

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2026/0148
Valid 17/04/2026

3 POTTER ROAD
HADFIELD
GLOSSOP

ERECTION OF RAISED
DECKING

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of development.
- Character, Design & Amenity.
- Historic environment.
- Arboriculture.
- Other.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site is a detached property located within the built-up area of Hadfield, Glossop.

Land levels at the application site vary, with levels dropping sharply to the west of the existing dwellings. Therefore the garden area of No.3 is situated at a lower land level than the residential property. Land levels at neighbouring properties also vary.

An elevated platform is currently in-situ at the property, which provides access from the front/side of the dwelling, and from the rear to the garden area via steps.

To the rear of the property a conservatory extension has been constructed.

PROPOSAL

The proposal seeks planning permission for the construction of a raised decking platform, proposed to project up to 3.4metres from the rear of the existing dwelling (conservatory). The decking would have a maximum height of 2.1metres from ground level to the top of the raised platform. A 1.1metres balustrade is proposed to sit atop this, resulting in an overall height of 3.2metres. A 2metre high privacy screen is proposed along the south side of the decking platform. This privacy would take the overall height of the development to 3.9metres from ground level.

The proposed decking would span the full width of the plot, extending beyond the northern elevation to the common boundary with numbers 5 and 7 Potters road and aligning with the southern elevation, beyond which step would be provided into the rear garden.

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 5 Glossopdale Sub-area Strategy.

Policy EQ 2 Landscape Character.

Policy EQ 6 Design and Place Making.

Policy EQ 7 Built and Historic Environment.

National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024):

Part 2 – Achieving Sustainable Development.

Part 4 – Decision-making.

Part 12 – Achieving Well Designed Places.

Part 16 – Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment.

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

High Peak Design Guide (2018).

Residential Design (2005).

Landscape Character (2006).

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

The following applications are considered to be the most relevant to this application:

HPK/0002/6588 - Housing Development With New Access And Service Roads
Approx. 80-100 Dwellings - Refused 15/11/1988.

HPK/0002/7825 - Housing Development - Approved 15/05/1989.

HPK/0003/3961 - Erection Of Eighty Dwellings - Approved 15/12/1994.

HPK/0003/7922 - Sun Lounge Conservatory - Approved 28/04/1999.

CONSULTATIONS**Publicity**

Site Notice expiry date: 19/05/2026.

Neighbour consultation period ends: 08/05/2026.

Press Advert: N/A.

Public Comments

2 written representations have been received from residents, objecting to the proposal. A summary of the points raised in the submitted comment(s) is as follows:

- Decking will be higher than existing 6ft fence.
- Significant concerns regarding loss of privacy, overlooking, and the detrimental impact this development would have on the wellbeing of my household.
- The proposed raised decking, by virtue of its elevated height, would enable direct overlooking into garden and home, significantly exceeding the height of standard boundary fencing.
- The raised platform would allow users to see directly into internal living areas of home, resulting in a severe and intrusive loss of privacy.
- The decking and associated overlooking would materially harm living conditions.
- The presence of an elevated viewing platform overlooking private outdoor space with direct views into internal living areas would: compromise sense of safety and security, increase anxiety and distress due to perceived surveillance, and undermine professional recommendations regarding privacy and stability for children.
- Decking would be overbearing and it would feel like an intrusive, out of scale structure towering over the fence.
- May block sunlight to the back of the house, therefore affecting quality of life.
- Due to the elevated position of the property and not in keeping with other residential properties on the estate. Feel this would have a detrimental impact, on the future sale of 5 Potter Road, Hadfield.

Other:

A summary of the other consultation responses is as follows:

High Peak Borough Council Tree Officer:

- There are no arboricultural objection to the proposals.

Derbyshire County Council Highways:

- There appears to be no material impact on the public highway and therefore the Local Highway Authority has no further comments to make.

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, the effective use of land, protecting and enhancing the boroughs natural and historic environments, and securing high quality design and amenity standards. 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 Hadfield, which is identified as a 'Larger Village', where a moderate scale of development may be acceptable, consistent with meeting local needs, and maintaining or enhancing their distinctive character or appearance whilst also maintaining existing facilities and services.

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 whilst there are no 'in principle' objections to the application in policy terms, all other material planning considerations must be satisfied for the scheme to be supported.

Character, Design & Amenity:

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, and Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Documents, seek to build upon Policy EQ 6 and provide more detailed and practical advice for aspects such as design (size, siting, scale, materials etc) and impacts on neighbours in relation to possible overshadowing, massing, and overlooking etc.

Paragraph 9.2 of the High Peak Residential Design SPD (2005) states domestic extensions should be of a scale and be designed and positioned to avoid undue harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties. They must have regard to the orientation of adjacent homes, the number and position of windows and land levels. Excessive overshadowing of neighbouring habitable rooms windows, glazed doors and private garden/amenity areas should be avoided. These general principles are considered to be of relevance to the proposed development.

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF (December 2024) identifies that planning decisions should ensure that developments:

- will function well and add to the overall quality of the area.
- are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment.
- create places that promote a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Paragraph 139 of the NPPF continues, stating that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect or take account of any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides.

The application site has an existing raised platform to the rear of the dwelling. Based on the Council's on-site observations this raised platform consists of stone slabs enclosed by a timber balustrade, leading to a set of stone steps which provides access to the rear garden space. Given the size and nature of the existing raised platform, it is considered to effectively form a circulation space to the rear/side of the dwelling and onto the garden area. As a result, the existing raised platform is unlikely to provide opportunity to sit/dwell in this area for recreation purposes, and overall the associated impacts are likely to be limited in terms of overlooking/loss of privacy as a direct result of the platforms configuration, extent and use.

The proposed raised decking platform would create an area of substantial size, which could accommodate various recreational activities and would facilitate and encourage users to dwell in this area. It has been indicated in the submitted details that existing boundary treatments to neighbours are approximately 1.5metres from ground level. As identified, the proposed decking would create a platform which would reach a height of 2.1metres above ground level, with the proposed glass balustrade taking the height of the platform to 3.2metres.

Given the substantial height of the proposal which would project above existing boundary treatments, the use of the raised decking platform would result in significant levels of overlooking into the private garden space of several nearby properties, including numbers 2, 4 & 6 Tavern Road, and numbers 1, 5 and 7 Potter Road. The proposed raised decking platform would also afford views into neighbouring dwellings. A separation distance of approximately 10.5metres is

achieved from the proposed development and numbers 5 and 7 Potter Road to the north.

Paragraph 8.6 of the High Peak Residential Design SPD (2005) identifies the importance of new development providing adequate privacy to occupiers of existing dwellings.

Paragraph 8.6.1 also sets out that, as a guide, a distance of 21 metres should be achieved between new development and habitable room windows of adjacent properties. This is to ensure an acceptable level of amenity is provided. Where changes in land levels on site are evident or where taller buildings are present, these distances should increase by 1metre for every 0.5metre difference in height between the smaller to the taller building.

The height of the platform, and the associated overlooking impacts, are only exacerbated by virtue of the proximity of the proposal to the site boundaries, the height of existing boundary treatments, and distance to neighbouring dwellings.

A 2metre high timber privacy screen is proposed along the southern boundary of the raised decking platform. This may, to an extent, reduce some overlooking to the immediate neighbour of No.1 Potter Road, but would not negate the overall extent of overlooking which will occur from the raised platform, nor will it mitigate against the increase perception of overlooking, which is also in itself harmful to the amenity of neighbours.

The extent, scale, and siting of the proposed raised decking platform and privacy screen, reaching a maximum height of 3.9metres from ground level, is also considered to appear as an unduly prominent and uncharacteristic feature within an elevated position, resulting in both visual harm to the areas character, and would appear overbearing to neighbouring properties, impacting their amenity.

Overall the proposal is considered to cause harmful levels of overlooking to the above identified neighbouring properties within the vicinity of the application site, compromising the amenity of neighbours and their reasonable enjoyment of their dwellings and private garden areas. The raised decking platform and its associated boundary fence, particularly to the south is also considered to result in a structure which would appear as an overbearing feature, and a form of development which is visually uncharacteristic of the area. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies S 1 and EQ 6 of the High Peak Borough Council Local Plan (2016), Part 12 (Achieving Well Designed Places) of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024), and guidance contained within the adopted High Peak Residential Design (2005) Supplementary Planning Document.

Historic Environment:

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 the 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.

To the rear of the property is a Public Right of Way (Bridleway No.177), which also comprises the former (now demolished) route of the Waterside branch of the Great Central Railway, as identified on Derbyshire County Council's Historic Environment Record. This route now forms part of the Trans Pennine Trail.

The proposed development would relate to an extension/alteration to an existing residential dwelling. The development is therefore considered not to cause harm to the significance of the former railway route as a non-designated heritage asset.

Arboriculture:

The proposed structure is likely to encroach into the root protection area of the adjacent tree. However given the extent and nature of the development, it is considered that the health/stability of the tree would not be unduly compromised as a result of the proposal.

The consultation response from the Council's Tree Officer raises no objections to the proposal.

Other:

Response to Consultation Comments:

The above commentary addresses many of the points raised in comments, including the concerns raised the privacy/safety of children, about which have been received from the public. The following is intended to address those points which remain outstanding.

1. The impact a proposal may have on property value and/or the sale of property is not a material planning consideration.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The existing raised platform is unlikely to provide opportunity to sit/dwell for recreation purposes, and overall the associated impacts are likely to be limited.

The proposed raised decking platform would create an area of substantial size, which could accommodate various recreational activities and would facilitate and encourage users to dwell in this area.

Given the substantial height of the proposal which would project above existing boundary treatments, the use of the raised decking platform would result in significant levels of overlooking into the private garden space of several nearby properties. The proposed raised decking platform would also afford views into neighbouring dwellings.

The height of the platform, and the associated overlooking impacts, are only exacerbated by virtue of the proximity of the proposal to the site boundaries, the height of existing boundary treatments, and distance to neighbouring dwellings.

The development is not considered to cause harm to the significance of the former railway route as a non-designated heritage asset.

The health/stability of the adjacent tree would not be unduly compromised as a result of the proposal.

The Council tries to work proactively with applicants where it can, however in this instance it was unclear to the Council what amendments to the scheme could have been made to overcome the concerns as set out in the above assessment. As such, no revisions were sought, and the application was determined on its merits in accordance with the submitted details.

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: 11/06/2026

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council