

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2025/0161
Valid 15/04/2025

COTHERSTONE HIGH LEA
ROAD
NEW MILLS

APPLICATION FOR THE
VARIATION OF CONDITIONS
2, 3 AND 4 IN RELATION TO
HPK/2024/0231

(FULL - MINOR)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of Development
- Design
- Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site is situated on the north of High Lea Road and comprises a detached two storey property. The site is just within the built up area boundary, land to the south and the rear of the property is countryside and designated green belt. The site is set an elevated position above High Lea Road and the garden rises steeply to the rear. It has a double garage directly on the frontage of High Lea Road. The site is not in conservation area and is flood zone 1.

PROPOSAL

This application seeks to vary conditions:

Existing Condition 2:

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 4121_00_12B (Block Plan as Proposed), 4121_00_13D (Plans as Proposed), (4121_00_14F (Elevations as Proposed), 4121_00_16 (Access drawing 2m setback Site Plan as Proposed).

Proposed Condition 2:

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 4121_00_12B (Block Plan as Proposed), 4121_00_13D (Plans as Proposed), (4121_00_14G (Elevations as Proposed), 4121_00_16 (Access drawing 2m setback Site Plan as Proposed).

Existing Condition 3:

The external wall materials to be installed on the side and rear elevations shall be finished Callow Sandstone Coursed cladding slips in accordance with the details submitted with the application. All other materials shall match the details included in the submitted drawings listed in condition 2, unless otherwise agreed in writing.

Proposed Condition 3:

The external wall materials to be installed on the side and rear elevations shall be finished in off-white render in accordance with the approved plans: (4121_00_14G Elevations as Proposed). All other materials shall match the details included in the submitted drawings listed in condition 2, unless otherwise agreed in writing.

Existing Condition 4:

The extension hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the access, parking and turning facilities have been provided as shown on drawing 4121-00-16.

Proposed condition 4:

The additional parking space hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the access, parking, visibility splay, and turning facilities have been provided as shown on drawing 4121_00_16.

In relation to application reference HPK/2024/0231.

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 Guidance/Documents

Residential Design (2005)

High Peak Design Guide (2018)

National Planning Policy Framework

Chapter 2: Achieving Sustainable Development

Section 12: Achieving Well-Designed Places

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 15-07-2025

Neighbour consultation period ends: 16-05-2025

Press Advert: N/A

Derbyshire County Council Highways

Of the conditions seeking variation under this application, it would appear only condition 4 was imposed at the Highway Authority's request. The following comments therefore relate specifically to that condition.

There are no objections to the variation of this condition.

New Mills Town Council

No objection

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application proposes an amendment application pursuant to extant planning permission reference HPK/2024/023. Therefore, the principle of the development has already been established and agreed via this consent and therefore this application does not provide the opportunity to review or re-assess the principle of development. The extant permission has already been deemed to be acceptable in principle. The main considerations in this application relate to whether the change to the conditions 2, 3 and 4 are appropriate.

Design

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states amongst other things that decisions should ensure that developments will add to the overall quality of the area; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture; and are sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.

Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.

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.

Chapter 3, para 3.15 of the Residential Design Guide SPD states that the limited use of render will be acceptable on end gables in character with traditional details. Render should be finished in naturalistic tones reflecting local colours within stonework. Rendered and lime washed frontages are not characteristic to the High Peak.

Chapter 9 of the Residential Design Guide SPD contains the following guidance relating to domestic extensions and alterations that are relevant to the assessment and determination of this application:

9.0 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 more recently adopted Design Guide 2018, sets out at paragraph 5.2 that “Alterations need to be undertaken with care. Insensitive changes can easily spoil a building. The key to a sensitive approach is to take note of what is there already before preparing the design and to work with, and not against, the buildings character. The aim should be to revitalise the building without altering its fundamental character.”

Paragraph 7.15 continues “Traditionally, materials have been selected and used in a way that promotes their durability in a harsh climate and ensures that buildings meet the purpose for which they were intended. Consequently, walling stone is laid horizontally, retaining the orientation it has in the quarry.” Paragraph 7.16 identifies that “The predominant building stone in High Peak is gritstone, although there is some limestone in the Buxton and Chapel areas.”

The application proposes the use of a rendered finish to the rear and side elevations of the property in place of the previously approved stone slips. Previously the use of render on the dwelling house was deemed “inappropriate and contrary to the High Peak Design Guide” during assessment of application HPK/2024/0231.

This amendment is not supported and is recommended for refusal for the following reasons:

Impact on Character:

High Lea Road is defined by its consistent use of natural gritstone, which is evident across the street scene and contributes significantly to the local character and appearance. The gritstone used in the area is visually neutral in tone, and the introduction of render would sharply contrast with the established material palette. In particular end elevations for both detached and terraces in the street scene are typically gritstone. The result would be an incongruous and visually disruptive addition that fails to respect the uniformity and character of the local built environment.

High Visibility:

The dwelling is situated on elevated, sloping ground and forms part of a streetscape of detached, terraced and semi-detached houses with substantial spacing between them. This landscape, combined with the layout of surrounding properties, results in the gable ends of the property being highly visible from public vantage points along High Lea Road and beyond. The proposed render finish would therefore be not only inappropriate in principle, but also unduly prominent in the street scene, drawing attention to itself due to its contrasting appearance and finish. As such, the proposal would cause demonstrable harm to the visual amenity of the area.

Lack of Precedent:

Upon an officer site visit it was noted that there are no examples of rendering on High Lea Road, with the exception of No. 63 High Lea Road which includes a gable wall featuring red brick and white cladding, at complete odds with the surrounding houses. It is considered that this example would not be a justification for the proposed render as this example is not characteristic of the area and is not considered to represent good design, and is not supported by the Council. The

existence of an atypical design feature elsewhere on the road does not set a precedent for further departures from the established character.

Conflict with Policy:

The proposal is considered to be contrary to Policies S1 and EQ6 of the High Peak Local Plan.

Policy S 1 states that it is the expectation of the council that all new development should take into “account of the distinct Peak District character, landscape, townscape, roles and setting of different areas and settlements in the High Peak” Policy E Q6 states that development should contribute 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 feature It is also contrary to guidance within the Residential Design Guide 2005 and the High Peak Design Guide, which states “Limited use of render will be acceptable on end gables in character with traditional details.” This suggest in most contexts render is not a preferred choice of material.

The overarching theme of these policies and design guides is to respect the established character and identity of the existing built environment, particularly in areas where there is a strong architectural character, including materials or consistency.

The rendering would be an uncharacteristic and detrimental addition to the area as it would highly contrast the uniformity of the gritstone houses and would be highly visible from the street scene. Therefore conditions 2 and 3 should stand as per drawings submitted in the original consent.

Regarding condition 4, the applicant is proposing to amend this condition to “The additional parking space hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the access, parking, visibility splay, and turning facilities have been provided as shown on drawing 4121_00_16.

As the previous consent did not relate to an increase in the number of bedrooms on site it is considered the rewording of condition 4 to revise the access arrangements is acceptable. Moreover it is noted that the Highway Authority raise no objection to proposed revision.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

In conclusion for the reasons outlined above the variation of Conditions 2 and 3 are unacceptable and will not be supported. The variation of condition 4 is acceptable.

Therefore the variation of Conditions 2, 3 and 4 in relation to application HPK/2024/0231 is recommended for refusal.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : REFUSAL

Case Officer: Agatha Dutton

Recommendation Date: 19/08/2025

X *J Colley*

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council