

[REDACTED]

From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
Sent: 15 February 2026 21:36
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

[REDACTED]

Application Reference No. : HPK/2026/0050 Site Address: 11 Peaknaze Close Simmondley Glossop Derbyshire SK13 6UN
Glossop Comments by: Barbara Lomas

From:
12
Peaknaze Close
Simmondley
Glossop
Derbyshire
SK13 6UN

[REDACTED]

Submission: Objection
Comments: Subject: Objection to Planning Application HPK/2026/0050 11 Peaknaze Close

Date: 15/02/2026

Dear Mr Talbot,

I wish to formally object to the above application on the grounds of:

- ¿ Material loss of daylight to a primary habitable room
- ¿ Overbearing and tunnel-like impact
- ¿ Conflict with Local Plan Policy EQ6
- ¿ Failure to comply with the High Peak Design Guide SPD (Section 5.5 ¿ Subordination)
- ¿ Insufficient information to properly assess residential amenity impact

1. Loss of Daylight ¿ 45° Assessment

The proposal introduces a first-floor extension above the existing garage projecting approximately 5.85 metres beyond my rear elevation. The structure sits approximately 0.97 metres from the shared boundary.

The centre line of my kitchen window, which serves a primary habitable room is approximately 2.44 metres from the shared boundary and 2.02 metres above ground level. This results in a horizontal separation distance of approximately 3.41 metres between the window centre and the proposed two-storey extension.

Applying the commonly used 45° daylight guideline:

2.02m (window centre height) + 3.41m (horizontal separation)

= 5.43 metres

This represents the maximum height before breaching the 45° envelope.

The proposed eaves are estimated at approximately 5.35 metres, marginally below the threshold (by approximately 0.08m). However, the proposed ridge is estimated at approximately 7.10 metres, exceeding the 45° threshold by approximately 1.67 metres.

While the eaves may sit marginally below the 45° line, the ridge clearly breaches the 45° envelope by a substantial margin. This significantly increases vertical mass within the daylight envelope and is likely to result in a noticeable and harmful reduction in daylight to my kitchen.

The proposal therefore fails the intent of the 45° guideline and conflicts with Policy EQ6, which seeks to safeguard neighbouring residential amenity.

In addition, the BRE 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight' guidance advises that development should not cause material reduction in daylight to neighbouring habitable rooms. Given the limited separation distance and substantial ridge exceedance, it is highly likely that the proposal would result in harmful daylight loss. No daylight assessment has been submitted.

 

2. Overbearing Impact and Tunnel Effect

The neighbouring dwelling is set back from my rear elevation. The proposed extension would bring a full two-storey structure forward by 5.85 metres to a point significantly closer to my kitchen window than the main body of the neighbouring house.

The combination of:

- ¿ 5.85m projection
- ¿ Full two-storey height
- ¿ Ridge height of approximately 7.10m
- ¿ Only 3.41m separation
- ¿ Gable end form

would create a pronounced sense of enclosure when viewed from my kitchen and rear garden.

Although a single-storey garage currently occupies this footprint, the introduction of a full two-storey built form materially alters the spatial relationship between the properties. The increased vertical mass and ridge height would create an oppressive and tunnel-like outlook, contrary to Policy EQ6.

3. Failure to Be Subordinate ¿ Design Guide SPD Section 5.5

Section 5.5 of the High Peak Design Guide SPD requires extensions to be subordinate to the original dwelling.

The proposal follows the existing ridge and eaves heights and introduces a gable form of similar prominence. It does not reduce height, mass or visual weight in a way that establishes subordination. Extending almost six metres

forward at near-equivalent ridge height results in a substantial enlargement rather than a clearly subordinate addition.

The proposal therefore conflicts with adopted design guidance.

4. Insufficient Information to Properly Assess Impact

The submitted drawings do not provide clearly dimensioned proposed elevations confirming ridge height, eaves height, finished floor levels or ground datum.

In addition, the 1:500 site plan does not allow accurate verification of horizontal separation distances between the proposed extension and neighbouring windows.

Given that residential amenity assessment under Policy EQ6 relies upon precise spatial relationships, scaled drawings with confirmed vertical dimensions are necessary to enable a robust and transparent assessment. In the absence of this information, the Authority cannot properly evaluate the impact on neighbouring amenity.

 

5. Equality Act Considerations

I am an 81-year-old disabled resident with a diagnosed lung condition requiring oxygen use for approximately 16 hours per day. As a result, I spend extended periods within my home, and my kitchen is a primary living space used throughout the day.

Any material reduction in daylight and increased sense of enclosure would have a disproportionately greater impact on my health and wellbeing.

I respectfully request that the Authority give due regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty when assessing the impact of this proposal on neighbouring residential amenity.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, the proposal would result in:

- ¿ A measurable breach of the 45° daylight envelope at ridge level
- ¿ Likely material loss of daylight to a primary habitable room
- ¿ An overbearing and tunnel-like impact
- ¿ Conflict with Policy EQ6 and Design Guide SPD Section 5.5
- ¿ Insufficient information to enable proper assessment

I respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

Yours sincerely,

Barbara Lomas

12 Peaknaze Close,

Simmondley

Glossop,

Derbyshire.

SK13 6UN

[ends]

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.highpeak.gov.uk/YourData>
