

**HIGH PEAK BOROUGH COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

Date 6th June 2022

Application No:	HPK/2022/0065	
Location	2 Hawthorn Bank, Hadfield, Glossop	
Proposal	Single storey rear extension and two storey front extension	
Applicant	Rachel Sloman	
Agent	N/A	
Parish/ward	Hadfield South Ward	Date registered 17 th February 2022
If you have a question about this report please contact: James Stannard, Tel. 01298 28400 extension 4298, james.stannard@highpeak.gov.uk		

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. REASON FOR COMMITTEE DETERMINATION

- 1.1 This application has been brought before the Development Control Committee because the applicant is related to Councillor Sloman, Member for Stone Bench (Buxton).

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application relates to No.2 Hawthorn Bank, Hadfield, Glossop; a two storey 3no. bedroom semi-detached residential dwelling constructed like its neighbours from a dark red brick and tiled roof.
- 2.2 The principal elevation faces north-westwards on to the public highway, whilst a private driveway leads to a rather unsympathetic ancillary single garage finished in timber cladding with a high ceiling and flat roof that fills the gap between No.2 and No.3 Hawthorn Bank.
- 2.3 The garage continues towards the rear in the form of a brick flat roof extension that sits flush with the main house, with a small flight of steps leading to the rear patio, and garden beyond.
- 2.4 The north-eastern boundary is shared with No.1 Hawthorn Bank, which forms the other half of the semi-detached block, which has a rear elevation that contains a set of French doors nearest to the boundary,

which itself is defined by a timber fence. No.3 Hawthorn Bank lies a short distance to the south-west with the boundary defined by a similar timber fence.

- 2.5 The wider street scene (i.e. Hawthorn Bank) is characterised by properties of a similar design, and, importantly, does not show any examples of extensions beyond the principal elevation.
- 2.6 For the purpose of the Development Plan the site lies within the built-up area boundary and is not constrained by any sensitive statutory designations.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The application as originally submitted sought planning permission for a two storey rear extension, and two storey front extension. Owing to revised plans received 22.05.22 which shows the rear elevation reduced to a single storey extension, the description of development has been updated to reflect these changes.
- 3.2 The following plans are subject to assessment within this report:
 - Site Location and Block Plan (Ref: DWG-006)
 - Proposed Floor Plans (Ref: DWG-004)
 - Proposed Elevations (Ref: DWG-002)
 - Existing and Proposed Roof Layout (Ref: DWG-005)
- 3.3 The proposal in its revised form shows the single storey extension to the rear serving an extended kitchen/dining room having a depth of 3 metres, extending across the entirety of the rear elevation of the main house, and flush with the existing flat roof extension beyond the garage.
- 3.4 The two storey front elevation shows the provision of a porch at ground floor level with the first floor serving an enlarged third bedroom. This aspect is shown to have an approximate depth of 1.5m and an approximate width of 2.8m.
- 3.5 The elevation plans shows that the front two storey extension to be finished in a contrasting K-render with a dual pitched tiled roof, with a new entrance door at ground floor level and habitable bedroom window at first floor level.
- 3.6 The application can be viewed online at the following link <http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=253531>

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 The site has not been subject to any previous planning history

5. PLANNING LEGISLATION RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

High Peak Local Plan 2016

- S1 Sustainable Development Principles
- S1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- S2 Settlement Hierarchy
- S5 Glossopdale Sub-area Strategy
- EQ6 Design and Place Making
- CF6 Accessibility and Transport

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- High Peak Residential Design Guide SPD (2005)
- High Peak Design Guide SPD (2018)

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

- Achieving Sustainable Development Chapter 2
- Promoting Sustainable Transport Chapter 9
- Achieving Well Designed Places Chapter 12

6. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

Site notice	Expiry date for comments: 20 th April 2022
Neighbour letters	Expiry date for comments: 21 st March 2022
Press Notice	Expiry date for comments: N/A

6.1 1 x objection has been received in connection with the application who objects on the grounds of a window overlooking a neighbouring garden.

6.2 The following table shows the comments received from relevant statutory consultees in connection with the application.

Consultee	Comments
DCC Highways	No highway safety comments to make.

7. OFFICER ASSESSMENT

- 7.1 The determination of a planning application is to be made pursuant to section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which is to be read in conjunction with section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- 7.2 Section 38(6) requires the local planning authority to determine planning applications in accordance with the development plan, unless there are material circumstances which 'indicate otherwise'. Section 70(2) provides that in determining applications the local planning authority "shall have regard to the provisions of the Development Plan, so far as material to the application and to any other material considerations." The Development Plan consists of the High Peak Local Plan Policies Adopted April 2016.
- 7.3 Other material considerations include the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG). Paragraph 11 of the NPPF explains that at the heart of the Framework is the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision makers this means that when considering development proposals which accord with the development plan, they should be approved without delay, but where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, grant planning permission unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

Principle of Development

- 7.4 The site lies within the built-up area boundary of Hadfield; identified as a Larger Village within the Settlement Hierarchy set out under Local Plan (LP) Policy S2, which states that such settlements can accommodate development of a modest scale. The site is not constrained by any sensitive statutory designation.
- 7.5 In light of the above, the general principle of development is considered to be acceptable, subject to a detailed assessment of all relevant planning considerations.

Planning Considerations

Design, Character and Appearance

- 7.6 LP Policy S1 sets out a number of sustainability principles which all new development proposals should incorporate in order to make a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities and to protect, and where possible enhance the environment.

- 7.7 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.
- 7.8 Chapter 9 of the High Peak Residential Design Guide SPD (2005) contains guidance relating to domestic extensions and alterations. The guidance pertinent to this application is set out as follows:
- 9.0 *Extensions and alterations to existing houses can have a significant impact on the appearance of a house, neighbouring property and the street scene. It is important, on all types of houses, that domestic development is carefully designed.*
- 9.1 *Extensions should be designed so as to be subordinate to the main form of the house. It is important that the extension results in a dwelling that is well designed in itself.*
- 7.9 Chapter 5 of the High Peak Design Guide SPD (2018) contains further useful guidance for domestic extensions and alterations. The guidance pertinent to this application is set out as follows:
- 5.5 *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 size 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*
- 7.10 Paragraph 130 of the NPPF states amongst other things that decisions should ensure that developments will add to the overall quality of the area; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture; and are sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.
- 7.11 Paragraph 133 of the NPPF states 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.
- 7.12 The existing house sits centrally within a row of three properties of similar character and appearance, that have a well established building line. There are no examples within the vicinity of the site (i.e. either side of Hawthorn Bank) that shows development beyond the principal elevation.
- 7.13 The applicant has submitted a supporting document which attempts to make a justification for the acceptability of the proposed two storey extension.

- 7.14 The document cites Permitted Development rights that allows for a single storey front porch to be constructed without planning permission. The document also cites examples within the wider estate that have benefited from two storey additions to the principal elevation.
- 7.15 The two examples sited at No.7 Ivy Croft and 2 Sandybank Close, are situated in a different street scene that is some 300 metres from the site. Both applications were determined in excess of 20 years ago under a different planning policy context. As such, these applications carry little weight in assessing and determining this application.
- 7.16 The third example of a two storey front extension cited is No.42 Lower Barn Road, which again lies in a different street scene some 300m distant, was approved in 2019 under HPK/2018/0537. The delegated report which contains the analysis and justification for the approval, correctly identified that in this instance, the linear row of development is staggered, with no established building line, and that the street scene has a varied character and appearance, allowing for a front extension to be introduced without harming the overall character and appearance of the dwelling or wider street scene.
- 7.17 The same does not apply in relation to this application, and, noting that every application should be determined on its own individual merits, it is considered that this third example again carries little weight in the assessment and determination of this application.
- 7.18 The proposed two storey front extension would breach and therefore disrupt the well established building line which extends southwards from Higher Barn Road, and as a result would fail to respect the dominance of the parent building and result in harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and wider street scene.
- 7.19 Furthermore, the application of K-render would be read as an alien feature in a street scene that is predominately characterised by dark red brick.
- 7.20 Revised plans show that the single storey rear extension reads as a proportionate, balanced addition that unlike the extensions to the front, respects the dominance and character of the main dwelling and on its own, is supported, despite, a small amount of brickwork being visible from the highway, above the garage.
- 7.21 In light of the above, it is concluded that owing to its siting forward of the principal elevation, and choice of materials, the proposal fails to respects the dominance of the main dwelling and character and appearance of the dwelling and wider street scene, contrary to Local Plan Policies S1 and EQ6, the High Peak Residential Guide SPD, the Design Guide SPD, and relevant paragraphs under Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

Residential Amenity

- 7.22 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.
- 7.23 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.
- 7.24 Paragraph 130 of the NPPF states that planning should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.
- 7.25 The site is bounded by No.1 Hawthorn Bank to the north-east and No.3 Hawthorn Bank to the south-west. Owing to a distance in excess of 27m between the habitable window shown in the front extension, there are not considered to be any adverse impacts to any property that is situated on the opposite side of Hawthorn Bank.
- 7.26 The plans as submitted raised significant concerns in relation to the impacts on neighbouring amenity of both properties, due to the overbearing nature of a two storey extension so close to the boundary and the breach of the 45 degree angle from neighbouring habitable windows, thereby significantly reducing natural light.
- 7.27 The revised single storey extension has a depth of 3m which is consistent with what could be achieved to the rear without planning permission in light of Permitted Development rights being intact. With this in mind, any breach of the 45 degree angle with the neighbour to No.1, caused by building up to the boundary fence, and subsequent loss of sunlight and overbearing impacts, does not amount to a credible reason for refusal in light of the PD fall-back position.
- 7.28 The single storey rear extension would not result in any overbearing impacts given the distance between the side elevation and the boundary fence and would not breach the 45 degree angle of the nearest habitable window in this property. The proposed development would therefore not result in any harm to No.3 Hawthorn Bank.
- 7.29 In light of the above assessment, it is concluded that notwithstanding the identified harm caused by the siting, design and appearance of the front extension and its impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, there are not considered to be any adverse impacts to neighbouring residential amenity, in accordance with LP Policy EQ6,

the High Peak Residential Guide SPD, and paragraph 130 of the NPPF.

Highway Safety

- 7.30 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.
- 7.31 Paragraph 110 of the NPPF states that in assessing applications for development, it should be ensured that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users. Paragraph 111 goes on to state that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
- 7.32 The existing property benefits from a private driveway and single garage that provides sufficient space for 2no. vehicles. In light of the fact that the proposed extension does not result in any increase in the number of bedrooms, there is no requirement for the applicant to demonstrate any additional off-street parking provision, and as such, notwithstanding the issues identified above, there are not considered to be any adverse impacts upon highway safety, in accordance with LP Policy CF6 and paragraph 110 of the NPPF.

Planning Balance and Conclusions

- 7.33 LP Policy S1a reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). It states that planning applications that accord with relevant policies in the Local Plan will be approved without delay.
- 7.34 Paragraph 11 of the NPPF sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision taking, this means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or, where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission, unless:
- the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
 - any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

- 7.35 The application seeks permission for extensions and alterations to an existing residential dwelling that lies within built-up area boundary of Hadfield and is not constrained by any sensitive statutory designation. The principle of development is therefore supported subject to all planning considerations.
- 7.36 Whilst in its revised form the rear (single) storey extension is acceptable, the proposed two storey extension on the front principal elevation is found to amount to a poor design, by virtue of its siting and choice of materials, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the dwelling and wider street scene.
- 7.37 The application is therefore recommended for refusal for the reason as set out below.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Refuse for the following reason:

- 1. The proposed two storey front extension, by virtue of its siting forward of the principal building line and the choice of materials, fails to respect the dominance of the main building and fails to respect the 'grain' of development, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and wider street scene, contrary to Local Plan Policies S1 and EQ6, the High Peak Residential Design Guide SPD, the Design Guide SPD, and relevant paragraphs under Chapter 12 of the NPPF.**

B. In the event of any changes being needed to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions/informative/planning obligations or reasons for approval/refusal) prior to the decision being issued, the Operations Manager – Development Services has delegated authority to do so in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee, provided that the changes do not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision.

This recommendation is made following careful consideration of all the issues raised through the application process and thorough discussion with the applicants. In accordance with Paragraph 187 of the NPPF the Case Officer has sought solutions where possible to secure a development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

Site plan

