

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2025/0065
Valid 28/02/2025

28 FAUVEL ROAD
GLOSSOP

SIDE EXTENSIONS OVER 2
FLOORS WITH SINGLE
STOREY REAR EXTENSION

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design, Character and Appearance
- Impact upon Residential Amenity
- Impact upon Highway Safety and Parking

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site relates to a two storey semi-detached property located on Fauvel Road within the established settlement boundary area for Glossop. The site is a 20th Century semi-detached red brick and part rendered property.

The application site is located opposite to the Norfolk Square Conservation Area and faces onto the Fauvel Rd playing fields. The surrounding area predominantly comprises of two-storey semi-detached red brick and rendered dwellings which are similar to the application site.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks planning permission for a two storey side extension further to a single storey rear extension.

The proposed two storey extension element would extend 3.5m from the existing side elevation and would have a depth of 7.55m, set back 0.3m from the front elevation, and flush with the existing rear two storey element of the host dwelling. The proposed development would feature a hipped roof of a matching pitch and profile to that of the existing dwelling. The proposed two storey element would measure 5m in height to the eaves and have a maximum height of 7.3m to the ridge, set down 0.3m from the ridge height of the existing property.

The proposed single storey rear extension element would extend 2.5m from the rear elevation of the proposed two storey extension and would be flush with the existing rear extension of the existing dwelling. The proposed rear extension comprises a lean-to roof to match that of the existing rear extension. The proposals would use red facing brick and render 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
S2 Settlement Hierarchy
EQ 6 Design and Place Making
EQ 7 Built and Historic Environment
CF 6 Accessibility and Transport

Supplementary Planning Documents

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

National Planning Policy Framework

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

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

No relevant planning history

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 03/04/2025
Neighbour consultation period ends:
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

One neighbour objection has been received. Their comments are as follows:

The proposed extension will greatly reduce the amount of natural light into my kitchen. The design of my semi detached differs to the others on Fauvel Road in the way that my kitchen windows are to the side of the property, overlooking my drive and onto number 28 Fauvel Road. These are two small narrow windows, I do not have a kitchen window at the back of the house that looks out onto the garden as there is a utility room in between. There is also an issue with significant loss of natural light to my back garden in the mornings, this will be reduced by a two storey extension being built as there is only a small gap between the roof tops of the two

houses that allows light, especially sunlight, as it is now. I am retired and spend a lot of time in my garden in the mornings, I also put plants and hanging baskets out at the side of my house which I enjoy, it will greatly reduce the satisfaction I derive from growing flowers and plants. Naturally due to this worrying me I have tried to gain information as what defines a right to light, I believe this to be relevant, 'A right to light is usually defined as one that has been enjoyed through defined spaces in a building for an uninterrupted period of 20 years, as governed in England and Wales under the Prescription Act 1832'.

The proposed extension of two storeys is extremely large, domineering and overbearing. It will create a depressing sense of enclosure and overshadow my property, making it dark.

My outlook from my kitchen will be a brick wall in close proximity, blocking out any sight of the sky. Also the windows to the bathroom and stairs are on this side. My property will become very dark and gloomy which is depressing and will have a negative impact on me and my family. I would like to reiterate the fact my house is designed with windows to the side, not the back, these being to the kitchen, bathroom and stairs.

Town / Parish Comments

N/A

Conservation Officer

As the single storey rear extension will not be visible from or within the context of the conservation area there are no heritage objections to this.

The host dwelling is constructed of red brick and render neither of which are typical of Glossop, nor of the adjacent conservation area. However, they are both characteristic of Fauvel Road. As such in this case, the use of red brick is considered acceptable in the setting of the conservation area. However, it is recommended that the proposed two storey ridge line be dropped, and principle elevation set back from that of the host dwelling. This will create a subordinate appearance, therefore, allowing the original portion of the dwelling to be readable when viewed from the adjacent conservation area. This will improve and allow the current relationship to the conservation area to be retained.

There are no heritage objections to the principle of the two storey side extension. However, in order to preserve the setting of the conservation area the proposed extension should be set back from the principle elevation, with a lowered ridgeline. This will maintain the visual recognition of the original portion of the dwelling house, subsequently maintaining the applications site positive relationship with the adjacent conservation area.

- Amended plans have been received to drop the ridge height and set the extension back.

Derbyshire County Council Highways

The proposal shows the creation of a garage, but the submitted information indicates that the garage will be 3m in length which (see extract from the County Council Design Guide below) falls below the expected minimum internal dimensions, so is it correct to label it a garage?

At the end of 2024, the County Council also introduced a parking guidance document which states in section 4.5.1: *'In all circumstances garages are excluded from the car parking calculations due to the ability to convert them into habitable accommodation without the need for permission and their usage for personal storage rather than that of a vehicle. They may be counted as bicycle storage subject to the design and location.'*

Drawing number P101 (22/02/25) shows the dwelling having 4 bedrooms, but according to the High Peak Borough Council Parking Standards requirement for a 4+ bedroom dwellings is 3 spaces per unit, but the proposal only leaves 1 space, which is the same as the County Council parking requirement, but a lower parking level for a 4 bedroom dwelling will be considered where local evidence demonstrates it will not result in parking displacement, so can you confirm that 1 space is acceptable?

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application seeks full planning permission for an extensions to an existing residential property that lies within the built up area boundary for Glossop, which is identified as a Market Town under Policy S2 of the High Peak Local Plan (2016).

Given the nature of the proposed development, it is deemed to be acceptable in principle subject to an assessment of material considerations such as design and residential amenity which are discussed in greater detail below.

Design and Impact upon the Setting of the Conservation Area

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."*

LP Policy EQ 7 identifies that *"The Council will conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. This will take into account the desirability of sustaining and enhancing their significance and will ensure that development proposals contribute positively to the character of the built and historic environment in accordance with sub area strategies S5, S6 and S7. Particular protection will be given to designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings."*

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.

Whilst the application site itself is not within any statutory designations, the site is located opposite to the Norfolk Square Conservation Area. Comments have been received from the Conservation Officer who comments that the ridge height should be set down and set the two storey extension element back from principal elevation both of which have subsequently been amended. It is also noted that the *“The host dwelling is constructed of red brick and render neither of which are typical of Glossop, nor of the adjacent conservation area. However, they are both characteristic of Fauvel Road. As such in this case, the use of red brick is considered acceptable in the setting of the conservation area”*. Overall it is considered that there would be no adverse impact on the setting of the conservation area.

The proposed rear extension would extend from the rear elevation of the proposed two storey side extension element and would be flush with the existing rear extension. The proposal comprises a modest addition which would not be visible within the wider street scene. The proposed rear extension would comprise a lean-to roof and materials that are in keeping with those of the existing property. The rear extension would be subservient to the host dwelling and is considered to be of an appropriate design, matching that of the existing single storey rear extension.

The proposed two storey side extension element has been revised so that it would be set down from the existing ridge by 0.3m and also set back 0.3m from the principal elevation. This will allow the side extension to read as a separate extension to retain the character of the existing dwelling and that of the wider semi-detached pair. The proposed extension would therefore create a subordinate extension which would be in keeping with the character of the existing property and that of the wider street scene. The proposed extension would retain 1m to the neighbouring boundary with no.26 Fauvel Road which will ensure that it does not create an overly dominant extension and reduces the potential impact of terracing. With consideration to this the proposed two storey element is considered to be acceptable.

Whilst the use of render and red brick are not typically found in the High Peak they are common materials along Fauvel Road. Therefore, with regard to the established character of Fauvel Road the proposed use of red brick and render for the proposed extensions is considered to be appropriate in this instance as it would help retain the character of the existing property would not have any detrimental impact upon the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area.

The proposed works would comply with the Local Plan Policy EQ6, EQ7, the Design Guide 2018 SPD and national policy in 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.

Section 9.2 of the Residential Design Guide states that *“Domestic extensions should be of a scale and be designed and positioned to avoid undue harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties. They must have regard to the orientation of adjacent homes, the number and position of windows and land levels. Excessive overshadowing of neighbouring habitable rooms windows, glazed doors and private garden/amenity areas should be avoided.”*

The proposed two storey element of the extension would not extend beyond the existing principal or rear elevations of the host dwelling. Whilst the properties along Fauvel Road do not respect a strict building line the properties directly adjacent to the application site (no.26 & no. 30) do follow a uniform building line. The proposed two storey extension's massing would not result in excessive overshadowing of habitable rooms as the rooms to this side of the adjacent neighbouring property of no.26 Fauvel Rd do not comprise any habitable rooms. Although it is noted that there would be limited opportunities for overshadowing of the existing driveway and rear access to the east facing side of no. 26, given the orientation of the properties the proposed extension would not lead to the overshadowing of the front and rear garden areas of no.26.

Paragraph 9.3.1 states that “Similarly an extension should not unduly reduce outlook from a main habitable room window or produce a tunnelling affect. To prevent this, extensions affecting neighbouring property should not normally extend more than 2.5 m from the rear of the affected home. All planning applications for domestic development should be careful to include scaled plans indicating the position of neighbouring property.”

The proposed rear extension element would comply with the 45 degree line to both adjacent properties of no.'s 26 and 30 Fauvel Road. The proposed two storey element as outlined above would not extend beyond the existing rear elevation and therefore is in accordance with SPD guidance in this respect. Therefore the proposed rear extension element is not considered to have any adverse impacts upon overshadowing or be overbearing in its nature in this regard.

Additionally it is noted that the neighbouring objection refers to the loss of light to their kitchen, bathroom and stairwell. Although these room would experience some loss of light, they are not considered to be primary habitable rooms (such as bedrooms and living rooms) and therefore further reduces the potential for detrimental impacts upon neighbouring amenity. With a distance of 4m between the side facing wall, combined with the orientation of the neighbours windows (facing

east) and the non habitable nature of the rooms which the windows serve, it is considered that any loss of light would not be significant.

The proposed two storey side extension element has been reduced in height and set back from the principal elevation which ensures it will not have an overly dominant impact. Concerns have been raised that the proposed two storey side extension would reduce the outlook to the neighbour's kitchen, bathroom and stairwell and that the outlook from the kitchen will be affected with a brick wall in close proximity. It is acknowledged that there would be some limited loss of outlook from the kitchen of no.26.

Section 9.3.1 of the SPD looks to protect outlook and outlines that "*Similarly an extension should not unduly reduce outlook from a main habitable room window or produce a tunnelling affect.*"

However with regard to this, the SPD seeks to retain outlook from habitable rooms, given that in this case the affected rooms of no. 26 would be to a kitchen, bathroom and stairwell, it is considered that the proposed development remains compliant with the relevant planning policy and guidance. Furthermore, the proposed extension would retain 1m to the boundary with no.26 Fauvel Road with an overall distance of 4m between the side wall of the extension and the neighbours side elevation. The extension would not extend forward or beyond the front and/or rear elevations of no.26 Fauvel Road. As such the loss of outlook, whilst acknowledged, is not considered to be significant enough to have a detrimental impact upon neighbouring amenity, and to warrant refusing this application on this basis.

It has also been noted that the neighbouring objection makes reference to the Right to Light under the Prescription Act 1832, this is separate to planning and is a legal issue. Moreover as set out above the impact on light has been assessed against the relevant development plan policy and adopted SPD.

Consequently it is deemed that the proposed two storey extension element would not have any unacceptable impact with regards to loss of outlook, light or an overbearing sense of enclosure.

The proposed works would therefore comply with the Local Plan Policy EQ6, the Residential Design Guide 2003 SPD and national policy in the NPPF.

Highway Safety

The application proposes the creation of a two storey side and single storey rear extension which would increase the site's bedroom provision from 3 to 4 bedrooms. The two storey extension element would be built upon an area of hardstanding and driveway which currently accommodates 1-2 off-road parking spaces. As such the sites off-street parking provision would also be reduced to 2 spaces. Whilst the proposals do include the provision of a garage to the ground floor this is substandard for vehicle parking and therefore does not count towards off-street parking provision.

Comments received from DCC highways confirm that said garage is substandard and queries whether it can be labelled as a garage. Additionally it is noted that all garages are discounted from the DCC highways parking guidance due to the ability to convert these into habitable rooms without the need for permission. DCC highways goes on to state that a 4 bedroom dwellings are required to have 3 spaces per unit but a lower parking level will be considered where local evidence demonstrates it will not result in parking displacement.

Nonetheless an amended block plan has been submitted to show that two designated off-street parking spaces can be retained. With consideration to this and the fact that the application site is in a highly sustainable location; a 6 minute walk to Glossop Train Station, an 8 minute walk from Glossop Town Centre and well served by bus routes with the Talbot Rd Bus stop 140m to the north of the site. The proposed development is therefore not judged to have any detrimental impacts upon highway safety as a result of an increase in on-street parking and complies with Policy CF6 of the Local Plan and the NPPF.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The proposed development is considered acceptable principle, would be of an acceptable design and will not result in any adverse impacts upon visual or residential amenity and would not have any detrimental impacts upon highway safety. The proposals are in accordance with the relevant policies of the High Peak Local Plan, Supplementary Planning Documents and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Therefore the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Approve

Case Officer: Stuart Talbot

Recommendation Date: 28/04/2025

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council