

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2023/0546
Valid 15/12/2023

7 ASHBOURNE COURT
GLOSSOP

PROPOSED PARTIAL
GARAGE CONVERSION

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Residential Amenity
- Highway Safety & Car parking

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site comprises a 4 bedroom detached property situated on Ashbourne Court in Glossop. The house has been extended from its original form with a first floor extension over the garage and kitchen to create an additional bedroom and bathroom. A conservatory has been added to the rear. Ashbourne Court is a small close of just five properties (all seven properties are numbered as odd numbers). All properties were built with garages and driveway in front.

PROPOSAL

The application proposes to convert part of the existing garage to a utility and shower room. A 1.5m depth of garage would remain for storage and the existing garage doors would remain in situ. The submitted site plan shows that two car parking spaces would be provided to the front of the property, part of which is in an area which is currently landscaped, although it was clear at the time of the site visit that 2 vehicles can already be accommodated within the front garden area with a 3rd in the garage. .

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Local Plan 2016

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

Supplementary Planning Documents

Residential Design Guide SPD (2005)
Design Guide SPD (2018)

National Planning Policy Framework

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/0003/8866 – extension over garage & kitchen – approved 09/05/2000

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 01.02.24
Neighbour consultation period ends: 01.02.24

Public Comments

Two residents who live on a nearby street wrote in to confirm that they have no objections to the proposals.

Derbyshire County Council Highways

No objection

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application seeks planning permission for extension and alterations within the curtilage of an residential property. The property lies within the built-up area of Glossop which is identified as a Market Town in the settlement hierarchy under Local Plan Policy S2 in recognition of it being a moderately sustainable location with access to facilities and services.

As such, the principle of development is acceptable, subject to a detailed assessed of all relevant planning considerations.

Design

LP Policy S1 sets out a number of sustainability principles which all new development proposals should incorporate in order to make a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities and to protect, and where possible enhance the environment.

LP Policy EQ6 states that all development should be well designed to respect and contribute positively to the character, identity and context of High Peak's townscapes, having regard to matters of scale, height, density, layout, appearance and materials.

The proposal will not alter the external appearance of the property in terms of the house itself. The alterations to the property are internal. The plans show the provision

of two car parking spaces which will necessitate the removal of some landscaping that currently existing between no. 7 and no.9.

As the alterations are principally internal, aside from the parking arrangements, the proposal are considered to satisfy policy EQ6 with regards to design considerations.

Amenity

LP Policy EQ6 requires all new development to have a satisfactory relationship with existing land and buildings and protects the amenity of the area, which includes residential amenity of neighbouring properties. Aspects of residential amenity include impacts such as a loss of sunlight, overshadowing and overbearing impacts, loss of outlook, and loss of privacy.

As the alterations are principally internal, except the car parking arrangements, there will be no residential amenity impacts from the proposals and policy EQ6 is satisfied from a residential amenity perspective.

Highway Safety

LP Policy CF6 seeks to ensure that development can be safely accessed in a sustainable manner and that all new development is located where it can be satisfactorily accommodated within the existing highway network and provides suitable off-street parking provision. Appendix 1 of the Local Plan specifies that 4+ bedroom dwellings are required to provide three car parking spaces.

As such the existing dwelling is already a 4 bedroom property and has a single garage and 2 car parking spaces in the front garden. The photograph taken at the site visit does show two vehicles parked on the driveway, although it is not possible to move the vehicles independently. The proposed development will result in the loss of one parking space within the garage.



Policy CF6 requires three car parking spaces for a 4 bedroom property and the proposal would result in the loss of a garage car parking space. Even if the front garden is rearranged to provide two larger car parking spaces, whereby vehicles can move independently as shown on the site plan this will result in the overall under-provision of car parking spaces and would still represent a net loss of spaces compared to the existing situation.

Ashbourne Court is not a street that benefits from any on-street parking. All parking is off street in garages and driveways, any parking in the street would block in one of the properties' driveways. Therefore any visitors have to park on Hebden Drive or Shirebrook Drive, the local distributor road.

The Highway Authority raises no objection with regards to highways safety but this does not negate the need for sufficient car parking spaces for the proposal.

It is therefore considered that the proposal is contrary to the policy requirements of CF6 as it will result in an increase in on street parking to the detriment of the free and safe flow of traffic.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The proposals would be contrary to policy CF6 of the Local Plan and the advice contained within the NPPF, and as such it is recommended that the application be refused.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Refuse

Case Officer: Rosie Dinnen

Recommendation Date: 09.02.24

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council