

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2023/0537
Valid 07/12/2023

65 MEADOW LANE
DOVE HOLES

PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY
FRONT PORCH WITH DUAL
PITCHED ROOF TO EXISTING
MID TERRACED
DWELLINGHOUSE

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

65 Meadow Lane is a mid-terraced dwellinghouse located on the edge of the Dove Holes built-up area boundary. This row of terraces sits on an exposed hillside with views over surrounding open countryside. Meadow Lane forms one of the vehicle routes out of Dove Holes, to the south the Lane leads to Dove Holes Train Station. No.65 is located on Meadow Lane, with a narrow portion of paved footpath to the front separating the dwelling from the road. The application site has no off-street parking.

No. 65 is a small traditional terrace of natural stone and slate. To the south Meadow Lane is made up of a number of semi-detached and detached rendered dwellinghouses. All of which are set back from the road and appear to be of a mid-20th century construction. As such the application site and its neighbouring terraces stand out in the street scene as a more traditional element of Meadow Lane.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for the construction of a porch to the front of 65 Meadow Lane. The proposed porch would be located to the front of the existing front door, sitting on the existing footpath and will not encroach on the vehicular highway.

The porch would be constructed of stone with a dual pitched slate roof. The principal elevation of the porch would have a small window with the proposed door being located on the northern elevation.

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
Section 12

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

No previous planning history

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 30/01/2024
Neighbour consultation period ends: 04/01/2024
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None received

Town / Parish Comments

Chapel En Le Frith PC - This matter was considered at last night's Parish Council meeting. The Council had 2 concerns about the proposal:

1. This is a narrow road, where it can be difficult for cars to park without becoming an obstruction to passing traffic. It seems likely that the addition of the porch will cause a parked vehicle outside the property to park in a way which obstructs the carriageway more than previously, and this would not be acceptable.
2. No other nearby dwelling has a porch, so it will look odd for this house to have one.

Environmental Health

N/A

Derbyshire County Council Highways

No objection

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

LP Policy S 2 states that moderate scale development which meets local needs should be allowed in large villages such as Dove Holes. The above development is considered to be a moderate scale, and is therefore acceptable in principle subject to consideration of the following policy.

Design

Section 12 Paragraph 135(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 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 Adopted Residential (SPD) (2005) paragraph 9.5 states that Porches are rarely a traditional feature on the front of terraced houses and their introduction requires considerable care because of the disturbance to the main elevation of the house and possible intrusion in the street scene. Porches can sometimes hide interesting door surrounds and are often unacceptable in conservation areas and on listed buildings. In most cases the simpler the porch, the better. Usually a gabled form is preferred, although a lean-to roof may be better on post war houses.

The High Peak Design Guide (SPD) (2018) paragraph 5.9 states that porches must be appropriate to the property and well designed. They rarely look right on small cottages and often spoil terraced properties. They detract from the basic simplicity of such buildings. In these cases, an internal porch is the better solution.

The proposed porch will be located on a small mid-terraced property of a traditional style. The host dwelling is simple in style and well matches its adjacent terraced properties. The porch would introduce a foreign feature to the traditional row of terraces, interrupting the existing street scene. The would directly conflict with the guidance of the High Peak Design Guide.

The proposed porch appears larger and oversized on the front of an otherwise simple principal elevation. The proposed eaves will cut into/across the upper mantle of the existing front window. This creates an odd visual effect of the porch appearing out of place and oversized for the space provided.

Officers attention has been drawn to examples of other porches in the Dove Holes area. However, no example of front porches are found with the immediate street scene of Meadows Lane. No other porches are located along the row of terraces of which no.65 is part of. Furthermore the remainder of the dwellings visible from no.65 are semi-detached properties of a different character type. As such example in the wider Dove Holes area do not provide precedent for a porch in this location.

Overall it is considered that the proposed porch is not appropriate for the host dwelling and would have a negative impact upon the established street scene.



FIGURE 1 – In this view from along the street the proposed porch would disturb the main elevation of the house and cause intrusion in the street scene. It would not look right on the row of small cottages would spoil the terrace as it would detract from the basic simplicity of the buildings contrary to the High Peak Residential Design Guide 2005 and High Peak Design Guide 2018

Amenity

Section 12 Paragraph 135(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 porch will be located over an existing doorway, it is not considered a space in which extended periods of time are spent. As such there proposed doorway and window will not have lead to any privacy or overlooking concerns.

The proposed porch will not create any overshadowing in respect to no. 67 due to the proposed porch location. The proposed porch may breach the 45 degree guidance distance in regard to no.63. However, no.63 is located to the south of the application site and will benefit from its orientation leading to no overshadowing issues. As such there are no amenity concerns.

Highway Safety

No highway safety concerns have been raised by DCC Highways. Chaple En Le Frith Town Council have raised concerns that the proposed porch will lead to more on street parking. However, as the porch will not impact any existing off-street parking provision then the proposed porch does not alter the existing arrangements. As such there are no highway safety concerns.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

In conclusion the proposed porch would introduce a foreign feature to the street scene, having an overall intrusive and negative visual impact. The proposed porch is oversized and interrupts the traditional and simple principle elevation. As such the development is recommended for refusal.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Refusal

Case Officer: Rachel Robinson

Recommendation Date: 30th January 2024

X *B.S. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council