

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2025/0423
Valid 27/10/2025

THE RISINGS REST HOME
PRIMROSE LANE
SIMMONDLEY
GLOSSOP

SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION
TO RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME

(FULL - MINOR)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of development.
- Character & Design.
- Residential amenity.
- Historic environment.
- Highway safety.
- Ecology & Biodiversity Net Gain.
- Flood Risk / Drainage.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site is located within the built-up area of Glossop. The site area measures approximately 2212sqm, and is an existing established care home located in a residential area.

The site is accessed via the unadopted road of Sunny Banks, which also serves several residential properties.

The care home has been subject to several planning applications over the years, with various extensions and alterations undertaken.

PROPOSAL

This is a full application seeking planning permission for a single storey extension to the side (north-west) of the existing care home.

The extension will project from the side elevation of the property by approximately 8.76m, with a depth of approximately 11.05m. The extension incorporates 2x dual pitched roofs, with eaves and ridge heights of approximately 3m and 4.07m respectively.

The number of employees is proposed to remain the same, at 22 full-time members of staff. The existing parking arrangement to the front of the premises remains unaltered.

A proposed rear patio area is illustrated on the submitted plans, measuring approximately 4.5m x 2.8m

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES
High Peak Borough Council Local Plan (2016):

Policy S 1 Sustainable Development Principles.

Policy S 1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development.

Policy S 2 Settlement Hierarchy.

Policy S 4 Maintaining and Enhancing an Economic Base.

Policy S 5 Glossopdale Sub-area Strategy.

Policy EQ 5 Biodiversity.

Policy EQ 6 Design and Place Making.

Policy EQ 9 Trees, woodland and hedgerows.

Policy EQ 11 Flood Risk Management.

National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024):

Part 2 – Achieving Sustainable Development.

Part 6 – Building a Strong, Competitive Economy.

Part 8 – Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities.

Part 11 – Making Effective Use of Land.

Part 12 – Achieving Well Designed Places.

Part 15 – Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment.

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

High Peak Design Guide (2018).

Residential Design (2005).

Glossop Design and Place Making Strategy (2011).

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Biodiversity and geological conservation: circular 06/2005.

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/0002/7365 – Proposed dormer and two bays to side elevation forming extensions to existing rest home for the elderly – Approved.

HPK/0003/3139 – Single storey extension to create eight additional bedrooms and conservatory lounge – Refused – Appeal Dismissed.

HPK/0003/7780 – Erection of PVC conservatory – Approved.

HPK/2017/0508 – Retention of patio area and renewal of ramp (existing) - already used as garden area with shed and greenhouse – Approved.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 28/12/2025.

Neighbour consultation period ends: 18/11/2025.

Neighbour re-consultation period ends: 12/03/2026.

Press Advert: N/A.

Public Comments

2 written representations have been received from residents, objecting to the proposal. The submitted comment(s) raise the following points:

- Highways:
 - The site only has a right of access over land owned by, and in front of, Oaklea.
 - Large number of vehicle movements currently associated with the site.
 - Two vehicles cannot pass on the access.
 - Vehicles speed when accessing/leaving the site.
 - Vehicles accessing/leaving the site damage the access drive and aspects of property.
- Loss of privacy.
- Overshadowing.
- Loss of light.
- Increase in noise.
- Impact on enjoyment of residential property.
- Disruption during construction.
- Trees removed from site.
- Light pollution.
- Previous refusals for extensions at the site.

Other:

Derbyshire County Council Highways:

- No objections.
- No additional bedrooms or staff are proposed. Therefore no material change to the operation of the premises.

Derbyshire Wildlife Trust:

Comments dated 16/12/2025:

- The application red boundary of site falls within 10m of the riparian zone of a river or stream. If the red line is not amended to be more than 10m away, then 10% gains and a new metric must be completed.
- Metric should reflect any trees removed on site.
- Onsite gains would not be considered significant and a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) is not proportionate. Planting and management details provided in the BNG Report are considered sufficient to ensure the gains are realised. These should be secured by a landscape condition.
- Investigation into bat roosting may be required.
- Details about bird and bat boxes could be provided now on amended elevations, or secured via condition.

Comments dated 22/01/2026:

- After reviewing the supplied photographs, can confirm that a bat roost assessment is not advised in this instance. The extension is single-storey and will be constructed well below the existing roofline / eaves. The two existing bay windows to be impacted appear in good condition, with no gaps visible in the tiles or the flashing that could be used by bats. The stonework also appears in good condition.
- Informative advised if bat(s) encountered during works.

No other written representations received as part of the consultation process.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

HPBC Local Plan Policy S 1 seeks to ensure the delivery of sustainable development, by ensuring, amongst other things, securing high quality, locally distinctive and inclusive design to provide a high standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants. Policy S 1 seeks to locate new development in line with the boroughs Settlement Hierarchy.

HPBC Local Plan Policy S 2 sets out the settlement hierarchy for the borough. The application site falls within Glossop, which is identified as a 'market town', which is an area which will be the main focus for development and growth.

Policy S 4 identifies how the Council will maintain and where possible, enhance the economic base of the Plan Area by supporting the appropriate improvement, enhancement and expansion of existing businesses. Policy S 4, however, attracts only limited weight when considered against the latest national policy position.

The Glossopdale Sub-area Strategy (Policy S 5) seeks to promote the sustainable growth of Glossopdale whilst promoting and maintaining the distinct identity of its settlements, including protecting and enhancing the historic environment.

Therefore the principle of development is considered to be acceptable, subject to all other material planning considerations being found to be acceptable.

Character & Design:

Background & Revisions

The original submission proposed a single storey side extension of a comparable scale and design. The Council raised concerns with the agent in relation to the scheme, specifically about the design and scale of the proposed extension.

It was considered that the extension would appear as an unduly large and disproportionate addition to the host property. The roof pitches did not reflect the host dwelling and thus appeared as an unsympathetic addition to the property. Additionally, the windows on the principal elevation needed revising as they did not present an appropriate fenestration, with their different sizes and ad-hoc placement creating a jarring appearance on the principle elevation. Opportunities were provided for revisions to be made to the scheme.

Consequently sets of revised plans were submitted. This resulted in the fenestration of the windows being changed on the front elevation, and a reduction in the width of the extension by approximately 1.5m. No further changes to the scheme were forthcoming, and this is reflected in the latest plans held on file. Following communication with the agent, it was agreed that the revisions would be consulted upon and the application determined accordingly.

Policy Position

Policy EQ 6 of HPBC's local plan identifies that all development should be well designed and of a high quality that responds positively to its environment, whilst also contributing to local distinctiveness and sense of place. It seeks to achieve this by, amongst other things:

1. Requiring developments to be of high quality design that protects, enhances and / or restores landscape character.
2. Requiring that development contributes positively to an area's character, history and identity in terms of scale, height, density, layout, appearance, materials, and the relationship to adjacent buildings and landscape features.
3. Requiring 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 adopted Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, seek to build upon Policy EQ 6 and provide more detailed and practical advice for aspects

such as design (size, siting, scale, materials, roof style etc) and impacts on neighbours in relation to possible overshadowing, massing, and overlooking etc.

Assessment:

The existing property currently has a width of approximately 18.7m. The existing property has historically been extended, as detailed in the above planning history section.

The Council's adopted High Peak Design Guide (2018) SPD identifies that all extensions should harmonise with the parent building and should respect the dominance of the original building and be subordinate to it in terms of its size and massing. Irrespective of size, however, all buildings can reach a threshold point beyond which further extension is just not possible without destroying their character.

It is proposed to construct the extension from matching materials, utilising stonework walls and a natural slate roof. This could be secured via way of a condition, including the provision of a sample panel on-site for the stonework.

It is considered that the proposed extension, which will project from the side of the property by approximately 8.76m, would not appear as a subordinate addition to the host property and would appear as a disproportionate and excessively wide addition to the existing property.

Due to the width and depth of the extension, this has resulted in a roof pitch and design which does not reflect the host property, as advocated by the Council's adopted design guidance, and accentuates the disjointed appearance of the extension relative to the host property. The design of the extension is compounded further by the presence of windows on the side elevation of the property at first floor level.

The fenestration of the windows in the extension are considered to appear at odds with the existing property. The windows within the host property sit just below the eaves level at both ground and first floor level. Due to the roof design/pitch of the proposed extension, this has resulted in the extension having a higher eaves level at ground floor compared to the existing property. The windows in the extension are proposed to sit below the eaves, however due to the varied eaves height, the placement of the windows is considered to be discordant. The size of the two windows in the extension relative to the expanse of walling is also considered to result in the extensions disproportionate appearance.

The extension is considered to be highly visible within the street scene. Although the application site is located at a lower land level than the adjacent highway of Primrose Lane, views are still readily available into the site (over the boundary wall and soft planting) when travelling in both directions along the highway, by both vehicles and pedestrians.

The Case Officer suggested that, in order to overcome the harm to the host building and the street scene, options be explored to either re-site the development elsewhere within the plot, or reduce its scale further. However the applicant/agent considered the current siting and scale of the development was the most optimal to meet their service needs in addition to that of third party regulators, so re-siting etc of the development was discounted.

It is considered that the design and scale of the proposed extension would not appear as a subordinate addition to the host property, and would result in an extension which is disproportionate and which would dominate the host property, and appear as a disjointed addition which would erode the fundamental character of the host building and cause harm to the street scene. This harm is only exacerbated by the inconsistent roof design and pitch, and the scale and siting of the windows.

Residential Amenity:

Policy EQ 6 of HPBC's local plan requires development to achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development, so it would 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.

To the north-west of the application site is the residential property of 'Oaklea'. Oaklea has 2 windows in its side elevation facing the application site, 1 at ground floor level and 1 at first floor level. Whilst it is unclear what spaces these windows serve, given their siting and the fact they are both obscurely glazed, they likely serve circulation space (such as a hallway, stairwell, or landing area(s)) within the property.

The proposed extension will be sited approximately 2.8m from the boundary line with Oaklea. Given the separation distance from the side elevation of Oaklea to the extension, orientations, scale of the extension and location of windows, it is considered that Oaklea would not be detrimentally affected by virtue of harmful levels of overshadowing/loss of light, or overbearing impacts.

4x windows are proposed in the side (north-west) elevation of the extension, proposed to serve shower and W/C areas, and a secondary window to an office. As such, a condition could be attached to ensure these windows are obscurely glazed to avoid any undue levels of overlooking. As a result, it is considered that nearby residents would not encounter harmful levels of overlooking/loss of privacy.

Concerns have also been raised by a neighbour through the consultation process in relation to an increase in noise through the operation of the extension, and from existing/potential light pollution. There is nothing to suggest that the extension would be directly responsible for an increase in noise levels being generated at the site. The extension does not facilitate an increase in the number of residents/staff at the premises. It is acknowledged that the extension would result in the development being closer to the residential property, but this in itself would not automatically result in harm, especially when considering recreational activities can take place outside at

present within the covered outdoor seating area adjacent to the boundary. Should any issues be experienced from noise/lighting, either now or at any time in the future, these should be reported to the appropriate authorities for investigation outside of the planning process, such as to the Council's Environmental Health Team.

Similarly, it is recognised that some noise is likely to be experienced during any construction works. However these activities would be for a temporary period only and would not in their own right warrant a refusal of planning permission. As above, in the event noise issues are encountered during any construction works, these should be reported to the Council's Environmental Health Team for investigation.

Overall, it is considered that the development would not result in any detrimental harm to the amenity of any nearby residents.

Historic Environment:

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires a Local Planning Authority to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of a Conservation Area (Section 72 respectively).

Approximately 100m+ to the east of the site is the St James Conservation Area. Given the separation distance, various degrees of built form and landscaping, and land level differences within the vicinity, it is considered that the proposed development would not form the setting of the Conservation Area, and therefore would not have any impact upon its significance.

Paragraph 216 of the NPPF (December 2024) identifies that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining an application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

The Historic Environment Record has identified that the site was previously a 19th century cotton mill and mill pond (considered to be a non-designated heritage asset), which was demolished in the early 20th century. The mill building has been demolished, and no immediate evidence is available of the pond's retention. The site has also been historically redeveloped. As such it is considered that the proposal would have no impact on the sites significance in terms of its heritage value as a site of a 19th century cotton mill & mill pond.

Highway Safety:

The site is accessed via an existing shared private drive (Sunny Banks), which is accessed from Primrose Lane.

The proposed development seeks to provide additional amenity space within the property by increasing the size of the lounge and dining areas. Additional facilities

are also to be added, such as shower rooms, clinic space (for use by pre-arranged appointments such as hairdressers, chiropodist, and opticians), and staff offices. These services are understood to already visit the site, but this proposal seeks to provide a formalised space for their visit. Similarly, the current on-site staff office is considered to be too small for all necessary activities, so additional office provision is proposed accordingly.

The proposal is not expected to increase vehicle movements to and from the premises, and no additional staff or residents are proposed. Accordingly, no changes are proposed to the current on-site parking arrangements, and the same level of off-street parking would be retained post development. As a result of these factors, the Highway Authority (HA) raise no objections to the development, and conclude that there will be no material change to the operation of the premises. The comments of the HA are considered to carry significant weight.

The submitted statements identifies that 11 parking spaces are available on site. Based on the Council's observations on site, it is unclear how 11 vehicles would be reasonably accommodated, but in any event this would not change the findings and conclusions on the above highway position.

Several points of objection regarding highway matters have been raised in the objections submitted by residents. These have been detailed in the consultation section at the start of the report, but for ease of reference these comprise of:

- a) The site only has a right of access over land owned by, and in front of, Oaklea.
- b) Large number of vehicle movements currently associated with the site.
- c) Two vehicles cannot pass on the access.
- d) Vehicles speed when accessing/leaving the site.
- e) Vehicles accessing/leaving the site damage the access drive and aspects of property.

Matters relating to any legal right of access (point a), and any damage caused by patrons to the care home (point e) are civil matters which would need to be resolved outside of the planning process by contacting any relevant party, such as a solicitor and/or the police. Similarly, any concerns about vehicles exceeding speed limits (point d) should also be reported to the police.

Regarding points b and c, in relation to existing vehicle movements and access concerns, this is an existing scenario which this proposal does not seek to effect in real terms. The number of vehicle movements once the extended site would be operational is not expected to change, with the extension seeking to formalise areas for activities which already take place on site. The proposal is therefore considered not to result in an increase in vehicle-vehicle and/or vehicle-pedestrian conflicts.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact upon the safety and/or capacity of the local highway network.

Ecology & Biodiversity Net Gain:

On-site habitats include buildings/structures, sealed surfaces, and vegetated garden. Several trees have been removed on the application site sometime after April 2023 and prior to the submission of the application.

Protected Species

Consultation comments received from Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (DWT) in December 2025 highlighted that roosting bats could be impacted by the proposal by virtue of the removal of the 2x bay windows on the west elevation of the property. DWT requested photographs of the bay windows/side elevation be submitted to them in the first instance for them to establish whether opportunities were likely to exist for roosting.

Circular 06/2005 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation) identifies the presence of a protected species as a material consideration when a planning authority is considering a development proposal that, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to a protected species or its habitat (Paragraph 98).

Paragraph 99 of the aforementioned Circular goes on to identify that it is essential that the presence of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decision. Where there is a reasonable likelihood of a protected species being present and affected by the development, survey(s) should be completed and any necessary measures to protect the species should be in place before any permission is granted.

A number of site photographs were submitted to DWT by the Council, to illustrate the condition etc of the bay windows and side elevation. After reviewing the photographs, DWT have confirmed that a bat roost assessment is not required in this instance. This is because the extension is single-storey and will be constructed well below the existing roofline / eaves of the main property. The two existing bay windows, although to be removed, appear in good condition with no gaps visible in the tiles or the flashing that could be used by bats. The stonework also appears in good condition. DWT do however suggest an informative in relation to taking a precautionary approach to any works.

As such, it is considered that the proposed development would not cause harm to any protected species, which includes bats.

Biodiversity Net Gain

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is a mandatory requirement of Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act

2021, and requires all planning permissions granted in England to deliver at least a 10% gain in biodiversity, which must be measured using Defra's biodiversity metric. The BNG requirement is a deemed condition of planning permission, and all on-site and off-site habitats will need to be secured for at least 30 years via the use of Biodiversity Net Gain Management Plan.

A BNG Metric and a Biodiversity Net Gain Report have been submitted with the application.

Both area habitats and linear habitats are to be impacted by the development. To achieve the required 10% gains for both of the habitat types, 6x new trees are proposed for planting, as is new ornamental hedgerow planting (circa 12m length). Comments received from DWT conclude that on-site gains are sufficient, and should be secured via condition.

The original application red boundary of site fell within 10metres of the riparian zone of the 'Long Clough Brook', located to the rear (south) of the site. This would have required the 'watercourse' aspects of the BNG Metric having to be completed. However the application red boundary of site has been amended to be located 10m or more away from the watercourse.

A condition would need to be attached to secure the submission of a Biodiversity Net Gain Management Plan.

Other:

Comments received from DWT request that a condition be attached to any favourable decision requiring details to be submitted and approved in relation to the provision of integrated bird and bat boxes.

Flood Risk / Drainage:

To the rear of the site is the 'Long Clough Brook'. The Brook itself falls within Flood Zones 2 and 3, but the application site itself, and indeed the location of the proposed extension, falls within Flood Zone 1.

The existing drainage arrangements discharge surface water and foul sewage via the main sewer. It is proposed that the extension would utilise the same arrangement, however a condition could be attached to require details to be submitted and approved.

Response to Resident Comments:

The above commentary addresses many of the points raised in comments which have been received from the public. The following is intended to address those points which remain outstanding.

1. It has been identified within a neighbouring objection that previous refusals have been issued at the site for extensions. Whilst this may be the case, as detailed in the planning history section, each application is assessed on its

own merits based on relevant policies and material planning considerations at the time of any decision being issued.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The site is located within the 'market town' of Glossop, which is an area which will be the main focus for development and growth. The principle of development is therefore considered to be acceptable.

The design and scale of the extension, in conjunction with the window fenestration and inconsistent roof design/pitch, is considered to result in an extension which is disproportionate and which would dominate the host property, and appear as a disjointed addition which would erode the fundamental character of the host building and cause harm to the street scene.

It is considered that the amenity of nearby residents would not be unduly affected by virtue of any overshadowing, overlooking, or overbearing impacts.

The form and function of the application site are to remain as existing, serving as a care home. The facilities will not see an increase in bedrooms, residents, or staff, and therefore in real terms there will be no material change in vehicle movements associated with the operation of the site. Accordingly the proposal would not have a detrimental impact upon the safety and/or capacity of the local highway network.

Biodiversity Net Gain is applicable to the scheme, and gains in habitat and hedgerow units could be secured via condition. There are no protected species issues.

Having reviewed all the submitted information, and assessing this against all relevant policies and material planning considerations, within the planning balance, a refusal of planning permission is recommended for this application.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : REFUSE

Case Officer: Alex Bonser

Recommendation Date: 18/03/2026

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council