



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2025

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/W/25/3361211

152 Station Road, Hadfield, Glossop, Derbyshire SK13 1AA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr M Hussein against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is HPK/2022/0390.
 - The development proposed is a new access door to the front elevation, re-configure existing first floor flat, new second floor flat and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a new access door to front elevation, re-configure existing first floor flat, new second floor flat and rear extension at 152 Station Road, Hadfield, Glossop, Derbyshire SK13 1AA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HPK/2022/0390 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Dwg No's: 101 and 200 Rev C.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed rear extension on (i) the living conditions of neighbouring residents, with regard to outlook and privacy, and (ii) whether the development would provide satisfactory accommodation for its future occupants, with regard to outlook.

Reasons

Living conditions – neighbouring residential occupiers

3. The appeal site is a mid-terrace mixed commercial/residential property that is situated in predominantly residential surroundings. It is a two-storey building, with single storey elements to the rear. The proposal includes a rear first floor extension above an existing single storey rear projection.
4. The proposed rear extension would contain a number of windows that would be around 9m from the rear garden area to 14 Railway Street. This neighbouring property's rear garden is however already overlooked by a number of surrounding

properties on Station Road and Railway Street at not markedly dissimilar distances. As such, whilst the separation distances to this neighbouring garden and windows on No. 14's rear elevation would be shorter than the existing layout, given the prevailing distances between surrounding properties, I do not consider there would be a materially greater overlooking impact arising from the proposed development. Furthermore, the siting and scale of the proposed rear extension, as seen from the rear of No. 14, would be against the terrace that the appeal site forms part of, and consequently it would not be detrimental to the outlook of No. 14's occupants.

5. The appeal property currently has a kitchen window at first floor level that faces the rear outdoor amenity area of the neighbouring property at 154 Station Road. This window would serve a bedroom to flat 1 in the proposed development. The appellant considers this to be a less intense use, whilst the Council has set out that this would result in a change to a habitable room. I have not been provided with a definition of what constitutes a habitable room, but given the position of this window, and the oblique and limited views towards the neighbouring property at No. 154, including its rear garden area, I do not consider this change, even if it results in a more prolonged use of this room, would be unduly harmful in privacy terms.
6. The rear extension would extend along the boundary with No. 154, but from my site observations, the nearest openings on the rear elevation of No. 154 comprise of a door and an obscure glazed window. The two-storey massing therefore along this neighbouring property's boundary would not give rise to an unacceptable loss of outlook. Although the projection of the extension would be greater than 2.5m, the development would not result in the tunnelling effect that the High Peak Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) seeks to avoid, as No. 154 is a corner property with no other adjoining rear projection.
7. I therefore conclude, for the reasons set out above, that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with regard to outlook and privacy. As such, it would comply with Policy EQ 6 of the High Peak Local Plan (Local Plan) and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), which seek, amongst other matters, a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development. It would also not be contrary to the aims of the SPD, which includes seeking adequate amenity.

Living conditions – future occupants

8. Future occupants of the proposed development would look towards the rear of properties on Railway Street. Having regard to the circa 16m separation with the building at No. 14, and the angled relationship between the rear elevations, this would be an adequate distance to ensure the outlook of future occupants of the proposed development would not be unduly compromised.
9. As such, I conclude that the development proposed would provide satisfactory accommodation for its future occupiers, having regard to outlook. Consequently, it would be compliant with Local Plan Policy EQ 6, Paragraph 135 of the Framework and the aims of the SPD.

Other Matters

10. No concerns have been raised relating to the creation of a new doorway. Given the size and position of the proposed door that would reflect others on the terrace, I consider this element of the proposal would be visually acceptable, as would be the proposed rooflights given their size and positioning on the roof plane.
11. As the proposed extension would be constructed on an existing single storey part of the appeal building, there would not be any harmful impacts on trees. Reference has been made to additional vehicles being parked in the area and increased congestion but having regard to the accessible location of the site to public transport options and on-street parking availability that I was able to see, I do not consider there would be harmful highway safety impacts arising. The refuse storage arrangements arising from the net additional residential unit can be accommodated in the rear yard.

Conditions

12. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council, having regard to the six tests set out in the Framework. For the sake of clarity and enforceability, I have amended the suggested conditions as appropriate.
13. Conditions are required to ensure external materials of the development match the existing building in the interests of the character and appearance of the building and the area.
14. A condition requiring obscure glazing on the rear elevation has been suggested by the Council but given my conclusion on the first main issue relating to the first floor extension, I do not consider it is necessary in the interests of privacy. The existing first floor window would serve a hallway and based on the transient nature of the space served by this window, this would not necessitate the requirement for obscure glazing either.

Conclusion

15. The proposal would comply with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR