

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2026/0050
Valid 03/02/2026

11 PEAKNAZE CLOSE
SIMMONDLEY
GLOSSOP

PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR
EXTENSION OVER GARAGE
AND PARTIAL GARAGE
CONVERSION

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design, character and appearance
- Impact upon residential amenity
- Highway Safety and Parking

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site refers to a two storey brick built detached dwelling located on Peaknaze Close within the defined settlement boundary of Glossop. The site as existing is afforded an integrated side garage as well as a rear conservatory style extension.

The surrounding area comprises predominantly detached dwellings which are similar in scale and appearance to the application site. The properties along Peaknaze Close do not follow a regular building line with properties staggered from the highway at varying depths.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks full planning consent for a first floor extension over an existing side garage.

The proposed first floor extension would measure 4.2m in width matching the width of the garage below. The extension would have a depth of 6.5m, set back 2.2m from the principle elevation. The extension would measure 5m in height to the eaves and would have a maximum height of 6.7m to the ridge, level with that of the existing roofline.

The proposals would utilise brickwork and concrete tiles to match that of the existing dwelling.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Local Plan 2016

S 1 Sustainable Development Principles
S 1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
S2 Settlement Hierarchy
EQ 6 Design and Place Making
CF 6 Accessibility and Transport

Supplementary Planning Documents

Residential Design Guide SPD (2005)
Design Guide SPD (2018)

National Planning Policy Framework

Chapter 2 - Achieving Sustainable Development
Chapter 12 - Achieving Well Designed and Beautiful Places

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS – N/A

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 17/03/2026
Neighbour consultation period ends: 27/02/2026
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

One objection has been received from the neighbouring property at 12 Peaknaze Close on the following grounds:

- Loss of daylight, BRE standards advises that development should not cause a material reduction in daylight to neighbouring habitable rooms.
- Overbearing and tunnel-like impact
- Failure to comply with Local Plan Policy EQ6, the High Peak Design Guide (Section 5.5)
- Insufficient information to properly assess residential amenity impact.
- The plans are not scaled, so the Authority is unable to properly evaluate the impact on neighbouring amenity.
- Due to health condition, I spend extended periods within my home and my kitchen is a primary living space used throughout the day.

- The Council should give due regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty when assessing the impact on neighbouring residential amenity.

Town / Parish Comments

N/A.

Derbyshire County Council Highways (No Objection)

It is noted that the proposed extension will reduce the size of the garage and will increase the bedroom numbers from three to four. There is space on the drive to accommodate two parking spaces. DCC's parking guidance requires four bedroomed dwellings to have a minimum of three parking spaces; it is assumed that you will assess the parking provision against your own parking standards.

There does appear to be space to provide at least one additional parking space in the front garden and an increase in the parking provision would be beneficial to avoid additional road side parking.

However, in terms of assessing the parking provision at the property, the LHA must assess the potential impact of additional parking on the highway network. In this instance it is considered that a small amount of displaced parking would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety when taking into account the nature and characteristics of Peaknaze Close.

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

The application seeks full planning permission for an extension to an existing residential property that lies within the built up area boundary for Glossop, which is identified as a Market Town under Policy S2 of the High Peak Local Plan (2016). The site is not constrained by any sensitive statutory designations and given the nature of the proposed development is deemed to be acceptable in principle subject to an assessment of material considerations such as design and residential amenity which are discussed in greater detail below.

Design

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.

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.

One objection has been received from the neighbouring property, and has raised concerns that the proposals would result in tunnelling and are not subordinate in their nature.

The proposals seek to create a first floor extension above an existing side garage. The proposed extension is set back significantly from the principle elevation of the dwelling (2.2m) and as such the proposals would clearly appear as a subordinate addition to the dwelling in accordance with Local Plan Policy and guidance contained within the Design Guide SPD. The proposals are judged to create a harmonious addition which appears subservient to the property by virtue of its design and large set back. It is also noted that within the immediate vicinity there are a number of similar first floor extensions, most notably directly opposite the application site at no.9 Peaknaze and at no.13 Peaknaze where first floor extensions align with the existing ridge height. Therefore, first floor extensions above garages forms part of the character of the Peaknaze Close. The proposals are in keeping with the character and nature of the surrounding street scene.

As existing the application site is positioned substantially behind the neighbouring property of no.12 Peaknaze (Approx. 7m) and the proposed first floor extension would continue to retain a 2m separation to the side elevation of no. 12 Peaknaze Cl. As such the proposed extension is judged to retain the appearance of a detached dwelling and is not judged to result in any tunnelling impacts given that the properties are not aligned in a linear fashion, there would be no continuous built form when viewed from the street scene. Consequently, the proposals are not deemed to give rise to any tunnelling or terracing impacts.

The proposals would use brick and concrete tiles to match that of the existing dwelling. The use of matching materials is deemed to be appropriate and would retain the character of the existing dwelling and would appear in keeping with the nature of the street scene.

The proposed development would not have any unacceptable impact with regards to design, character and appearance in accordance with Local Plan Policy EQ6, the Design Guide SPD and national policy contained within the NPPF.

Amenity

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that planning decision should promote health and well being and ensure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

LP Policy EQ6 requires all new development to have a satisfactory relationship with existing land and buildings and protects the amenity of the area, which includes residential amenity of neighbouring properties. Aspects of residential amenity include impacts such as a loss of sunlight, overshadowing and overbearing impacts, loss of outlook, and loss of privacy.

The High Peak Residential Design Guide 2005 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.

There are no properties to the rear of the application site and therefore the proposed extension would not have any detrimental impacts with regards to overlooking or lead to any loss of privacy.

An objection has been received from the neighbouring property which states that the proposed extension would lead to a loss of daylight and that the proposals breach the 45 degree rule.

Due to the siting and orientation of the site the existing dwelling breaches the 45 degree rule to the neighbouring property of no.12 Peaknaze. The proposed first floor extension would also breach the 45 degree line to the nearest window in the first and ground floor of no.12 Peaknaze.

However, from both from previous planning history at the neighbouring property and the neighbouring objectors comments it can be confirmed that the two windows closest to the development site, to which the site breaches the 45 degree line relate to a kitchen at ground floor level and a bathroom at first floor.

Paragraph 9.2 & 9.3 state that *“Excessive overshadowing of neighbouring **habitable rooms windows**, glazed doors and private garden/amenity areas should be avoided.....**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.”*

From the submitted plans regarding a previous application at no.12 Peaknaze Close, ref HPK/2025/0453, it is clear that the kitchen is in use solely as a kitchen and not kitchen / diner and as a result does not qualify as a habitable room. The bathroom to the first floor of the no.12 also contains obscure glazing and does not relate to a habitable room. The proposed extension would not breach the 45 degree line to the bedroom of the first floor of no.12 or the ground floor dining room window. Therefore, the proposals are not deemed to result in any overshadowing or loss of light to any important habitable rooms. Moreover, the extension is positioned to the north west of the neighbour, and therefore any loss of sunlight would only be experienced during the late afternoon/early evening, with the remaining parts of the day being unaffected. In respect of daylight, the neighbours kitchen would experience some

loss of light, however as noted above kitchens are not considered to comprise habitable rooms, and there are other ground floor rooms available within the dwelling to occupy.

The proposed extension does not comprise any side windows and therefore the proposed development is not judged to lead to overlooking of the garden / amenity space associated with no.12.

As a consequence the proposed extension is not deemed to have any unacceptable impacts with regards to overshadowing and would not result in any undue loss of light to the neighbouring property.

The neighbouring objector has also raised concerns with regards to insufficient information, the Equality Act and BRE standards.

The submitted plans are accurately scaled and there are no requirements from High Peak Borough Council for dimensions to be shown on the plans. Following a site visit and examination of the submitted plans, which can be scaled, it is deemed that sufficient information has been provided to determine this application. It is noted that the objector makes reference to BRE standards, however as noted above the Council do not consider kitchens and bathrooms as habitable rooms. Whilst the neighbour may well spend extended periods in her kitchen, due to a health condition, the floor plans for the property also show a dining room and a large living room elsewhere, therefore other rooms are available within property at ground level for the occupant to spend time in.

With regards to the Equality Act, the proposals have been comprehensively assessed against local plan policies, adopted supplementary guidance further to national policy in the form of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the proposed works are not deemed to unduly harm to the residential amenities of the neighbouring occupiers.

The proposed development complies with Local Plan Policy EQ6, the Residential Design Guide SPD and national policy contained within the NPPF.

Highway Safety

LP Policy CF6 seeks to ensure that development can be safely accessed in a sustainable manner and that all new development is located where it can be satisfactorily accommodated within the existing highway network and provides suitable off-street parking provision in accordance with guidelines set out under Appendix 1 of the Local Plan.

The proposed development would increase the bedroom provision from three to four. Appendix 1 of the High Peak Local Plan parking standards states the dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms should provide 3 off road car parking spaces.

The proposed site plan shows sufficient space for 3 defined off-street vehicle parking spaces which accords with the criteria under Appendix 1 of the High Peak Local Plan parking standards.

DCC Highways have not raised any objections to the proposed works and as such the proposed development would not have any adverse impacts upon highway safety or lead to an increase in on street parking and complies with Local Plan Policy CF6.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

Due regard has been had to the Equality Act, and the circumstances identified by the objector, however in the overall planning balance the impact to residential amenity is not found to be sufficiently harmful for the reasons outlined above. Any perceived impact by the neighbour is outweighed by the compliance with the relevant Development Plan Policy, Policy EQ6, the Residential Design Guide 2005 and the NPPF. The proposed development is considered acceptable principle, would be of an acceptable design and will not result in any adverse impacts upon visual amenity. The proposals are in accordance with the relevant policies of the High Peak Local Plan, Supplementary Planning Documents and the National Planning Policy Framework. Therefore the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Approve

Case Officer: Stuart Talbot

Recommendation Date: 27/03/2026

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council