

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2026/0138
Valid 15/04/2026

57 SCHOOL ROAD
PEAK DALE

DEMOLISH EXISTING SINGLE
STOREY REAR EXTENSION
AND ERECT A NEW SINGLE
STOREY EXTENSION.
PROPOSED WORKS ALSO
INCLUDE ENLARGING FIRST
FLOOR BEDROOM WINDOW
AND CHANGES TO THE
SETTING OUT & LEVELS OF
THE EXISTING
PATIO/GARDEN

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design, Character and Appearance
- Impact upon Residential Amenity
- Nutrient Neutrality

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site refers to a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on School Road within the defined built up area boundary of Peak Dale. The property comprises a typical semi-detached appearance with a white render and pebbledash exterior finish with brick plinth lowers. As existing the property is afforded a single storey rear extension with a mono-pitch roof. To the rear of the application site lie large open fields which contain 2 ProW, the first which runs along the perimeter of the field directly adjacent to the rear boundary of the site and the neighbouring properties along School Lane and a further ProW which crosses the field in a diagonal south west to north east orientation.

The surrounding area is residential in its nature and predominantly comprises two storey semi-detached and detached dwellings which do not observe a strict building line.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks full planning consent to replace an existing single storey rear extension with a new single storey flat roofed rear extension.

The proposed rear extension would have a depth of 4.2m from the original rear elevation and would occupy a width of 4.4m. The extension would have a maximum height of 3.1m. The submitted supporting plans show that the proposed extension is to be re-rendered and to use brick plinth as per the existing extension.

The proposals also seek to enlarge the first floor window to create a Juliette balcony and alter the ground levels of the existing patio / rear garden area.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Local Plan 2016

S 1 Sustainable Development Principles
S 1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
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

HPK/0002/6879: Proposed vehicular access (Approved 23/08/1988)

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 16/06/2026
Neighbour consultation period ends: 18/05/2026
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

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

- Overshadowing
- Loss of light
- Scale / depth

It is also noted the comments raised also give concerns as to de-valuing the neighbouring property. House prices and future valuations are not material planning considerations in the determining of a planning application and therefore this element will carry no weight in the determination of this planning application.

Town / Parish Comments

N/A.

Derbyshire County Council Highways (No Objection)

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

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 Peak Dale, which is identified as a Larger Village under 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 proposals would replace an existing single storey rear extension which is moderately larger than the one it seeks to replace. The proposals are of a modest scale and would be subservient to the existing dwelling and as such are not deemed to result in any adverse harm upon the character of the existing dwelling.

The existing dwelling comprises a rendered and pebbledash exterior finish with brick plinth lowers which is to be replicated by the proposed replacement extension and as such is deemed to be appropriate.

The proposed works are located wholly to the rear of the application site and although there are two ProW to the rear of the site, given the site topography with the field below located at a much lower land level, the terrain would largely obscure the proposed works, particularly regarding the garden and patio alterations. The nearest ProW is therefore judged to only have limited views of the upper sections of the site. The PRow located further to the west would likely afford some views of the rear of the property, but these would be at distances circa 100m.

Paragraph 9.4.1 of the Residential Design Guide SPD states that “In view of their often squat and ungainly appearance, the prevailing climate and ongoing maintenance problems, flat roofs should be avoided.”

Although the residential design guide seeks to avoid flat roofs where possible, given that in this instance the proposals relate to a rear extension which will not be visible within the street scene and would have limited opportunities for intervisibility from ProW further to the east, the flat roof arrangement is not deemed to have an unacceptable impact upon the character of the existing dwelling or the wider surrounding area.

The development also includes the enlargement of a rear window to the first floor elevation to facilitate a new Juliette balcony. The proposed balcony is located to the rear of the site and from a design perspective is not judged to give rise to any unacceptable impacts upon the character of the existing dwelling.

The proposed development is therefore not considered to have any detrimental impacts with regards to its design, character or appearance in accordance with local Plan Policy EQ6, SPD's and national planning policy contained within the NPPF.

Amenity

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 development relates to works which are wholly to the rear of the site. There are no dwellings to the rear of the application site which instead comprises a number of field parcels and the open countryside. Consequently, the proposed extension is not deemed to have any adverse impacts regarding privacy or lead to

overlooking to the rear. The proposed extension would create a new larger window to the south facing side elevation facing towards no.59 School Road. The submitted supporting plans show that the larger lower section of this window is to be obscured glazed to reduce any potential unneighbourly impact. Therefore given that the proposed side window replaces an existing window, albeit smaller than the window proposed in this instance, combined with the use of obscure glazing the proposed rear extension would not lead to any loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties. Any permission hereby approved will be conditioned for the lower section of this window to remain obscure glazed.

The proposed development also includes the enlargement and dropping of the cill of a first floor window to facilitate a new Juliette balcony. Whilst balconies do have the potential to have an unacceptable impact with regard to overlooking as above, there are no properties opposite the rear of the site and therefore there would be no potential for overlooking in this regard. Whilst there could be potential for overlooking between the Juliette balcony and rear garden amenity areas of the properties of no. 55 and 59 School Road. Given that the proposals relate to a balconet with no standing platform or room to use this area as a standing / seating area in addition to the lack of objection from the neighbouring occupiers. The proposals are therefore not deemed to result in any unacceptable impacts with regard to overlooking or loss of privacy of the rear garden / amenity areas.

One neutral comment has been received with regards to the potential for the devaluing of the property and overshadowing. Whilst impacts upon property valuations are not material considerations in the determination of planning applications concerns regarding overshadowing and loss of light are material.

Nonetheless, the proposed rear extension has been assessed to comply with the 45 degree line to both neighbouring properties and as such would not lead to any unacceptable loss of light or overshadowing and is not judged to create an overbearing addition. The neighbour has also raised concerns about the proposed depth of the extension being 4.4m, whereas their own two storey rear extension was restricted to a depth of 3.5m. On review of application HPK/2005/0297, a two storey rear extension to the adjoining neighbour, this was refused due to its excess depth and impact on the light and outlook to the application site. The current proposals significantly differ in that they relate to a single storey extension which would not adversely affect light and outlook to the adjoining neighbour.

The proposed increase in the patio height by 450mm and the replacement of existing steps to the patio area, moved circa 1m to the northwest are judged to comprise a minimal intervention and the raising of the patio by 450mm is only 150mm above what would be permissible under permitted development rights. With regard to the existing boundary treatments to the neighbouring properties and the minimal raising of the patio this is not judged to have any detrimental impacts upon neighbouring amenity. Close boarded fencing forms the boundaries to both properties, and in terms of the location of the raised patio, it would be positioned towards the centre of the rear garden, further away from the existing raised patio and neighbours amenity space closest to their rear elevations.

The development would not have any detrimental impacts upon residential amenity in accordance with Local Plan Policy EQ6, the Residential Design Guide SPD further to national policy detailed within the NPPF.

Nutrient Neutrality

The site lies within the catchment of the River Wye which forms the Peak District Dales Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The Council has been notified that action must be taken to address exceedances of phosphorus in the River. As such, the Council cannot grant consent for development unless it can rule out “likely significant effects” on the SAC. A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) will be required when the plan or project creates a source of water pollution or has an impact on water quality and when it is within the catchment of the SAC. Initially, a screening assessment will be required to consider if “likely significant effects” (alone or in-combination) on the SAC can be ruled out. If not, this will be followed by an “Appropriate Assessment” where the impact of the plan or project is considered in detail.

Screening Assessment

The proposal is not directly connected with or necessary for the conservation management of a European site. The proposal will involve additional roof area and will therefore increase surface water run-off. However, given the very limited extent of the additional roof it will not significantly increase run-off from the site. On the basis, of an average occupancy rate of 2.4 persons per dwelling, however, there will be no increase in waste water generated by the proposals. Therefore in terms of both foul and ground water it is not considered that the proposal will risk having a significant negative effect on the SAC either on its own or in combination with other proposals and therefore it is not necessary to carry out an Appropriate Assessment.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The proposed development is considered acceptable principle, would be of an acceptable design and will not result in any adverse impacts upon visual or residential 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: 15/06/2026

X *J. Colley*

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council