

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2026/0125
Valid 20/03/2026

3 BEECH AVENUE
SIMMONDLEY
GLOSSOP

PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR
EXTENSION OVER EXISTING
GROUND FLOOR
ACCOMMODATION

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of development
- Design
- Residential amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site comprises a two-storey mid terrace dwellinghouse situated on the south side of the Beech Avenue cul-de-sac. The property is constructed of red/brown brick and white render and benefits from a single storey rear extension. The site is located within the built-up area boundary of Glossop. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character and there are no heritage constraints affecting the application site.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a first-floor extension to rear.

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

National Planning Policy Framework

Chapter 12 - Achieving Well Designed and Beautiful Places

Supplementary Planning Documents

Residential Design Guide SPD (2005)

Design Guide SPD (2018)

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

No planning history

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 15-05-2026

Neighbour consultation period ends: 15-04-2026

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

No comments

Derbyshire County Council Highways

The applicant is required to provide a plan which indicates the existing parking provision or any additional parking to accommodate the potential increase in parking demand generated by the additional bedroom.

Further comments will be provided on receipt of the required information.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

This 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.

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a first-floor rear extension. The extension would sit above the existing single-storey rear extension and would measure 3m in depth and 5.6m in width, with a roof height set below that of the main dwelling. The proposed materials, including a white rendered finish, would match the existing property and can be secured by condition should permission be granted.

Within the surrounding area there are several examples of two-storey extensions, and the proposed addition would not appear out of keeping with the established pattern of development. Positioned to the rear of the dwelling, the extension would not be visible from public vantage points and would therefore have no impact on the street scene.

Overall, the extension is considered to be of an appropriate scale and design for the host property. It would read as a subordinate addition and is deemed to comply with the overarching principles of Policy EQ6 and the Residential SPD.

Amenity

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states 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 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 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.

Para 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.”

9.3.1 Similarly an extension should not unduly reduce outlook from a main habitable room window or produce a tunnelling affect. To prevent this, extensions affecting neighbouring property should not normally extend more than 2.5 m from the rear of the affected home. All planning applications for domestic development should be careful to include scaled plans indicating the position of neighbouring property.

No. 4 Beech Avenue is the adjoining property located to the west of the application site. This dwelling remains unextended. By contrast, the application property has already been extended at ground floor level by way of a single-storey rear extension. The existing single-storey extension breaches the 45-degree line when taken from all rear ground floor windows serving No. 4, resulting in an existing degree of impact upon outlook and light at ground floor level. The proposed first-floor rear extension would introduce a further infringement of the 45-degree when assessed from the first-floor rear windows of No. 4, which are understood to serve a bedroom located closest to the boundary and a bathroom set away from the boundary. The extension would encroach just over 2m into the 45 degree line.

Although the rear of the properties are south-facing in orientation which is generally considered favourable, the additional bulk and height of the proposed development would materially reduce the level of natural light currently enjoyed in the bedroom window of this neighbouring property. When considered in combination with the existing ground floor extension, the proposed first-floor addition would result in a significant increase in massing that would give rise to an unduly overbearing impact, adversely affecting the residential amenity by of No. 4 Beech Avenue in terms of outlook and daylight. As the extension is located to the south of this neighbour and given the proximity orientation of the extension to rear windows at number 4, there would be loss of sunlight, which would be particularly noticeable in the morning.

No. 2 Beech Avenue is the adjoining property located to the east of the application site. Similarly to No. 4, this dwelling has not been extended.

The existing single-storey rear extension at the application site is positioned approximately 0.9 metres from the shared boundary with No. 2. The proposed first-floor rear extension would follow this building line. As a result, the proposal would not breach the 45-degree guideline when assessed from the nearest habitable room windows serving No. 2. Accordingly, the proposed extension is considered to maintain an acceptable relationship with this neighbouring property.

Overall, the proposed extension by virtue of its height and siting would breach the 45 degree line when measured from the rear windows of number 4, causing a loss of light and having an overbearing impact on this neighbour contrary to Policy EQ6 and the adopted Residential Design SPD.

Highway Safety

Para 113 of the NPPF states maximum parking standards for residential and non-residential development should only be set where there is a clear and compelling justification that they are necessary for managing the local road network, or for optimising the density of development in city and town centres and other locations that are well served by public transport (in accordance with chapter 11 of this Framework).

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 application property benefits from an area of hardstanding to the front which provides two off-street parking spaces, in accordance with the guidance contained within Appendix 1 of the Local Plan for a three-bedroom dwelling. The surrounding properties similarly benefit from adequate off-street parking provision. Given the site's location within a cul-de-sac, it is particularly important to limit reliance on on-street parking in order to maintain the free flow of vehicles and protect highway safety.

The proposed development would result in the creation of an additional bedroom at first floor level, increasing the dwelling from a three-bedroom to a four-bedroom property. In accordance with Appendix 1 of the Local Plan, a four-bedroom dwelling is required to provide a minimum of three off-street parking spaces. No additional parking provision is proposed as part of the development, and the site would therefore fall below the adopted parking standards.

As such, the site would become undersupplied and could lead to increased on-street parking pressure within the cul-de-sac if replicated on the street.

It is considered that the proposal would fail to meet the Council's adopted parking standards and would not comply with policy CF6 and Appendix 1 on the High Peak Local Plan.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

Whilst the proposed first-floor rear extension is considered acceptable in design terms, the development would result in harm to neighbouring residential amenity. In particular, when considered cumulatively with the existing single-storey extension, the proposal would have a significantly overbearing impact on the adjoining property at No. 4 Beech Avenue and would lead to a material loss of light to habitable room windows.

Furthermore, the introduction of an additional bedroom without the provision of sufficient off-street parking would result in the property being undersupplied, contrary to the Council's adopted parking standards.

Therefore, the proposal would fall contrary to Policies EQ6 and CF6 of the High Peak Local Plan and the adopted Residential Design Guide.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : REFUSE

Case Officer: Agatha Dutton

Recommendation Date: 09-06-2026

X *J. Colley*

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council