

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2025/0421
Valid 24/10/2025

3 SHIREBROOK DRIVE
GLOSSOP

PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR
SIDE EXTENSION OVER
EXISTING GARAGE

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of development
- Design
- Amenity
- Highways

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

2 Shirebrook Drive is a red/brown brick two storey detached dwelling house located within the Glossop built-up area boundary. The property features an attached garage and has a driveway which can accommodate 2 cars.

There is a conservatory to the rear of the dwelling house which opens onto the rear garden area.

The surrounding area is residential comprising for a mixture of semi-detached and detached dwelling houses of a similar design.

There are no heritage constraints on the site.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a first floor side extension over the existing integral garage.

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
EQ 6 Design and Place Making
CF 6 Accessibility and Transport

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 4 – Decision-making
Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places

Supplementary Planning Documents

Design Guide 2018
Residential Design Guide 2005

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

(Approved) HPK/0003/8663 - Rear Conservatory & Replacement Garden Shed.
(Refused) - HPK/2001/0517 - Bedroom Extension Above Existing Garage.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 24/12/2025
Neighbour consultation period ends: 17/11/2025
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

By the end of the consultation period, one neighbouring objection was received. I wish to oppose the proposed first floor side extension over the existing garage at the above address. This proposed extension is identical to an earlier application, number HPK/2001/0517. This application was opposed by me and neighbouring householders and was refused on 19th December 2001.

The reasons provided on that occasion were as follows:

1. Due to proximity to and height to neighbouring houses, the extension would harm residential amenity contrary to policies GD.9, H.11 and H.14 of the High Peak Local Plan
2. Due to its design, the extension would appear unduly prominent within the street scene contrary to policies GD.8 and H.14 of the High Peak Local Plan.

In addition to the above I want to stress that the extension would have a serious detrimental effect on the amount of daylight and sunlight to habitable rooms at my property. I have resided at my property since 1987.

Town / Parish Comments

None

Derbyshire County Council Highways

Based on the analysis of the information submitted and a review of Local and National policy the Highway Authority concludes that there would not be an

unacceptable impact on highway safety or a severe impact on congestion. There are no justifiable grounds on which an objection could be maintained.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

LP Policy S 2 states that development should be directed towards sustainable locations, including Market Towns such as Glossop. The site is situated within this built-up area boundary. Therefore, the principle of the development is acceptable subject to consideration of the following policy.

Design

Section 12 Paragraph 130(c) of the NPPF states that development should be sympathetic to the character and history of the area, while not restricting change.

LP Policy EQ 6 states that all development should be well designed, of a high quality and respond to the areas character, history and scale.

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.” Chapter 5, paragraph 5.5 states that ‘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’.

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a first floor side extension above the existing integral garage. The extension would run the full depth of the dwelling and would tie into the main roof, forming a gable ended roof profile. External materials are proposed to match those of the host property, and this can be secured by condition.

The extension is not set back from the principal elevation, nor does it incorporate a lowered ridgeline, which would ordinarily be expected in accordance with the Council's adopted Design Guide. However, an assessment of the immediate locality identifies several examples of similar side extensions that have been accepted. Notably, No. 7 Winnats Close located to the south features a comparable design approved under HPK/2021/0606. Further examples are present within the wider street scene, including No. 1 Lincoln Way, which features a first floor extension approved in 2016 HPK/2016/0104 and No. 20 Hathersage Drive located to the east of the application site.

Given the prevalence of this design approach within the surrounding context, the proposed extension would reflect the established pattern of development and would not appear visually incongruous within the street scene.

The proposal is considered not to have a significant, harmful impact on the character and appearance of the property or the surrounding area. The development is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policies S1, and EQ6 of the High Peak Local Plan, the guidance contained within the Residential Design SPD, High Peak Design Guide, and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Amenity

NPPF (2024) states in para 135 (f) Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments: create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

Policy EQ 6 'Design and Place Making' requires that '...development achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and does 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.

The council's Residential Design SPD (2005) paragraph 8.6 states, it is important that the design of new residential development provides adequate privacy, security, sunlight and daylight to occupiers of both new and existing dwellings

Paragraph 8.6.1 states as a guide a distance of 21 metres between habitable room windows of adjacent properties will provide an acceptable level of amenity.

Paragraph 8.8.5 states, over shadowing can be particularly important in tall developments and in laying out external amenity spaces, which should avoid shady (and north facing) locations. Where new development is located close to existing homes, specific attention should focus on minimising issues of overshadowing as far as is practical

Paragraph 9.2 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'.

Paragraph 9.3 states if the centre of a main habitable room window is affected by the heavily shaded area, i.e. overshadowed on both a vertical and horizontal plane, then the extension may well cause a significant reduction in the skylight received by the window.

No.10 Derwent Drive lies immediately to the north of the application site and shares a common boundary. The rear elevation and principal private amenity space (south-facing rear garden) of No.10 are orientated towards the application site. As such, the relationship between the proposed rear extension and the rear-facing habitable rooms/conservatory at No.10 is a key consideration.

A previous proposal at the site was refused in 2001 (ref: HPK/2001/0517) for reasons including harm to residential amenity. Whilst the planning history is noted each application must be determined on its own merits against the development plan and relevant guidance in place at the time of decision. Accordingly, the 2001 refusal is noted for context but is not, in itself, determinative.

The current scheme proposes a first floor extension which extends the full depth of the original dwelling house. This represents a materially different form of development compared to the earlier proposal, which related to a first-floor extension only without the added depth. By extending the full depth of the property, the proposal would introduce a greater degree of massing along the shared boundary and across the rear elevation facing No.10, thereby increasing the potential for an unacceptable impact on neighbouring residential amenity through overshadowing.

The extension would be located approximately 12 metres from the original rear wall of No.10 Derwent Drive and approximately 8 metres from the rear conservatory. In this instance, given the close relationship, and increase in depth the proposal would heighten the risk of loss of light on the neighbouring rear garden and into the rear conservatory, principal windows and garden.

Given that No.10 benefits from a south-facing rear garden, development positioned to the south has the greatest potential to reduce sunlight/daylight to the garden and rear-facing rooms. The Council's Residential Design SPD confirms that residential schemes should provide adequate sunlight and daylight to both new and existing occupiers and that amenity impacts are a determining consideration, including the need to minimise overshadowing where new development is close to existing homes.

In addition, the SPD is clear that domestic development should be of a scale, design and position that avoids undue harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties, including excessive overshadowing of neighbouring habitable room windows and private garden/amenity areas.

For the reasons set out above, the proposal would cause an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of 10 Derwent Drive by reason of an unacceptable degree of overshadowing/loss of sunlight to the rear amenity space, particularly during periods when the sun is lower. The proposal is therefore contrary to the Residential Design SPD 2005 and LP policy EQ 6

Highway Safety

Policy EQ 6 'Design and Place Making' requires that '...developments are easy to move through and around, incorporating well integrated car parking, pedestrian routes and, where appropriate, cycle routes and facilities'. Policy CF 6 'Accessibility and Transport' states that development should not 'lead to an increase in on street parking to the detriment of the free and safe flow of traffic'

Following the proposed alterations, the dwelling would increase from a four-bedroom to a five-bedroom property. Appendix 1 of the High Peak Local Plan sets out that dwellings with four or more bedrooms should be provided with three off-street

parking spaces. In this case, the property benefits from an integral garage and two off-street parking spaces to the front. The development therefore meets the required parking provision and is considered to comply with Policies EQ6 and CF6.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

Due to its depth, siting and proximity to the shared boundary with No.10 Derwent Drive, the proposed rear extension would result in an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, by harmful overshadowing/loss of sunlight to the rear amenity space and rear-facing rooms of No.10. The development is therefore contrary to the Council's Residential Design SPD 2005 and the principles outlined in LP Policy EQ 6.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : REFUSE

Case Officer: Agatha Dutton

Recommendation Date: 03/02/2026

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council