

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2025/0402
Valid 13/10/2025

1 BRIDGEFIELD
GLOSSOP

REBUILDING OF ROOF TO
NORTH EASTERN SIDE OF
HOUSE, SINGLE STOREY
REAR EXTENSION, SINGLE
STOREY FRONT EXTENSION
TO FORM DRAUGHT LOBBY &
WC, FORMATION OF NEW
RETAINING WALL, NEW
FRONT BOUNDARY
TREATMENT AND
STRUCTURAL OPENING
ALTERATIONS

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of Development
- Design
- Amenity
- Flood risk

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse located within the built-up area boundary for Glossop. The house has previously been extended at the side/rear and benefits some outbuildings within the curtilage. Together with it's adjoining neighbour (1a Bridgefield), the house is set back from Bridgefield within a large garden to the north Long Clough Brook runs around the south of the property, and small parts of the site are within flood risk zones 2/3 due to the proximity of the brook. design terms.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear and single storey front extensions, partial rebuilding of the roof and a new rear patio area with retaining walls and railings.

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
S 5 Glossopdale Sub-area Strategy
EQ 6 Design and Place Making
EQ9 Tree, woodlands and hedgerows
CF 6 Accessibility and Transport

National Planning Policy Framework

Chapter 4 Decision-making
Chapter 12: Achieving well-designed places

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 11/11/2025
Neighbour consultation period ends: 07/11/2025
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

Having reviewed the most recent planning documents dated 04/11/2025 and discussed the proposals directly with the occupants of 1 Bridgefield, we can confirm that we, as the owners of 1A Bridgefield, have no objections to the proposed rear extension, including the outlined plans and elevations. As the works will involve the party wall, we have requested that a formal Party Wall Agreement is put in place. The occupants of 1 Bridgefield have agreed to provide this in due course, and we are satisfied that this matter will be appropriately managed outside the planning process.

Arboricultural Officer

The site and adjacent land contain trees that are likely to be affected by the proposed works. Tree Preservation Order no 101-1994 (A1) lies to the South of the site and abuts the Southern boundary. At present, no arboricultural detail has been submitted. An Arboricultural Impact Assessment to BS5837-2012 will be required to enable the impact of the proposed works to be assessed and to recommend/detail any mitigatory measures required including tree protection measures. At present an

in principle objection is raised. Further comments may be made once arboricultural detail becomes available.

Lead Local Flood Authority

No comment.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

Local Plan policy S2 identifies Glossop within the Glossopdale sub area where there is support in principle for a range of developments including housing and employment related proposals. Whilst there are no 'in principle' objections to the application, all other material planning considerations must be satisfied for the scheme to be supported. In this instance the considerations include design, visual impact, neighbour amenity, flood risk, and parking provision.

Design

Policy S1 states that new development will be expected to make a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities and where possible enhancing the environment which would be achieved by, inter alia, securing high quality and locally distinctive design.

Policy EQ6 states that all development should be well designed and of a high quality and that this will be achieved by requiring development to be well designed to respect the character of the townscape, and requiring development to contribute positively to an areas character, identity and history in terms of scale, height, density, layout, appearance, materials and relationship with adjacent buildings.

The Residential Design Guide (2005) provides guidance in section 9, and states that extensions should be designed to be subordinate to the main house and that an extension results in a dwelling which is well designed in itself. The Design Guide SPD (2018), at 5.5, states that extensions should harmonise with the parent building and should respect the dominance of the original building, being subordinate to it in terms of size and massing.

Planning permission is sought for a series of extensions and alterations to the existing dwelling at 1 Bridgefield. The proposals comprise the rebuilding of the roof to the north-eastern side of the property, the demolition of an existing rear extension and its replacement with a new single-storey rear extension, the erection of a single-storey front extension to form a porch and, and associated alterations to fenestration.

The application proposes the rebuilding of the roof to the north-eastern side of the house. The existing building incorporates a two-storey side extension that currently has a roof form which does not suitably adjoin the main dwelling. The proposal seeks

to introduce a new pitched roof that adjoins the main roof slope. The new roof is to be slightly stepped down from the main ridgeline, ensuring that the extension remains visually subordinate and secondary to the host dwelling. The roof is to be finished in natural slate, matching the existing roof covering of the main dwelling.

Following the demolition of the existing rear extension, the proposals include the construction of a new single-storey rear extension. The extension would measure 6.0 metres in depth, 6.3 metres in width, with a maximum height of 3.6 metres. Beyond a new patio area with a 2.3m (maximum) high retaining wall. Given its location at the rear of the property, the extension would not be visible from public view and would therefore not result in any adverse impact on the character or appearance of the street scene. The external materials would match those of the existing dwelling, including render.

The proposals also include a single-storey front extension forming a porch. This would measure 3.3 metres in height and 2.9 metres in width, with a pitched roof. The scale and design of the porch are considered to be acceptable. Lastley, the development includes amendments to fenestration, comprising the replacement of existing windows and doors and the introduction of new openings associated with the extensions. The proposed windows would be uPVC units finished in olive green, while doors would comprise olive green uPVC and timber frames. In this context, the proposed colour is considered appropriate.

The proposed extensions and alterations are considered to preserve the character of the original dwelling, have been designed appropriately and would enhance the appearance of the dwelling. It is therefore in accordance with Policies S1 and EQ6 of the Local Plan, as well as the guidance set out in the Residential Design Guide (2005) and the Design Guide SPD (2018).

Amenity

Policy EQ6 requires development to achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and not cause unacceptable effects by reason of visual intrusion, overlooking, shadowing, overbearing effect, noise, light pollution or other adverse impacts on local character and amenity.

No. 1a Bridgefield is the attached neighbouring property located to the west of the application site. Elevations and floor plans submitted to the Council as part of planning application HPK/2022/0241 indicate that the property features a single rear-facing window serving a kitchen. This window is positioned away from the shared boundary with the application site. The proposed development would not breach the 45-degree line of sight when assessed from this window. With respect to the patio and retaining wall, the top of the retaining wall will have a similar height to the rising ground levels found in the neighbours garden. As such, the proposal is not expected to result in an unacceptable impact on outlook or daylight to the neighbouring property.

Properties to the rear in Overdale Drive lie in excess of 25m from the rear elevation of the single storey rear extension. As such this would more than meet the Councils

21m privacy distance. The fenestration to the two storey side extension would remain as existing.

Overall the proposed extension does not give rise to any undue impact on surrounding neighbours.

Impact on trees

Tree Preservation Order no 101-1994 (A1) lies to the South of the site and abuts the Southern boundary. A site Tree Appraisal has been submitted by the applicant in support of the proposal. The survey identifies a small number of mature trees located adjacent to, but outside, the application site, together with boundary hedgerows. The AIA confirms that the proposed development will not encroach within any tree Root Protection Areas (RPAs) and no trees are to be removed or pruned to facilitate the works. The trees are sufficiently distant from the proposed extensions to avoid direct or indirect impacts. The submitted documents have been reviewed by the councils Arboriculture Officer to which he recommended that temporary tree protective fencing during construction should be in place as detailed in the AIA.

Other matters

Regarding Party Wall, these matters are private/civil issues governed by separate legislation and fall outside the scope of planning. Any necessary Party Wall Agreement is a matter between the relevant property owners.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The proposals are considered to accord with policies S2, EQ6 and EQ9 of the High Peak Local Plan (2016), the Design Guide SPD (2018) and The Residential Design Guide (2005). As such the application is recommended for approval.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Agatha Dutton

Recommendation Date: 19/01/2025

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council

