

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2023/0024
Valid 24/01/2023

1 PRINCES ROAD
CHINLEY

2 STOREY SIDE EXTENSION
AND WORKS TO WINDOWS
AT THE REAR

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Conservation Area
- Design

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

1 Princes Road is located within the Chinley conservation area. The property is an end terrace stone and slate property. the property has a long driveway running along the side of the dwelling house which can accommodate 2 or 3 cars. To the rear is a small garden with small stone outbuilding.

The front of the property has a small paved area to the front of the house, enclosed with a low stone wall.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for a 2 storey side extension. The 2 storey extension will provide a garage/bike store on the ground floor, with wc and utility at the rear. the upper floor will provide a third bedroom at the front of the property, with office room to the rear and a second bathroom.

It is also proposed to close the existing rear door entrance and turn the existing rear window into a doorway.

Revised plans have been submitted changing the material for the proposed side elevation from render to a natural stone finish.

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
EQ 7 Built and Historic Environment

CF 6 Accessibility and Transport

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 4 Decision- making

Section 12 Achieving well-designed places

Section 16 conserving and enhancing the historic environment

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

N/A

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 23/02/2023

Neighbour consultation period ends: 15/02/2023

Press Advert: 23/02/2023

Public Comments

None Received

Town / Parish Comments

Chinley, Buxworth & Brownside Parish Council has no objections to this application in principle. However, they would suggest that the side elevation to the extension would be more in keeping with the character and appearance of the conservation area if it were built in natural stone rather than render.

Environmental Health

N/A

Derbyshire County Council Highways

The proposed side extension will reduce the available on site parking provision to only one vehicle which is not ideal. However, there is existing junction protection in the form of waiting restrictions on Princes Road and the potential for additional roadside parking is not considered in this instance to warrant an objection on highway safety grounds alone. On this basis, there are no highway objections to the application.

HPBC Conservation Officer

No issue with this in principle. However am not sure of the choice of render for the side of the extension (proposed west elev). Stone coloured render in close proximity to the trees and under tree cover has the disadvantage of turning a dirty mucky colour and can become rather unsightly. I feel this would cause some visual conflict and make this vicinity look slightly depreciated.

I think perhaps for the extension to be successfully integrated it would be preferred if it was matched. A recon stone may suffice subject to specification.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

LP Policy S 2, which states that moderate scale development which meets local needs should be allowed in large villages such as Chinley. Therefore the principle of the development is acceptable subject to consideration of the following policy.

Design and heritage

Section 12 Paragraph 130(c) of the NPPF states that development should be sympathetic to the character and history of the area, while not restricting change.

LP Policy EQ 6 states that all development should be well designed, of a high quality and respond to the areas character, history and scale.

The Adopted Residential (SPD) (2005) chapter 9 stats 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.”

LP Policy EQ 7 states that the council will conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Section 16 Paragraph 199 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 This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

The proposed two storey side extension is set back from the principle elevation and the ridge line is set down from that of the host building. This ensures that the proposed extension remains subordinate in nature and appearance to the host dwelling. The slope of the roof follows that of parent building, successfully mimicking its character.

From the front elevation the proportions of the first floor window utilises a vertical emphasis, like that of the fenestrations on the host dwelling. To the rear the fenestrations on the proposed extension and those being altered on the existing rear elevation maintain the vertical emphasis in design as found on the host dwelling.

Therefore the principle of the proposed side extension is considered to be acceptable. However, there are concerns raised by the conservation area regarding the rendering of the end gable is proposed to be rendered. This is out of character with the wider conservation area. Revised plans were submitted changing the material of the proposed side elevation from render to a natural or reclaimed stone. It is felt that this resolves any initial concerns regarding material.

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.

The Adopted Residential (SPD) (2005) paragraph 8.6.1 states that there should be 21 metres between adjacent inhabitable windows to provide an acceptable level of amenity.

The first floor window on the proposed front elevation faces no. 2 Princes Road. However, it faces above the single storey garage, therefore not breaching the 21 metre guidance distance. However, behind this is no. 1 Belle Vue, the proposed first floor window faces the first floor window of No. 1 Belle Vue, however this is located approximately 41 metres away from the proposed extension and therefore does not breach the guidance distance.

To the rear of no. 1 Princes Road is St Mary's Church. The rear elevation of which sits 25 metres away from the rear elevation of the proposed side extension. As such this does not create any amenity concerns.

The proposed extensions do not project beyond the existing front and rear building lines and as such no overshadowing issues are raised in respect of the attached property. An open space lies to the other side.

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. CF6 further requires applicants to submit details of parking which included the proposed parking provision based on an assessment of the parking needs of the development ... guidance on parking is

given in Appendix 1. Appendix 1 states that a 3 bedroom dwelling requires 2 off-street car parking spaces.

DCC Highways have identified that the proposed garage is too small in size to accommodate a car. As such this reduces the amount of off-street parking provided to 1 space, on the driveway in front of the proposed extension.

However, the application site is located close to the Chinley train station (0.3 miles). Therefore it is felt that there are other transportation options available to residents so they should not require more than one vehicle. There are already restrictions in place around the junction of Princes Road which will protect highway safety.

As such due to the close proximity to public transport and the existing parking restrictions, highway safety should not be negatively impacted by the propped reduction in parking provision.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The development is considered acceptable in terms of design, amenity and highway safety. It is considered to be in accord with the relevant policies put forward in the Local Plan and the NPPF. Therefore this application is recommended for approval.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Approval

Case Officer: Rachel Robinson

Recommendation Date: 14th March 2023

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council