

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2026/0091
Valid 19/03/2026

1 PARK CRESCENT
FURNESS VALE

**PROPOSED TWO STOREY
AND SINGLE STOREY SIDE
EXTENSION, NEW ENTRANCE
PORCH AND CANOPY WITH
ASSOCIATED INTERNAL
ALTERATIONS.**

(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 red brick semi-detached property located within the defined settlement area of Furness, at the end of a cul-de-sac known as Park Crescent. The site is directly adjacent to a public footpath (Ref. HP23/7/1) which gives pedestrian access from Park Crescent towards the centre of Furness Vale. The site is also located within the Whaley Bridge Neighbourhood Plan Area.

The site as existing is afforded a one and half storey rear extension with a flat roof and a large outdoor amenity area and garden. From an overview of the planning history there is no information regarding the single storey rear extension element which appears to have been built with planning consent.

The surrounding area is characterised by two storey brick semi-detached dwellings which are similar in scale and appearance to the application site, however it is noted that opposite the site to the east lies an isolated detached red brick bungalow.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks full planning consent for a number of alterations comprising a two storey side extension and a large flat roof single storey side / rear extension, further to a new rear entrance store, infilling the area between the existing extension and the neighbouring boundary.

The proposed two storey element would comprise a two storey hipped roof arrangement and is to be dropped approximately 0.8m from the ridge height. The

proposed two storey element would have a maximum height of 7m above ground level with the eaves at 5.8m in height. The proposed two storey element would project 3.3m from the existing side elevation and is not set back from the principal elevation. The proposals also include a side / rear single storey “cube” extension with a flat roof and large glazing panels to its rear elevation. The proposed single storey element would extend 4.8m from the original side elevation and approximately 1.6m beyond the side of the two storey element. The proposed “cube” extension would be set back from the principal elevation by 2m. The single storey element would have a height of 4m and also includes a balcony above the flat roof element connecting to the rear of the two storey side element.

The proposals also include a single storey rear store element with a large chamfer to the rear which would project a maximum of 4.3m, 2.4m beyond the existing rear extension. From the rear elevation it infills the rear between the existing flat roofed rear extension and the neighbouring boundary. The proposed store would have a flat roof with a maximum height of 2m.

The proposals identify that they are to use facing brick and roof tiles to closely match that of the existing dwelling further to new anthracite grey windows and doors.

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)

Whaley Bridge Neighbourhood Plan

WB-E1 Sustainable Design

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: 14/05/2026

Neighbour consultation period ends: 15/04/2026

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

One neutral public comment has been received which has raised the following comment:

- I basically have no objections to this application except to ensure that the facing brick mentioned in the application is actually matching facing brick to the existing structure.

Town / Parish Comments

No comments

Derbyshire County Council Highways

The proposed extensions will increase the bedroom numbers at the property to three. It is considered that there is space to accommodate two parking spaces to the front of the dwelling which accords with DCC's parking guidance for three bedroomed dwellings.

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 and alterations to an existing residential property that lies within the built up area boundary for Furness Vale, which is identified as a Larger Village 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

Paragraphs 135 of the NPPF outlines that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;*
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;*
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);*

Paragraph 139 continues that *“Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.”*

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 Whaley Bridge Neighbourhood Plan policy WB-E1 states that *“Development should be well-designed, locally distinctive to Whaley Bridge and sustainable, meeting the following requirements of this policy where they are appropriate and necessary and in a way that is proportionate to the nature and scale of the development.”* And continues:

A) Development should complement the townscape character and topography of the site and context and wider Whaley Bridge area in terms of scale, height, massing, roofscape, set-back from the road, spacing of properties, and the pattern of front and rear gardens.

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 additions, whilst respecting the character and appearance of the building through an appropriate choice of materials.

The proposed development consists of a number of alterations which comprises three main elements; the two storey hipped roof side extension, the large “square / cube” single storey side / rear extension, further to a rear infill store extension.

Paragraph 9.4 of the Residential Design Guide SPD states that *“Extensions and other works should seek to match the prevailing angle of the original roof, to maintain the proportion of the house.”*

Paragraph 9.4 of the Residential Design Guide also identifies that *“In view of their often squat and ungainly appearance, the prevailing climate and ongoing maintenance problems, flat roofs should be avoided.”*

Paragraph 5.2 of the Design Guide 2018 states that *“alterations need to be undertaken with care. Insensitive changes can easily spoil a building. The key to a sensitive approach is to take note of what is there already before preparing the design and to work with and not against, the buildings character. The aim should be to revitalise the building without altering its character”.*

Paragraph 5.5 of the Design Guide SPD identifies 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 sizing 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.”*

The proposed two storey side extension is set down from the ridge of the existing dwelling which does reduce its prominence somewhat, however the two storey extension would maintain the same eaves height and would not be set back from the principal elevation which means that the proposed two storey addition would not clearly be viewed as an extension to the existing dwelling eroding its character. Furthermore by not stepping the extension back from the principle elevation, any mismatch in materials would appear visually incoherent and striking, further harming the character of the existing dwelling. Additionally, by virtue of the width of the proposed two storey element, the hipped roof design follows a different and much shallower roof pitch than that followed by the host dwelling, resulting in a ridge and eaves of the proposed extension appearing “stretched and elongated” compared to the roof pitch arrangement of the existing dwelling, which has a much steeper roof profile from ridge to eaves, particularly when viewed from the front. These elements combined, result in the design and appearance of the two storey extension creating adverse harm upon the character of the existing dwelling and is not in accordance with local plan policy or the design guidance.

Paragraph 5.6 of the Design Guide states that *“In some circumstances it may be acceptable to consider extensions which do not emulate the style of the original building. A more contemporary approach to an extension in terms of style and materials, will provide a more honest recognition of the buildings evolution and retain historic integrity. These need to be handled carefully and must respond to the scale and character of the host dwelling”.*

The proposed “cube” single storey side / rear extension features a modern contemporary design which is wholly at odds with the existing dwelling and the street scene with the majority of the rear elevation occupied by large glazing panels.

The “cube” element is substantial in its height at 4m, to allow for a balcony connecting to the first floor window to the rear of the proposed two storey element, which when combined with the flat roof design would result in the extension appearing very “square” in its appearance and would appear as an excessively tall and ungainly addition to the side extension. Moreover the solid to void ratio, due to the excessive amount of glazing is completely at odds with the host dwelling, which

has much smaller portioned windows. As above contemporary extensions can be considered to be acceptable however this is only where they can demonstrate that they would respond to the scale and character of the host dwelling. In this instance the proposed one and a half storey side extension is incongruous and wholly out of scale with the existing dwelling substantially diminishing its character and therefore is the view of the Council that this development constitutes an inappropriate contemporary extension.

The proposals also include the installation of a balcony over the flat roof of the “cube” extension linking to the rear window of the two storey side extension. This balcony would be highly visible given the open nature and context of the site particularly noting the public footpath directly adjacent to the east. This balcony would be widely visible within the context of the residential close and balconies are highly untypical additions to properties within the High Peak. Therefore, the inclusion of a balcony would look out of keeping with both the character of the surrounding area and that of the existing dwelling. Consequently, the proposals would have an unacceptable impact upon the character of the existing dwelling by virtue of its design and appearance in direct conflict with the Design Guides and the Whaley Bridge Neighbourhood Plan.

Furthermore, the property forms one half of a traditional brick two storey hipped roof semi-detached pair of dwellings. The resulting two storey side extension with its elongated ridge to that of the principle ridge and large flat roofed one and a half storey side extension would have a detrimental impact upon the symmetry of the wider semi-detached dwelling pair. Park Crescent is dominated by this style of semi-detached dwellings which reinforces the character of this locality. Therefore, given the height, scale and massing of the proposed extensions, the proposals would be highly prominent within the street scene and would appear as a visually intrusive and overly dominant additions which would cause an unacceptable level of harm to the character of the street scene and surrounding area.

The proposals also include the erection of an infill rear porch entrance to the property which features a significantly chamfered edge to fill the area between the site boundary and the original dwelling resulting in an incongruous and unsympathetic design which does not create a harmonious addition to the rear of the dwelling. This is exacerbated by the flat roof and comparably low roof height to depth ratio. It is also noted that there are no windows to the rear elevation with the only window to this element being to the east facing side elevation. All of these design characteristics combined result in an unusual “squashed” appearance with a high solid to void ratio, which is at odds of the existing dwelling. With regard to the ProW, which runs adjacent to the eastern boundary of the dwelling the proposed rear store is still judged to have a high level of visibility within the street scene and as such would result in a detrimental impact upon the character of the surrounding area.

Paragraph 5.8 also states that “Irrespective of size, however, all buildings can reach a threshold point beyond which further extension is just not possible without destroying their character”

Paragraph 9.1 and 9.2 of the Residential Design Guide SPD goes on to add that “It is important that the extension results in a dwelling that is well designed in itself.

Domestic extensions should be of a scale and be designed and positioned to avoid undue harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties.”

The design of the contemporary extensions do not appear in scale with the host dwelling nor do they respect the character of the host dwelling resulting in a disjointed appearance. Additionally, by virtue of the number and scale of the additions to the original property, this would extend the building by more than 80% of the original width and the proposals would substantially increase the footprint of the site through the large extensions to the side and rear of the property. The scale, proportions and character of the original dwelling would be lost as a result of the cumulative impact of all of the extension elements. Thus, the proposed extensions are deemed to constitute to the overdevelopment of the dwelling by virtue of their cumulative impact upon the host dwelling.

Therefore, with regard to the above the proposed development would constitute the overdevelopment of the plot through the sheer expanse of multiple extensions. Furthermore the design, character and appearance of the proposed extensions would create an incohesive additions and alterations which is judged to not harmonise with the existing dwelling or create a subordinate extension to the host dwelling. Moreover the overall impact would be to unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties.

The proposed development is therefore contrary to local plan policy EQ6, The Whaley Bridge Neighbourhood Plan, the Design Guide SPD, the Residential Design Guide SPD further to national planning policy detailed within the NPPF.

Amenity

Paragraphs 135 of the NPPF outlines that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

f) 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 users⁵¹; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

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 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.

The proposed side extensions do not extend beyond the furthest most point of the front or rear elevations and therefore the 45 degree rule is not applicable to these

elements. The proposals do include a rear store extension, however by virtue of the large chamfered edge this extension has been assessed to comply with the 45 degree rule to the adjoining neighbouring semi-detached dwelling. As a consequence, the proposed extension would not be an overbearing addition, nor would it result in any unacceptable overshadowing or loss of light to the adjoining property. Given the site context and arrangements of the neighbouring property of no.2 Park Crescent the proposed extensions are not judged to have any adverse impacts upon the neighbouring amenity of the property of no.2.

Paragraph 8.6.1 of the Residential Design Guide SPD states that “As a guide a distance of 21 metres between habitable room windows of adjacent properties will provide an acceptable level of amenity. Where changes in levels on site are evident or where taller buildings are present, these distances should increase by 1 metre for every 0.5 metre difference in height between the smaller to the taller building.”

The site is located at much higher ground level than the properties to the rear of the site on Charlesworth Road. The property of no. 3 Charlesworth Road is located directly to the rear of the application site at approximately 29m to the north. However, given the lack of topographical plans it is impossible to accurately ascertain the difference in ground levels.

Nonetheless whilst it is accepted that the proposed extensions would retain over 21m to the rear elevation of any habitable room windows of no. 3 Charlesworth Road, the proposals do include a rear balcony which has the potential to create a significant loss of privacy and overlooking. Therefore with regard to the fact that the proposals would looking directly into the rear garden / amenity area of no.3 Charlesworth Road and that the proposed balcony would be approximately 20.5m from the rear garden of no.3, combined with the significant level changes, it is deemed that the inclusion of the balcony above the flat roofed “cube” extension would result in an unacceptable impact upon the residential amenity of no. 3 Charlesworth Road by virtue of the direct overlooking and loss of privacy.

Furthermore, the proximity of the ProW to the east and the positioning of the balcony means that whilst using the balcony area, the occupiers would be directly overlooking users of the pedestrian footpath. Additionally given that the pedestrian footway slopes steeply uphill towards the application site, any users of the pedestrian footpath would be directly overlooking the occupiers of the application site on the balcony area. As a consequence, the proposed development is judged to have an unacceptable impact with regards to overlooking and a loss of privacy for any occupiers of the application site.

Therefore with regard to the above the proposed development is judged to have an unacceptable impact upon the amenity of no.3 Charlesworth Road, further to the amenity of the occupiers of the application site in direct conflict with Local Plan Policy EQ6, the Residential Design Guide SPD further to national policy detailed in 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 proposals would lead to an increase in the bedroom provision from two to three, however the proposed site plans do demonstrate that there is sufficient off street vehicle parking to accommodate 3 parking spaces. As such the proposals are not judged to lead to any increase in on-street parking in accordance with Local Plan Policy CF6 and Appendix 1 - Parking Standards.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The proposed development by virtue of the cumulative impact of the 3 extension elements would substantially increase the built footprint of the site and beyond 80% of the width of the original dwelling constitutes the overdevelopment of the plot.

Moreover, the development comprises an appearance which is wholly at odds with the character of the existing dwelling and the street scene as a result of the incongruous flat-roofed cube single storey side extension and the elongated ridge of the extension when compared to the existing principle ridge and eaves arrangement and lack of set back of the two storey side extension elements. Overall, the design of the extension would be at odds with the character of the host dwelling, unbalance the appearance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings and have a visually harmful impact on the character of the street scene.

Additionally, the proposals would result in direct overlooking of the rear garden amenity space to the rear of no.3 Charlesworth Road and between users of the pedestrian path to the east of the site and any future occupiers of the application site, resulting in a significant loss of amenity. Consequently, the proposals are contrary to Local Plan Policy EQ6, Design Guide SPD (2018), Residential Design Guide SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Refuse

Case Officer: Stuart Talbot

Recommendation Date: 12/05/2026

X *J. Colley*

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council