

HPK/2024/0504  
Valid 13/12/2024

13 LEE VALE DRIVE  
CHARLESWORTH

PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR  
SIDE EXTENSION

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

---

### MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Neighbouring Amenity

### DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site relates to a two-storey detached dwelling house located within the development boundary of Charlesworth. The dwelling forms part of a wider residential estate of very similar house type with characteristically very little spacing between.

The dwellings along Lee Vale Drive generally feature a single storey attached garage. Several of the neighbouring properties have extended at first floor level above the existing garage, keeping the front building line and plane of the extended roof line in line with the existing.

### PROPOSAL

This application seeks consent for first floor side extension, above the existing attached garage.

The extension will follow the ridge line of the existing dwelling and meet the front and rear building lines. The extension will be constructed in buff brick to match the existing dwelling.

### 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

## **Supplementary Planning Documents**

Residential Design SPD 2005  
High Peak Design Guide 2018

## **SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS**

Single Storey Kitchen Extension – Approved 24/06/1996

## **CONSULTATIONS**

### **Publicity**

Site Notice expiry date: 04/02/2025  
Neighbour consultation period ends: 09/01/2025  
Press Advert: N/A

### **Public Comments**

None

### **Town / Parish Comments**

None

## **Derbyshire County Council Highways**

No Objection:

“The application will increase the number of bedrooms at the dwelling from three to four; it is noted that there is no proposed increase in the parking provision at the dwelling.

Whilst the onsite parking provision will remain at two spaces (including the garage), it is considered that the potential for additional on street parking generated by the additional bedroom will not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety and does not warrant an objection to the application.”

## **OFFICER COMMENTS**

### **Principle of Development**

The application site is located within the Built-up area of Glossopdale. Householder extensions are acceptable in principle within the Built-up Area under the terms of High Peak Local Plan Policies S2 and S5 but are subject to other relevant local plan policies such as Policy EQ6 which makes provision for design and amenity.

## 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 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 proposed first floor extension will be above the existing attached garage and will extend the width of the host dwelling. Having regard to the adopted High Peak Design Guide (2018), the authority are keen to encourage set back distances particularly at first floor level, to ensure that the existing dwelling can be clearly read alongside the new extension. This is more crucial on semi-detached or terraced properties in order to avoid a terracing effect where the gaps between properties are typically smaller.

It is noted that similar extensions have been permitted elsewhere along this road. Whilst some do not go the full width of the house and are set down from the main ridge and appear subordinate. Officers have noted there are examples similar to the application proposal, (including the neighbouring No.14) which have been extended in a like manner. Given this precedent has already been set it would be unreasonable to expect this extension to be stepped in from the principal elevation and down from the ridge line. Throughout the wider area of Lee Vale Drive are detached houses, some of which extending at first floor level. As such, although the extension would sit flush with the existing front and rear building lines, it would not appear disproportionate when compared to surrounding houses.

Dwellings on the street are slightly staggered and follow the natural sloped topography of the area. Although properties are located close together, the stepped front building line will reduce the potential for terracing. The scale and height of the application, whilst not set down and set back from the front wall, (a requirement of the Design Guide) is considered to be proportionate and balanced comparable to the main house. As such, it is considered that when having regard to the established characteristics of similar first floor extensions on Lee Vale Drive, and the fact that No.13 is a detached property and is much less susceptible to a terracing effect, the proposed extension is, on balance, of an acceptable scale, height, massing and visual appearance.

The proposed materials are coursed brick and cladding to match those of the host dwelling, in keeping with the character of the main dwelling house and the street scene. The use of tile hanging with a brick pier will create a visual break between old and new materials.

Accordingly, the siting, scale and proposed materials are considered appropriate and accord with the requirements of policies S1 and EQ6, and 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 inhabitable windows to provide an acceptable level of amenity.

The property is a detached plot, with two neighbouring properties, no.11 to the south and no.15 to the north. It is not considered the neighbouring property to the south would be adversely affected by the proposal since the extension would be situated on the gable end away from this neighbour.

The properties along this estate are characteristically close together, there would be just under 2m between the proposal and no. 15 Lee Vale Drive to the north. The proposal would not extend beyond the rear elevation of the dwelling and would thus not breach the 45-degree angle used to assess whether a proposal would adversely affect a neighbour's right to sunlight, this neighbour also has no side facing windows on the southern elevation. As such, there would be no adverse impacts upon this neighbouring property in terms of overshadowing, loss of light or loss of privacy.

The application site shares its rear boundary with no.36 Church Fold to the west, there is approx. 26m between the proposed first floor rear window and no.36, well above the Council's privacy standards.

The property on the opposite side of the public highway, no.16 Lee Vale Drive, stands at just over 27m from the first-floor window to the front elevation, again well above the Council's requirements and the privacy of this dwelling will not be affected by the proposed extension.

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**

Notwithstanding the comments submitted by DCC, the proposal will not lead to an increase in bedrooms at the application, it will lead to an increase in size to one of the bedrooms. Therefore, the development 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 C 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**

**Case Officer: Jennifer Robb**

**Recommendation Date: 30/01/2025**

X *B.S. Haywood*

---

Signed by: Ben Haywood

**On behalf of High Peak Borough Council**