

**HIGH PEAK BOROUGH COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

23rd October 2023

Application No:	HPK/2022/0327	
Location	Land Adjacent to 61, Temple Street, Padfield, Glossop, Derbyshire, SK13 1EL	
Proposal	Erection of a new dwelling as an extension to the existing terrace	
Applicant	Mr Harrison	
Agent	Mr Simon Plowman	
Parish/ward	Padfield	Date registered 16 th August 2022
If you have a question about this report please contact: John Van Eker <i>john.vaneker@highpeak.gov.uk 01538 395400</i>		

REFERRAL

The Application has been called in by Cllr Ollie Cross as he believes that the proposal could be reasonably considered not to contribute to the Conservation Area or the character of the vicinity. As such, would be harmful to the Conservation Area. In addition, the proximity to Lees Row is likely to exacerbate existing amenity issues. Moreover, there is room for debate whether to not this proposal is line with HPBC Local Plan Policies: EQ2, EQ6 and EQ7.

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The application relates to a vacant piece of land adjacent to no. 61 Temple Street, Padfield, located within the Glossop area of High Peak. The land is located within the development boundary for Padfield and forms a vacant piece of land within the ownership of the occupants of no. 61 Temple Street. The rear of the application site consists of open fields.

2.2 No.61 is one of three adjoining terrace style properties complete in local stone with attractive front gardens. Adjacent to the south of the application site is Lees Row, a row of terraced properties featuring entrances to both the north and south. Lees Row is sited at an oblique angle when viewed against the existing property at no. 61 Temple Street.

2.3 The site is located within the limits of the Padfield Conservation area.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL

3.1 The application proposes the erection of an additional dwelling attached to the south facing side elevation of no. 61 Temple Street effectively extending the row of terraced properties from a total of three to four dwellings.

3.2 The proposed dwelling proposes an addition of the same proportions and design as the existing properties that make up nos. 57, 59, 61 Temple Street. The dwelling features materials, window and door details and proportions to match the existing adjacent properties.

3.3 Internally the dwelling will provide a modest two-bedroom dwelling, replicating the layout of the adjoining properties contained within the terrace.

3.5 The application and all the relevant supporting documents and comments can be viewed at

<http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=256172>

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None at this location.

5. PLANNING POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

Adopted High Peak 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 5 Biodiversity
Policy EQ 6 Design and Place Making
Policy EQ 7 Built and Historic Environment
Policy EQ 9 Trees, woodland and hedgerows
Policy EQ11 Flood Risk Management
Policy H1 Location of Housing Development
Policy H3 New Housing Development
Policy CF 6 Accessibility and Transport

Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance

Residential Design SPD (2005)
Landscape Character SPD (2006)
High Peak Borough Council Design Guide SPD (2018)
Padfield Conservation Area Character Appraisal (Adopted Feb 2015)

National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

Paragraph 11 The Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
Section 4 Decision-making
Section 5 Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

Section 9 Promoting sustainable transport
 Section 12 Achieving well-designed places
 Section 14 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
 Section 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
 Section 16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

6. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

Site notice	Expiry date for comments: 29/09/2022
Neighbours	Expiry date for comments: 29/09/2022
Press notice	Expiry date for comments: 29/09/2022

Neighbours

23 objections to the proposal have been formally received against this application, the contents of which have been summarised below,

- The overwhelming problem with the proposed development is that it makes NO provision for off-street parking. Already, the existing parking spaces are regularly fully occupied: the "overflow" spills out elsewhere in the village and there is congestion at the point where Temple Street narrows adjacent to Lees Row.
- Within recent weeks I have been faced with dangerous head-on driving situations due to the narrowing of Temple Street due to the combination overstretched rogue parking and rat-running traffic using Padfield village as cut through to Hadfield, Tintwistle and over areas.
- It is quite obvious that the two developments are purely for financial gain rather than adding to the Padfield village community.
- I am also highly concerned that only a very few local residents have been consulted about this proposed developments - a couple only two doors away from 61 Temple Street knew nothing about this until another resident informed them about it.
- The terrace of three houses, numbers 57 to 61 and the land on which the proposed new dwelling will be built are clearly within the Conservation Area boundary. The houses border onto open countryside. There are no other new builds within the Conservation Area boundary. I understand that Conservation Areas are specifically designated to preserve the character and history of a place and the current buildings within them. This proposed new dwelling would contravene this sentiment.
- Numbers 57 to 61 are clearly listed as 'positive buildings', which I understand means that this terrace of three houses makes a strong contribution to the character of the Conservation Area. They were built between 1872 and 1900 so add great historical value to Padfield. The alterations that the Applicant made to No 61 when he purchased the property (removal of chimney stack, huge dormer at the back going across the whole back of the house and a large kitchen extension) already spoil the appearance of this terrace row, are extremely ugly and are completely out of character. I am concerned that the proposed new

dwelling, despite stating the proposal to use coursed stone and roof slates, will ruin the symmetry and appearance of these 'positive buildings'.

- Changing the drystone wall and removal of hedges by the lamp post and bus stop for this development will again ruin the appearance of the terrace. The entrance to the rest of the land at the back will be quite narrow and obstruct rather than enhance 'glimpse' views of the countryside behind. I cannot see how this will be advantageous.
- The land where the proposed dwelling will go is in character with the field behind in open countryside. Both are rough grass and a haven for wildlife, both birds and rodents plus insects. From an environmental point of view, I know it is very important to keep these areas of meadowland. This pocket of land has never been developed into a garden and in fact has been used for grazing lambs in the past.
- The proposed new dwelling will be very close to the cottages at the top of Lees Row. There is a right of way down the back of these cottages which is close to the land adjacent to No 61. There will be a substantial reduction in privacy for the rear of these historic cottages on Lees Row. I am very worried that the proposed new dwelling will cause overlooking, shadowing and light pollution with the gable end being so close to the pathway.
- The plan doesn't seem to meet requirements for affordable housing. Housing in Glossopdale should now be confined to affordable housing or Council housing. The HPBC Local Plan has identified areas where these should be constructed, and this is not within the Local Plan approved area. What is the point of this plan if we deviate from it?
- There is serious concern and belief amongst residents this plan will encourage further building in the village.
- The plans will require removal of at least some of the hedge at the front of the property in order to create access to the front of the building. Again, this is a feature which should be protected by being within the Conservation Area.
- Any development will have a negative effect on the wildlife and nesting birds that currently inhabit this piece of land. Particularly Sparrows that are in decline.

In addition to the above, comments received from the Padfield Residents association raised the following points (summarised)

- This application shows a building which will encroach on the privacy, light and mental health of residents living on Lees Row. Whilst the plans give a feeling of spaciousness between the proposed house and those on Lees Row, the reality on the ground is quite different. The main reason for this is that Temple Street is on a slope and the terrace on Temple Street is both taller and on higher ground than the very small cottages on Lees Row.
- The Glossop area has borne the brunt of new housing for many years. It has had far more new housing than other areas in the borough, without improvements in the highway infrastructure or in the services required for the rising number in the Glossop area population. Any new house will give rise to more traffic on already congested roads, more patients in over-subscribed doctors surgeries and dentists practices, more children in our over-subscribed schools and more pressure on our leisure facilities, which are already inadequate.
- The new housing in Glossopdale is the wrong type of housing to solve the housing problem. This proposed new house will be unaffordable to young people

who have grown up in the area and cannot buy a home of this type. Housing in Glossopdale should now be confined to either affordable housing or Council housing to address the social problems that are now growing across the country. The HPBC Local Plan has identified areas where this new housing should be constructed. The PRS was involved in long and detailed conversations with Councillors and other invited interested parties at the time when the Local Plan was under discussion. This application is not within the Local Plans approved area, so it seems undemocratic to approve applications in areas which were not approved at the time.

- The proposed building is in a Conservation Area, where present residents have to get permission to make even the smallest alterations to their housing, and are often refused. We request that the Council pays due attention to the Conservation Statement. Residents who have had to make changes to their plans to meet conservation rules will see no justice in the erection of new houses within the conservation area, despite the efforts the developer has made to fit in with the adjoining buildings.
- There is a belief that 'infill' in this instance may result in the 'thin end of a wedge' encouraging further building in other parts of the village.
- The application shows no associated parking. Parking is a very real problem in Padfield in all areas. There is no more room for additional cars in the village. The lack of parking spaces can lead to distress, confrontation and unhappiness in the residents.
- Whilst appreciating that the applicant has paid attention to the spirit of the Padfield Conservation Statement, if this application is approved, the approval should be subject to the use of reclaimed natural materials, and with the conservation features written into the approval statement.

Town / Parish Comments

N/A

Conservation Officer

Objection. Recommended refusal. Despite the drawings showing seemingly appropriate materiality, it is seen that the proposal does not contribute to the Conservation Area or the character of the vicinity. As such, I cannot see a place for it in this area. The history of the area's development and historic streetscape is well survived and well-read, secured by the relationship between the structures and surrounding natural landscape. The proposal will cause harm to this evidential value and aesthetic value, (as per Historic England's Conservation Principles, Policy and Guidance) and therefore harm to the Conservation Area. It is also noted that the proximity of the site's position, to the neighbouring terrace of Lees Row will have the potential to exacerbate amenity issues.

Environmental Health

No objection subject to conditions.

United Utilities

No objections subject to standing advice.

Derbyshire County Council Highways

The proposed development offers no off street parking provision which is likely to increase demand for existing on street parking places along with the existing dwellings located on Temple Street. Whilst this may cause some inconvenience it is not considered sufficient to warrant an objection on highway safety grounds. On this basis, there are no highway objections to the application.

7. POLICY AND MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Principle

7.1 The application proposes the construction of a new dwelling. Policy S1a of the adopted local plan reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

7.2 Section 2 of the NPPF sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision taking this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay unless 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; or specific policies indicate development should be restricted.

7.3 Policy H1 of the Local Plan refers to the location of new housing development. The policy supports housing development on unallocated sites within the defined built up area boundaries of the towns and larger villages, and promotes the effective reuse of land by encouraging housing development which includes redevelopment. The site is located within the built up area boundary of Padfield as defined within the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map.

7.4 Padfield is defined within Policy S2 of the Local Plan as a 'Smaller Village', described as the villages in the rural areas where only limited development to meet local rural needs may be acceptable consistent with maintaining and enhancing their distinctive character or appearance. New development should be focused within the settlement boundaries of the Market Towns, Larger Villages and Smaller Villages in accordance with their scale, role and function unless otherwise indicated in the Local Plan.

7.5 Given the location of the site, the nature of the proposed development and policy context outlined above, it is considered that the principle of development has already been established and is acceptable subject to all relevant material considerations.

Design and Conservation (Conservation Area and Listed Buildings)

7.6 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 refers to the 'preservation' or 'enhancement' of the special architectural or historic interest of the heritage asset or its character and appearance. The NPPF sets out in Chapter 16 of the document decision-making policies using different terminology, referring in particular to

'conservation of significance'. It is important to note that 'conservation' and 'preservation' are concerned with the management of change in a way that sustains a heritage asset's special interest or significance. However, 'conservation' has the added dimension of taking opportunities to enhance significance where opportunities arise and where appropriate.

7.7 Section 16 of the NPPF seeks to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. This is echoed within local plan policy EQ7.

7.8 Paragraph 201 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.

7.9 In this instance the proposal sits within the Padfield Conservation Area. Local Plan S1 explains the Borough Council will expect that all new development makes a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities and that this will be achieved by:

- Taking account of the distinct Peak District character, landscape, townscape, roles and setting of different areas and settlements in the High Peak;
- and
- Protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment of the High Peak and its surrounding areas including the Peak District National Park;

7.10 Local Plan EQ7 requires proposals that affect a heritage asset and / or its setting to demonstrate how the proposal has taken account of design, form, scale, mass, use of traditional materials and detailing, siting and views away from and towards the heritage asset in order to ensure that the design is sympathetic and minimises harm to the asset.

7.11 Section 12 of the NPPF places great importance of good design and states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Local Plan Policy EQ6 requires that all development should be well designed and of a high quality, responding to its environment whilst also contributing to local distinctiveness and sense of place.

7.12 The High Peak Design Guide 2018 requires new development to be guided by existing character and context, including the grain of development and building heights.

7.13 The proposal would result in a new dwelling extending directly from the existing terrace with a new dwelling of the same dimensions and characteristics as the existing properties contained within the terrace. Plans indicate a similar arrangement to the front with pedestrian access and a formal front garden along with the retention of the existing boundary treatment to the back of Temple Street. The proposed design would extend with a gradient the same as the existing terrace, following the natural change in levels across the site falling away towards the south. Extra details such as sills and lintels as well as an attractive gable end and chimney stack would further enhance the proposed development in the context of the existing terrace.

7.14 The Conservation Officer has provided an initial assessment of the proposal and maintains an objection to the proposed development highlighting that *‘Despite the drawings showing seemingly appropriate materiality, it is seen that the proposal does not contribute to the Conservation Area or the character of the vicinity. As such, I cannot see a place for it in this area.’* Comments received go on to explain *‘The history of the area’s development and historic streetscape is well survived and well-read, secured by the relationship between the structures and surrounding natural landscape. The proposal will cause harm to this evidential value and aesthetic value, (as per Historic England’s Conservation Principles, Policy and Guidance) and therefore harm to the Conservation Area.’*

7.15 It is acknowledged that the Conservation Officer has objected to the scheme on the basis that the historic streetscape is currently well preserved and well read. However, given that the proposed dwellinghouses would match the form and scale of the existing terrace and would not disrupt the uniformity of the street scene or appear as incongruous additions in comparison to the existing terrace.

7.16 Alongside the Local Plan, the Padfield Conservation Area Character Appraisal, Adopted 2015, provides an insight and summary into the special interest of the Padfield Conservation area. Paragraph 8.3 outlines a defined ‘Area 3’ made up of Temple Street, Post Street and Platt Street. The Appraisal acknowledges that this ‘is an area of contrasts, with enclosed areas of strong unified character, a steady rhythm of frontages, and large pockets of open space.’ The appraisal explains that Temple Street appears to follow an old route. ‘It winds its way down the hill, and as a result, picturesque views unfold, framed by groups of trees or the flow of a terrace. Temple Street has developed with a more rural character; there are fewer buildings, hedges and plants within gardens spill out over the boundary walls, in places there is no pavement, the road was not upgraded with setts and had simple gritstone channels to each side of the camber. The site of the old lodge to the middle mill is now the children’s playground. This is still raised and embanked and provides a level platform and vantage point to overlook Platt Street.’

7.17 The introduction of one modest dwelling to the existing terrace extending along one side of Temple Street at this location is considered acceptable in design terms and reinforces the steady rhythm of frontages as outlined in the Padfield Conservation Area Appraisal. Large open areas such as the children’s playground and open space located opposite the application site remain to provide a form of visual relief in the context of the streetscene and Conservation Area.

7.18 Therefore , it is considered that any harm to the significance of the Conservation Area is at the lower end of “less than substantial” and would be easily outweighed by the benefit of providing an additional dwelling in a sustainable location within the settlement boundary. Accordingly, the impact of the proposed development on the significance of the Conservation Area to be significantly detrimental to sufficiently warrant refusal in this instance.

7.19 In order to ensure that the harm remains very limited, Officers recommend that

suitably worded conditions are attached to the permission in the event of an approval for samples of all facing materials, in addition to details of each element to ensure they match the existing terrace are submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

7.20 The proposal would therefore satisfy the requirements of policy EQ7 and chapter 16 of the NPPF. The proposed external appearance and limited impact on surrounding streetscene and vantage points are likewise considered to be acceptable in design terms and therefore to satisfy local policy EQ6 and NPPF paragraph 130.

7.21 Overall, it is considered the siting, scale, design, and construction materials of the proposals are appropriate. Accordingly, the impact on the Conservation Area and the built-up area of Padfield would be acceptable and the proposal thereby accords with Policies EQ3, EQ6 and EQ7 from the High Peak Local Plan (Adopted April 2016) and relevant National Policies found in National Planning Policy Framework.

Amenity

7.22 Paragraph 130 f) of the NPPF seeks to secure a high standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants. Local Plan Policy EQ6 requires development to achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and to 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.

7.23 The proposed dwelling is well designed in terms of impact on neighbour amenity. The proposal represents an extension to the existing terrace projecting no further than the original respective front and rear elevations of the existing adjoining terrace. The occupants of adjoining no. 61 or occupants of other properties to the terrace are not considered to be adversely affected by the proposed development over the existing arrangement.

7.24 The arrangement of neighbouring properties to the south is such that the neighbouring terrace known as 'Lees Row' features historic front elevations with a historically shared front path sited between the application site and front elevations of properties along Lees Row. At present some properties sited along Lees Row use what appears to have previously been considered the rear elevation as a front entrance to the property. Nonetheless nos. 1 and 3 Lees row feature a north facing elevation facing towards the application site at an oblique angle. A considerable separation distance will remain between the side elevation of the proposed dwelling and the north facing elevations of nos. 1 and 3 Lees row. A minimum of 17.5m will remain in separation between the side elevation of the proposed dwelling and no. 1 Lees Row, this is increased to some 21m when measured against the positioning of no. 3 Lees Row. The remaining separation distance combined with the oblique angle of these adjacent properties facing away from the application site would ensure that the proposed development would not have a negative impact on the occupants of nos. 1 and 3 Lees Row or the rest of properties along Lees Row which remain further from the application site.

7.25 The aforementioned separation distances will also ensure privacy for occupiers of

the proposed property and the oblique angle of Lees Row, facing away from the application site improves any level of perceived overlooking further.

7.26 Additional habitable room windows to the proposed dwelling will overlook neighbouring fields to the east in the instance of the rear elevation and the green to the opposite side of the road in the instance of the front elevation, replicating the arrangement to the existing terrace and as such no amenity issues are raised. At ground floor habitable room windows will overlook the rear garden area and adjacent fields also. The proposed dwelling maintains an appropriately sized outdoor garden for future occupiers.

7.27 It is not considered that the scheme would have any significant adverse impact on residential Amenity in accordance with Policy EQ 6 from the High Peak Local Plan (Adopted April 2016) and relevant National Policies found in National Planning Policy Framework.

Access and Highway Considerations

7.28 be safely accessed in a sustainable manner. New development should also provide appropriate parking provisions where necessary. Derbyshire County Council Highways have advised no objection to the proposal subject to standard conditions.

7.29 Lack of off street parking along Temple Street is acknowledged. However there is existing on street parking provision at this location. Overall, the small scale scheme of one additional dwelling at this location does not represent any highway safety concerns. The development proposes residential development in a sustainable location with public transport options for future residents.

7.30 A space for bin storage can easily be accommodated within the limits of the site close to the entrance of the site and the application is considered acceptable in compliance with Policy CF 6 Accessibility and Transport from the High Peak Local Plan (Adopted April 2016) and relevant National Policies found in National Planning Policy Framework.

Landscaping and Trees

7.31 Additional landscaping is to be secured by means of condition. The applicant does not propose to remove any well established trees from the wider site. However appropriately worded conditions can be attached to any permission to ensure trees to be retained on site are appropriately protected during the construction phase. The proposals comply with section 15 of the NPPF and local plan policy EQ9 in this regard.

Other considerations

7.32 Following consultation with the Council's Environmental Health department, no objection has been received with recommendation to ensure that an appropriate construction method statement is followed on site. This is to be secured by means of a suitably worded condition and with this the proposal is considered acceptable in this regard. An additional condition is also proposed to ensure biodiversity enhancements

are provided on site following approval of planning permission.

7.33 In relation to the objections received alongside this application, matters relating to the principle of development, neighbour amenity, impact on designated heritage assets, highways and parking are considered in the above assessment section of this report.

7.34 The scale of the development proposed does not warrant a need for the applicant to demonstrate a provision of affordable housing as suggested by some objectors. Additionally this application can only be considered in isolation and any speculation of further development adjacent to this site or elsewhere in the area would not carry any weight in the decision making process in this instance.

7.35 Comments made in relation to existing development at no. 61, particularly comments received relating to the dormer extension at this address, cannot be considered alongside this application in design terms

8. CONCLUSION & PLANNING BALANCE

8.1 The application proposes a new residential dwelling at this location and it is considered that the application comprises sustainable development and meets the relevant policy tests of the adopted Local Plan and NPPF and accordingly is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. That approval be GRANTED subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Standard Time Limit**
- 2. Approved Plans.**
- 3. Samples of external facing materials required prior to development**
- 4. Sample of wall pointing required**
- 5. Window and door joinery details required**
- 6. Details of eaves and rainwater goods**
- 7. Boundary treatment details required**
- 8. Hard and soft landscaping plans required**
- 9. Landscaping to be implemented in first planting season**
- 10. No trees or shrubs to be removed**
- 11. Construction Method Statement required**
- 12. Restriction on construction hours**
- 13. Biodiversity enhancements required**
- 14. Permitted Development Rights removed**

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/ informatives/planning obligations or reasons for approval/refusal) prior to the decision being issued, the Head of Development Services has delegated authority to do so in consultation with the Chairman of the Development Control 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 38 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.

