DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2024/0146 **Valid 09/04/2024**	**66 CHUNAL LANE** **GLOSSOP**	**NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS AND GARAGE** **(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

MAIN ISSUES

- Design – Street Scene and Character
- Highway safety
- Green Belt

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

66 Chunal Lane is an end terraced property located on the edge of the Glossop Built-up area boundary. The dwelling is of natural stone, and located on an elevated position above the Chunal Lane. The dwelling has a narrow driveway leading to the dwellinghouse, with a lawn area to the front and side of the dwelling. The site is heavily bordered by mature vegetation.

The existing driveway acts as the edge of the built-up area boundary. As such a portion of the application site is located within the Green Belt.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for the installation of a double garage to the front of the dwelling house. This will be built into the current hill side. Revised plans show the garage to be 6.6M by 7.6M, to accommodate 2 vehicles. The garage would be slightly set back from the curtilage boundary. However a retaining boundary wall will be partially retained and built up. The proposed garage would feature a Sedum (green/living) roof.

A set of pedestrian stairs are proposed next to the proposed garage, which would be located within the Green Belt.

In an area f land to the side of the dwelling a new vehicle entrance is proposed . This will create a vehicle access and driveway from an existing field entrance and driveway space for 1 vehicle with turning space. This will be located within the green belt, and has previously been granted consent in HPK/2019/0076.

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 4 Green Belt Development
EQ 6 Design and Place Making
CF 6 Accessibility and Transport

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 4 – Decision-making
Section 12 – Achieving well-designed and beautiful places
Section 13 – Protecting Green Belt land

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

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/2009/0069 Extend Outbuilding Wall, Re-roof And Incorporate Shed Into The Two Adjoining Outbuildings APPROVED

HPK/2019/0076 New vehicular access APPROVED

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 23/05/2024
Neighbour consultation period ends: 13/05/2024
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None Received

Town / Parish Comments

N/A

Environmental Health

N/A

Derbyshire County Council Highways

Request for further information.
Summary of comments:

- Emerging visibility splay for both accesses are appropriate
- Single, uncentered door, restricts access for vehicles

- It is not clear what the new access to the far left of the application site is intended for

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

Local Plan (LP) Policy S 2, which states that development should be directed towards sustainable locations, including Market Towns such as Glossop. A portion of the site is located within this built-up area boundary. The is the portion with the proposed new garage. As such this is acceptable in principle, subject to compliance with the relative policies.

Part of the application site is located within the Green Belt. Paragraph 154 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. LP Policy EQ 4 states that within the Green Belt, planning permission will not be granted for development unless it is in accordance with national planning policy. As such must be determined if the proposal is considered appropriate development for within the Green Belt.

NPPF policy identifies engineering operations as a form of development which is not inappropriate in the Green Belt providing it does not adversely affect openness or conflict with the purposes of Green Belt. The proposed new driveway and pedestrian steps would be located within the Green Belt portion of the application site. The driveway and steps are not considered to be development which result in a loss of openness. As such this is considered appropriate and acceptable in principle, subject to compliance with the relevant policies. The proposed new garage lies outside of the Green Belt and is therefore also acceptable.

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.

Para 135(d) of the NPPF continues that development should establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;

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 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.

Paragraph 3. 8 continues that a new building should respect the scale of those surrounding it. Jumps in scale can sometimes be acceptable and can be justified if the development occurs at key locations such as on corners or at the end of vistas.

Paragraph 5.10 continues that garages ned to be designed and built in sympathy with the properties they serve. Materials and roof pitch should generally match those of the parent building.

The Adopted Residential (SPD) (2005) paragraph 5.12.2 (a) states that 'Garages are most successful in reducing the impact of parked vehicles but their scale and location need to be treated with care. House types where the garage dominates the building's frontage are to be avoided and as matter of principle double length garages as preferable to double width garages to minimize visual intrusion within the plot'

Para 5.12.2 (b) continues that 'a source for inspiration in garage design may be to make reference to the Borough's traditional outbuildings and lean to extensions built for the storage of horses. These buildings are often designed as subservient by stepping back from the façade of the main house'

Paragraph 9.7 of the Adopted Residential (SPD) (2005) continues that 'Garages and outbuildings should relate to the main dwelling in terms of size, proportion and appearance. They should be subordinate in size and height and match the materials of the existing house. Double garages should have two openings wherever possible, to maintain proportion, and with the roof ridge parallel to the doors. Flat roofs should be avoided. Doors with vertical emphasis are usually preferred and timber side hung door may be required in sensitive locations.'

The proposed new driveway is considered subordinate and will replace an existing field entrance. As such this is considered to have a minimal design impact upon the street scene and dwelling.

The proposed garage, on the other hand, will sit forward of the host dwelling, and will require substantial engineering works. The garage will be set forward of the established building line of no.66 – 50. Development forward of both the principal elevation and establish building line is considered inappropriate as it will create a heavily engineered frontage, dominated by the built form of the garage. The establish row of terraces, by contrast, are visually recessed from the street scene, hidden by mature vegetation. A number of driveway openings are inserted into the vegetation and retaining wall,. However, no built forms are located forward of the built line. The introduction of such a structure and resultant loss of the mature vegetation site will be have a negative and harmful impact upon both the character of host dwelling and the street scene.

The guidance provided within the HPBC SPDs states that garages should be subordinate in scale to the host dwelling. They further state that double garages are disfavoured, but where they are required they should have 2 access doors to maintain proportion. The proposed garage presents a footprint which covers (approx.) 63% of the footprint of the host dwelling. As such the proposed double garage would appear abnormally large in comparison to the host dwelling. This is exaggerated by the single door design, while the door is central to the garage it

presents a disproportionate appearance which goes against the guidance of the Adopted Residential (SPD).

Overall the proposed garage is considered of a poor design, which contradicts the guidance of The High Peak Design Guide (SPD) (2018) and The Adopted Residential (SPD) (2005). The garage is inappropriately cited forward of the established building line, leading to a dominating appearance and harm to the character of the street scene. The proposal is therefore contradictory to LP policy EQ6.



Figure 1 – View of 66 Chunal Lane and view down Chunal Lane

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 proposed garage would not lead to any overshadowing of neighbouring dwellings, due to its proposed location on a lower ground level than the row of terraces.

A flat roof is proposed for the garage this presents potential for usage as a raised platfrom. However, this would be level with the current garden level, and as such will not alter existing amenity.

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

DCC Highways have stated that the emerging visibility will be acceptable for both the garage and driveway. The proposal will provide 3 of street parking spaces. The existing driveway on site could also accommodate 3 vehicles to park in tandem, however, without turning space. As such the parking provision would be improved.

Overall there are no highway safety concerns.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The proposed garage is considered be of a scale and location which is inappropriate. This would create a garage which dominates the host structure, and breaks the established building line. The design is also found to be poor and contradictory to LP Policy EQ 6,ang the guidance of the High Peak Design Guide (SPD) (2018) and the Adopted Residential (SPD) (2005). This would result in significant harm to the character of the host dwelling, and the street scene. As such the application is recommended for refusal.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Refusal

Case Officer: Rachel Robinson
Recommendation Date: 11th June 2024

X B.J. Haywood

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council