

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2022/0430
Valid 21/09/2022

10 FORGE CORNER
OUTRAM WAY
CHINLEY

CONVERSION AND
EXTENSION OF EXISTING
SINGLE STOREY GARAGE.
CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW
TWO STOREY EXTENSION.

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Highway safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

10 Forge Corner, Outram Way is on the edge of a wider housing development, which has only recently completed construction. The Peak Forest Tramway runs along the southern boundary of the application site. The tramway marks the edge of the built-up area boundary of Chinley, where the open countryside begins.

10 Forge Corner, is a large four bedroom detached dwellinghouse with an L-shaped footprint. The main portion of the house is of 2 storeys with a single storey garage projecting in front of the property to create the 'L' shape. There is a small parking area to the front of the property, providing space for 2 vehicles. There is a large wrap around garden to the rear of the property, which has been enclosed by timber board fencing.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for a two storey side extension single storey extension to the garage.

The single storey garage extension and conversion would create a ground floor bathroom, gym room and additional bedroom. The front elevation of the garage would have 2 windows inserted. The north elevation would have the existing large window and garage door removed to be replaced with two smaller windows. The south gable elevation would be a blank brick wall.

The two storey side extension will extend the living space on the ground floor, and provide an extra bedroom with ensuite on the first floor. The ridge line of the two storey extension is to be slightly stepped down from the ridge line of the original dwelling. The front elevation will have two small windows on the first floor which, are mostly obscured from view by the roof of the garage extension. The south gable elevation will have one small window on the first floor and a second window on the

ground floor. The rear elevation will have two first floor window and large glazed doors on the ground floor providing access to the garden.

It is proposed to fill the gap between the garage and two storey side extension with a small flat roofed rear porch, providing access to the rear garden.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Local Plan 2016

S 1 Sustainable Development Principles
S 1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
S 2 Settlement Hierarchy
EQ 6 Design and Place Making
CF 6 Accessibility and Transport

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 4 – Decision-making
Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places

Supplementary Planning Documents

The Adopted Residential (SPD) (2005)
High Peak Design Guide (SPD) (2018)

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/2013/0577 – the original planning permission granting the redevelopment of the former bleach works for residential development APPROVED 21/01/2014

MNA/2017/0003 – Approved non-material amendment for layout design changes to accommodate highways changes which resulted in this property change 'housetype' that which was built on site and exists today APPROVED 10/04/2017

HPK/2021/0715 - construction of new 2 storey front and side extension REFUSED 15/02/2022

Appeal reference APP/H1033/D/22/3295781 DISMISSED

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 24/11/2022
Neighbour consultation period ends: 20/10/2022
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

Neither (1):

Having read all the supporting documents and the determination report of the failed application HPK/2021/0715 at this address I was surprised to see another application submitted HPK/2021/0430 which details a larger scale build footprint, albeit with the sacrifice of a nominal lowering the garage conversion roof ridge line. Considering all the statements made in rejecting the previous application how can this increased scale of imposing build now be compliant?

Objection (0)

Support (0)

Town / Parish Comments

Chapel-En-Le-Frith Parish Council – No Objection

Environmental Health

N/A

Derbyshire County Council Highways

No highway safety comments to make

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application site is located within the built-up area boundary of Chinley. LP Policy S2 recognises Chinley as a larger village, where it recognises that a moderate scale of development may be acceptable, however any development must meet local rural needs and maintain or enhance their role, distinctive character or appearance whilst also maintaining existing facilities and services. An extension is therefore considered acceptable in principle. However, the proposal must comply with policy and guidance laid out in the NPPF, High Peak Local Plan and associated SPDs which are examined below.

Design

The NPPF highlights that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and should contribute positively to creating places which people wish to live and work. Paragraph 130 requires development to function well and add to the overall quality of the area for the lifetime of the development. It should respond to local character and history and be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate landscaping. Paragraph 134 of the Framework advises that permission should be refused for development that is not well designed and where it fails to reflect local design policies and local design guidance, including supplementary planning documents.

LP Policy S1 states that the Borough Council expect that all new development makes a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities and to protecting, and where possible enhancing, the environment; and mitigating the

process of climate change, within the Plan Area. It goes on to state that this will be achieved by taking account of the distinct Peak district character, landscape, townscape, roles and setting of different areas and settlement in High Peak. This is supported by LP Policy EQ 6 states that all development should be well designed and of a high quality that responds positively to both its environment and the challenge of climate change, whilst also contributing to local distinctiveness and sense of place.

LP Policy EQ6 of the adopted Local Plan sets out a series of design criteria that all development, regardless of type and scale, should follow, which include the following three specific tests that are relevant in this location:

- Requiring developments to be well designed to respect character, identity and the context of High Peak's townscapes and landscape,
- Requiring development on the edge of settlements to be of high-quality design, that protects and / or restores the landscape character,
- 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.

The Adopted Residential (SPD) (2005) chapter 9 states that "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."

The High Peak Design Guide (SPD) (2018) paragraph 3.1 states that the setting of any building should be carefully considered. Attention should be paid to its impact on views into, over, and out of the site.

The High Peak Design Guide (SPD) Paragraph 5.5 states that all extensions should harmonise with the parent building, it should be subordinate to it in terms of its size and massing. The cumulative size of the proposed side extension and garage extension is large in scale in comparison. The width of the existing (main building) is 9.91 metres. The proposed two storey side extension is to be 5.70 metres wide. This is an increase of more than half the width of the existing property. As such the two storey side extension is oversized and cannot be considered subordinate to the existing property.

The previous appeal decision to application HPK/2021/0715 paragraph 4 describes the existing garage as follows "The host dwelling's garage projects forward of the principal elevation's building line. However, it is a harmonious subordinate part of the dwelling on the corner of the road". The garage as now proposed will have an overall width of 9.24 metres, this is comparable to the width of the existing dwelling house (9.91 metres). As such the proposed garage extension would result in a dominant feature of the principal elevation. The garage would no longer be appear an ancillary structure to the main dwelling. Such a large scale development will cause significant harm to the street scene and character of the existing dwelling.

The appeal decision to previous application HPK/2021/0715 paragraph 5 states the following: "The proposed extension would step down from the host dwelling, but it would be of a considerable scale and massing. The proposed eaves and ridge

heights strongly influence this. Collectively, the effect would, when allied with its position forward of the principal elevation of the host dwelling and the front elevation's visual appearance, result in a dominant form of development to the front and side of the host dwelling and next to the bridleway. This would be of a far greater overall scale and massing than the existing single storey element." These concerns are also felt in regards to the currently proposed scheme. As stated above the two storey side extension and garage extension cumulatively are dominate in scale and will introduce a large scale of development next to the side of the property. This proposed large form of the garage would unbalance the front elevation of the properties will substantially unbalance the dwellings appearance, resulting in the garage becoming a dominant structure within the development.

The application site is on a prominent corner plot on Outram Way, which overlooks the Peak Forest Tramway and open countryside. Any development of the site must respond to and respect these vantage points. The proposed extension does not comply with the relevant Policy S1 and EQ6 and SPD's. The proposed extension would be large in scale and incongruous on the street scene and harmful to the views from the street and bridleway.

The previous appeal decision paragraph 5 continues: "Furthermore, the proposed extension would introduce built form of a scale and mass into a gap between the dwelling and the bridleway. Gaps are characteristically maintained where parts of the housing development adjoin the bridleway. This would lead to significant harm when viewed from Outram Way and the bridleway in either direction given the dwelling's prominent location. As such, I do not consider the proposal, which was amended by the appellant to address Officer concerns, to be well designed or of a high quality that responds positively to the host dwelling or its local environment". Within the previous appeal decision great importance was placed onto the vantage point of the adjacent bridleway. It is felt that the current proposal will have a similar impact from the vantage point along Outram Way as seen in figure 1. The proposed development will add a large and dominating structure into the gap when viewed from the vantage point of figure 1, obscuring the present view of the open countryside. It is felt that such a vantage point of viewing the open countryside is of significant value and should be maintained. .

It is also noted that the useable footprint gain of this proposal is marginally less than that which was proposed under previous application HPK/2021/0715. The previous application would have provided a gain of approximately 98 square metres of useable space, the current proposal would create a gain of approximately 89 square metres. While this is a reduction in size the proposal is still considered to be excessively large in scale. The usable space within the existing property is approximately 155.60 square metres across the two floors. The additional 89 square metres is an addition of over half the existing space (a 57.4 % increase in usable space).



Figure 1 - View from Outram Way



Figure 2 - View from Tramway

Amenity

Section 12 Paragraph 130(f) of the NPPF states that development should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

LP Policy EQ 6 states that all development should achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and doesn't cause unacceptable effects by reason of vision intrusion, overlooking, shadowing, overbearing effect, noise, light pollution or other adverse impacts on local character and amenity.

Due to the location of the site and positioning of the proposed extension it is not considered that there will be any amenity concerns in relation to the proposal.

Highway Safety

LP Policy CF 6 states that all development should deliver sustainable patterns of development by ensuring that it does not lead to an increase in on street parking to the detriment of the free and safe flow of traffic. LP Policy CF 6 also requires applicants to submit details of parking which includes the proposed parking provision based on an assessment of the parking needs of the development and the impact on the surrounding road network. Developments which will lead to an increase in traffic or include parking provision will need to submit details. The details should be proportionate to the impact of the development. Guidance on parking is given in Appendix 1.

Local Plan Appendix 1 states that an dwellings of 4+ bedrooms must have a minimum of 3 parking spaces per dwelling. The proposal will reduce the number of off-street car parking spaces available at the site. The conversion of the existing garage space will leave only 2 off-street parking spaces on the driveway. Simultaneously the proposal aims to create an additional bedroom making the property a 5 bedroom dwelling. This will increase the capacity of the dwelling, the number of vehicles which would be present at the site also has the potential to increase due to the lack of off-street parking.

The combined increase in property capacity with the decreased number of off-street parking provided create concerns that vehicles would be parking on the street in relation to this property. The lack of off-street parking provision is a considerable highway safety concern and as such this would be in contradiction to LP Policy CF 6.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

In conclusion the proposed extensions may be acceptable in principle however, the scale and mass of the design are no in accord with Local Plan Policy EQ6, S1 and the relevant Supplementary Planning Documents. Furthermore, the reduction in off-street parking provision raise concerns regarding Local Plan Policy CF 6. As such it is recommended for refusal.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Refuse

Case Officer: Rachel Robinson

Recommendation Date: 20th December 2022

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council