

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2025/0408
Valid 22/10/2025

85A THE SHIRE
SIMMONDLEY VILLAGE
SIMMONDLEY
GLOSSOP

SINGLE STOREY REAR
EXTENSION WITH EXTERNAL
BALCONY AND ACCESS
STEPS

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of Development
- Design Considerations (impact on Heritage Assets)
- Impact upon Residential Amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site lies within the settlement boundary for Glossop as defined by the Local Plan policies map, in the village of Simmondley. The application site relates to a two storey semi-detached dwelling located within a predominantly residential area. The site lies within the Simmondley Conservation Area.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for the erection of an elevated single-storey rear extension with an external balcony and access steps.

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
S5 Glossopdale Sub-area Strategy
EQ7 Built and Historic Environment
EQ9 Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

Residential Design (2005)
High Peak Design Guide (2018)
Simmondley Conservation Area Character Appraisal

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 12: Achieving Well-designed Places

Section 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/2018/0041 - An oak framed balcony with glass panelled balustrade – Refused, allowed on appeal.

HPK/2022/0451 - Single storey home office to the side of the house – Approved

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 04/11/2025

Neighbour consultation period ends:13/11/2025

Press Advert: 27/11/2025

Public Comments

By the end of the consultation period one neighbouring comment of support and one comment of objection was received.

Neighbour 1 Comment:

We have no objections to the planning application. Any alterations to The Shires has always been completed with integrity to the surrounding locality by the applicants and we would support their proposal.

Neighbour 2 Comment Summary:

Objection to the proposed single-storey extension with concerns of significant loss of privacy for the neighbouring property. This neighbour highlights that the proposed viewing platform will overlook a neighbouring bungalow and that the materials and roof style are not in keeping with the Simmondley Village Conservation Area.

Conservation Officer

Objection. The proposed extension is out of character with the Simmondley conservation area in terms of both design and materials as outlined above. Owing to the visibility of the rear of the host dwelling from the public domain this is considered to result in harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area. In terms of planning policy this is considered to be less than substantial harm (NPPF para 215). No public benefits are identified to outweigh the harm caused by the scheme, on this basis it is recommended that the application be refused.

Arboricultural Officer

The application site contains two trees specifically protected by Tree Preservation Order 77-1992 and is sited within the Simmondley Conservation Area. At present, no arboricultural detail has been submitted. The proposals will require an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) to BS5837-2012 in order to quantify any impacts on retained and protected trees and to propose mitigation measures including tree protection. Further comments will be made once such detail becomes available. Until such point, an objection in principle is raised due to the protected status of trees within the site and absence of supporting detail.

Derbyshire County Council Highways

There appears to be no material impact on the public highway and therefore the Local Highway Authority (LHA) has no further comments to make.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application proposes householder development to a property which is located within the settlement of Glossop as defined by the Local Plan Policies Map which is located within the Glossopdale sub-area. Policy S5 seeks to promote sustainable growth within Glossopdale through promoting and maintaining the identity of its settlements. Policy S1, which relates to delivering sustainable development, seeks to promote the effective use of land. As the site lies within the Simmondley Conservation Area, the principle of householder development will only be acceptable provided that the development sustains or enhances the heritage asset.

Other material considerations include whether the design is appropriate, taking into consideration the relationship with designated heritage assets, whether any amenity issues would arise, and whether there would be an impact upon highway safety.

Design and impact on heritage assets

Section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that with respect to any buildings or land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of that area.

Paragraph 135 (c) of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities)

Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states “development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.”

Paragraph 215 of the NPPF states “where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.”

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 EQ7 has regard to the Built and Historic Environment. It states 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.

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.

High Peak Design Guide (2018) paragraph 5.2 states “alterations need to be undertaken with care. Insensitive changes can easily spoil a building. The key to a sensitive approach is to take note of what is there already before preparing the design and to work with, and not against, the building’s character (accurate survey drawings are essential in this respect). The aim should be to revitalise the building without altering its fundamental character.”

High Peak Design Guide (2018) paragraph 5.5 states “all extensions should harmonise with the parent building. An extension should respect the dominance of the original building and be subordinate to it in terms of its size and massing. Setting back the new section from the building line and keeping the eaves and ridge lower than the parent building will normally help.”

High Peak Design Guide (2018) paragraph 7.14 states “one of the most distinctive qualities of traditional buildings in High Peak is the use of locally sourced natural stone for walling and stone or slate for roofs. It follows therefore that, wherever possible, and particularly in sensitive locations, new buildings should be constructed from the same palette of materials.”

High Peak Design Guide (2018) paragraph 7.16 states “The predominant building stone in High Peak is gritstone (a buff or pink, large-grained sandstone) although there is some use of carboniferous limestone (a grey, hard, fossil rich stone) in the Buxton and Chapel areas. A glance at the field walls locally will tell you which of these two stones forms the underlying geology of the area you are in.”

Paragraph 7.25 of the Design Guide states that “there is no tradition of external timber boarding in High Peak.”

Although the Simmondley Conservation Area Character Appraisal doesn't outline materials specifically for extensions, it is clear that any new work should respect the area's character through the use of natural, locally traditional materials, especially gritstone or finishes that reflect that traditional palette.

The existing dwelling house is a two storey semi-detached withing Simmondley. Within Simmondley it is noted that there is an extensive use of gritstone as a primary building material for walls and boundary treatments, creating a strong sense of visual harmony throughout the conservation area. The consistent use of gritstone roof slates contributes to the area's distinctive architectural character and appearance. The property known as 'The Shire' reflects this established character by incorporating gritstone in both its walling and roofing materials.

Prior to this application the applicants received pre application advice in August 2025 where the case officer conducted a site visit and suggested the following;

“Based on this discussion, I would strongly advise against including timber cladding in your application. While there is an existing timber outbuilding on site, greater scrutiny is placed on materials used for extensions that are physically attached to the dwelling. As such, timber cladding would not be supported in this instance”

Planning permission is now sought for the erection of a single-storey rear extension incorporating an external balcony and access steps. The proposed extension would project from the rear elevation by 6.3m and be supported on steel columns. It is designed with a flat roof that will form a small open balcony area, with steps providing access down to the garden. A 1.7-metre-high privacy screen is proposed along the adjoining neighbour's side to provide screening. The extension will be finished in an oak-effect composite cladding.

Officers note that the proposed use of cladding is uncommon within the area and does not reflect the immediate established character of the built environment. With regard to domestic extensions, it is important that materials match the existing building to maintain visual harmony, and this requirement becomes even more critical within a conservation area such as Simmondley, where the enhancement of the area's distinctive character and appearance is a key consideration. Approving a large, highly visible structure that fails to harmonise with its surroundings would set an undesirable precedent within the area and should be avoided.

It is acknowledged that a timber shed is present within the rear garden however, the visual impact of a small garden structure cannot reasonably be compared to that of a flat roof 6-metre-deep rear extension attached to the main dwelling suspended on a metal frame. The scale and prominence of the proposed extension would result in a significantly greater impact on both the host property and the conservation area. There would be views of the extension from Simmondley Lane to the rear.

Comment from the Councils conservation officer outline that cladding is not characteristic of the Simmondley conservation area, nor is it characteristic of the

High Peak. The use of timber effect composite cladding for an extension to a dwellinghouse is considered unacceptable within the conservation area. Furthermore, the rear of 'The shire' is visible from the grass island where Simmondley Lane meets Simmondley Village. The raised nature of the proposed extension will result in the extension being visible from this point to the rear. Therefore, the proposed use of timber effect composite cladding will harm the currently harmonious material palette of the Simmondley conservation area. In addition to the inappropriate use of materials, the proposed extension appears excessively deep, bulky and squat in proportions, when compared to the proportions of the host dwelling. Flat roofs are not traditionally acceptable within the Simmondley conservation area (or within High Peak in general) as they contrast with the traditional pitched roofscape which forms part of the area's positive appearance.

Therefore, the proposed single-storey rear extension, by virtue of its scale, elevated location, design incorporating unsympathetic elements such as a flat roof and use of timber-effect cladding, fails to respect the established character and appearance of the Simmondley Conservation Area. It is considered to cause 'less than substantial harm' (NPPF para 215). No public benefits are identified to outweigh the harm caused by the scheme as this is a domestic extension which will only provide private benefit. The materials and form are not in keeping with the traditional gritstone palette and roofscape that define the area's significance. As such, the development would cause harm to the conservation area's visual harmony and set an undesirable precedent.

Accordingly, it is considered that the extension would fail to compliment the character of the host dwelling and fail to sustain and enhance the conservation area, contrary to Local Plan Policies EQ6 and EQ7, and the guidance contained within the High Peak Design Guide SPD and guidance within the NPPF.

Amenity

Policy EQ6 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 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.

The adjoining property to the west is known as Appletrees. The applicant has successfully demonstrated that the 45 degree line of sight from the closet habitable room at Appletrees would not be breached. Although the extension includes a platform, views into private amenity spaces or habitable room windows would not be possible due to the inclusion of a 1.7m glass balustrade. Whilst the plans indicate that this balustrade would be clear, it is considered that an obscure glazing condition would be necessary to prevent overlooking, had this application be found acceptable. It is considered, that subject to a planning condition securing obscure

glazing to the balustrade, the extension would not have a negative impact on the amenity of adjoining neighbours.

Trees

The application site contains two trees that are subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). In light of this, the Council's Arboricultural Officer advised that an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) should be submitted to assess potential impacts on these protected trees and to outline appropriate mitigation measures. However, the applicant has not provided an AIA. In the absence of this information, the case officer is unable to fully assess whether the proposed extension would have any adverse effect on the protected trees within the site.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The proposed single-storey rear extension is considered unacceptable in design terms incorporating a flat roof, having a bulky proportion and materials that are inappropriate and harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and conservation area. In the absence of an arboricultural report, the Council is unable to determine if there would be any adverse harm to the existing trees at the site. These impacts are contrary to local and national policies aimed at safeguarding the character of designated heritage areas.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : REFUSE

Case Officer: Agatha Dutton

Recommendation Date: 23/12/2025

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council