

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2025/0136
Valid 31/03/2025

11 EHLINGER AVENUE
HADFIELD
GLOSSOP

NEW DRAUGHT LOBBY, BAY
WINDOW AND CANOPY TO
FRONT ELEVATION; TWO-
STOREY EXTENSION TO SIDE
ELEVATION; SINGLE-STOREY
EXTENSION TO REAR.

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Residential amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application sites relates to a three-bedroom semi-detached property in Hadfield, approximately 2 miles away from the town of Glossop. To the north is the adjoining no.9 and to the south is No's. 13 & 15 which sit perpendicular to the application site.

The dwelling itself is cosntructed in a reconstituted stone, which is common to the locality. It is of a relatively simple form, at two storeys with a pitched roof. The front of the property has space for 2 cars to park off-street. Private garden space is provided to the rear of the house, which can be accessed by a gate.

Permitted development rights have been removed along Ehlinger Avenue.

PROPOSAL

The application is proposing a two-storey side extension to extend the kitchen and create a utility room, a single storey rear extension and a draught lobby and bay window to the front elevation.

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
CF 6 Accessibility and Transport

National Planning Policy Framework

Chapter 2: Achieving Sustainable Development

Chapter 12: Achieving Well Designed Places

Supplementary Planning Guidance

High Peak Residential Design Guide SPD (2005)

High Peak Design Guide (2018)

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/0003/3233 – 74 dwellings. Approved 1994.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 16/05/2025

Neighbour consultation period ends: 07/05/2025

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None

Derbyshire County Council Highways

Whilst there are no highway objections to the proposed draught lobby, bay window and canopy to front elevation, the two-storey side extension will reduce existing parking provision to a single space. Sufficient space is available within the site curtilage to provide a replacement parking space, set to be lost as part of the proposal, i.e. provision of two parking spaces within the site. Minimum dimensions of 2.4m x 4.8m should be provided to each space, with an additional 0.9m path provided directly alongside the parking for circulation space. Accordingly, I would be obliged if you could ask the applicant to revise the proposal in view of the above comments.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application site is located within the built-up area boundary for Hadfield. In such locations, new development will be directed in accordance with Policy S 2 of the Local Plan. This policy does not prohibit developments of this nature hence this development would be acceptable in principle, subject to the policy tests below being satisfied.

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 9.5 states:

- *“Porches are rarely a traditional feature on the front of terraced houses and their introduction requires considerable care because of the disturbance to the main elevation of the house and possible intrusion in the street scene. Porches can sometimes hide interesting door surrounds and are often unacceptable in conservation areas and on listed buildings.”*

More recent design guidance from the High Peak Design Guide (2018) para 5.9 states:

- *“Porches must be appropriate to the property and well-designed. They rarely look right on small cottages and often spoil terraced properties. They detract from the basic simplicity of such buildings. In these cases, an internal porch is the better solution.”*

The application is proposing a two-storey side extension, a single storey rear extension and the formation of a lobby and bay window.

The two-storey extension will extend the existing kitchen and allow for the creation of a utility room. Having regard to the adopted High Peak Design Guide (2018), the authority is keen to encourage set back and stepped down 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. The side extension element is modest, extending only 1.65m from the side elevation of the dwelling, this coupled with the fact the extension would be stepped back from the front elevation and down from the roofline prevents the pair of semis appearing unbalanced. Many of the dwellings along Ehlinger Avenue have been extended to the side, becoming an established part of the character of the street scene.

The rear extension is proposed to extend some 2.9m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling, with two roof lights and bi-folding doors to the rear, it will remain largely subservient by way of its single storey nature.

The application also proposes a new draught lobby, bay window and canopy to the front elevation. The property is a new build representing little architectural merit, and the porch represents a simple design, with a dual pitched roof. There would be no loss of legibility to the building, with the front door remaining the central feature. There are front porches featured on other properties along Ehlinger Avenue and Vale House Drive. As such, it would not be considered this element would be out of context within the surrounding area.

Bay windows are generally not common throughout the Borough; however, Officers have noted these are featured on other properties including no's 27 & 29 and at first floor level on No's. 19 & 21, as well as featuring frequently on dwellings throughout the wider estate. Accordingly, no harm would be caused to the character of the dwelling or the street scene.

The proposed materials are stonework with a tiled roof to match existing. Given the reasons outlined above, 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.

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.

With regards to the side extension, a ground floor window is proposed to serve the utility room which is a non-habitable room, moreover, the existing fence and neighbouring shed will prevent any overlooking into the garden space of no. 15 to the south. A window is proposed to the first floor serving the en-suite, this is to be obscure glazed, as per the Residential Design Guide, as such there are no concerns regarding overlooking or loss of privacy to no's 13 & 15 to the south. The extension would be positioned 12.5 from the closest neighbours to the south, which when combined with its orientation would ensure there would be no overbearing impact.

Turning to the rear extension, the 45-degree rule has been assessed from the central point of no.9's closest ground floor window in their rear elevation, and it has been established that the 45-degree rule would be breached, with approx. 1.5m of the top corner of the extension sitting within the 45-degree angle. Whilst Officers have noted

the existing high boundary fencing, the proposed extension sits at a maximum of approx.1m higher. The extension also sits to the south of this neighbour; therefore, it is likely that some overshadowing may occur to this window. It is not clear which room this serves, though it is reasonable to assume this adjoining neighbour mimics the layout of the subject property, in which case the secondary window serves the lounge/ dining area, with an additional source of light from another window. Therefore, any overshadowing to the closest lounge window at no.9 will not result in a detrimental loss of light and it cannot be considered reasonable to refuse the application solely on this basis. With regards to the garden space of this neighbour, due to the east to west sunlight trajectory, there will be minimal impact on the afternoon and evening sun during the summer months. Officers have also considered that if permitted development rights were intact, planning permission would not be required for this element.

The bay window would be replacing the existing ground floor window to the front elevation, a small side window is proposed to the porch, however, this would not be considered a habitable room and would outlook onto the driveway of no.9 as opposed to a private garden space and there would be no loss of privacy.

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

The application would not lead to an increase in bedrooms at the application site; however, the two-storey side extension element would reduce the existing parking provision to a single space. As highlighted by Derbyshire Highways sufficient space is available within the curtilage to provide an additional parking space. As such an amended site plan has been agreed, to show parking provision for two parking spaces to the front of the dwelling house, in line with the Council's parking standards for a three-bed property.

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.

LP Policy S1a reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). 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.

An assessment of the application has found all aspects of development proposals to be satisfactory that relates well to and respects the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and wider street scene. Moreover, the development would not result in any significant adverse harm to residential amenity or highway safety. It is therefore concluded that the proposal constitutes a sustainable form of development and in line with Policy S1a of the Local Plan and paragraph 11 of the NPPF is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Case Officer: Jennifer Robb

Recommendation Date: 10/06/2025

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council