

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2025/0384
Valid 02/10/2025

ELLIBANCKE FARM
REDMOOR LANE
NEW MILLS

SINGLE STOREY FRONT/SIDE
EXTENSION AND SINGLE
STOREY REAR EXTENSION

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of development
- Design, character and landscape
- Impact on the Green Belt
- Amenity
- Highways

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site relates to Ellibanke Farm, a single storey bungalow situated to the south of Redmoor Lane, a road that runs uphill in a roughly north-south direction from the A6. Ellibanke Farm sits within a group of other dwellings and other agricultural buildings, many of which are surrounded by mature trees and vegetation, including a new barn directly to the south of the building. The area has open pasture fields to the south and east which run downhill towards the linear development along the A6.

The property lies within the open countryside and on greenbelt land.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear/front and side extensions.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Local Plan 2016

S 1 Sustainable Development Principles
S 1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
S2 Settlement Hierarchy
EQ2 Landscape Character
EQ3 Rural Development
EQ4 Green Belt Development
EQ 6 Design and Place Making
CF 6 Accessibility and Transport

National Planning Policy Framework

Chapter 2 - Achieving Sustainable Development
Chapter 12 - Achieving Well Designed Places
Chapter 13 - Protecting Green Belt Land
Chapter 15 - Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment
Chapter 16 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

Supplementary Planning Documents

High Peak Design Guide
Residential Design SPD section 9 – Domestic Extensions

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/2011/0254 - New roof, external alterations and front and rear single storey extensions – Approved 2011
HPK/2013/0232 - Proposed replacement barn – Approved 2013
HPK/2022/0088 – Single storey extension – Approved 2022

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 15/11/2025
Neighbour consultation period ends: 24/10/2025
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

One neighbouring comment of support was received “we have no objections at all to the proposed extension”

New Mills Town Council

No objection

Derbyshire County Council Highways

The dwelling is served from Redmoor Lane, an unadopted track which carries the route of Bridleway 102 New Mills.
Assuming the applicant has a right of access to the highway there are no highway objections to the proposed extensions and alterations. The following note should be attached to any consent granted.

- Access to the site is via a public right of way and the applicant's attention is drawn to the restrictions imposed by Section 34 of The Road Traffic Act, 1988, regarding the driving of motor vehicles over public footpaths/bridleways.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

Local Plan Policy S2 outlines that all areas outside of the settlement boundary of settlements, including Green Belt and the Countryside which do not have a settlement boundary as defined on the Policies Maps, development will be strictly limited to that which has an essential need to be located in the countryside or comprises affordable housing in accordance with policies EQ3 and H5.

Local Plan Policy H5 would not be applied in case as the application refers to a domestic extension and not a new development that would be subject to affordable housing standards.

LP Policy EQ3 refers to rural development proposals which lie outside of the defined built-up area boundaries and seeks to ensure that new development is strictly controlled in order to protect the landscape's intrinsic character and distinctiveness. Extensions to existing dwellings are supported provided they are subsidiary to the building and do not have an adverse impact on the character of the landscape.

LP Policy EQ 4 states that the Council will seek to protect the Green Belt and maintain its openness and permanence. Within the Green Belt, planning permission will not be granted for development unless it is in accordance with national planning policy.

In this instance, domestic extensions are supported by policy EQ3, however it is necessary to consider whether the proposals comply with design, amenity, greenbelt and conservation area policies.

Design

LP Policy EQ2 looks to resist development which would harm or be detrimental to the character of the local and wider landscape and will seek to protect, enhance and restore the landscape character of the Plan Area for its own intrinsic beauty and for its benefit to the economic, environmental and social well-being of the Plan Area.

LP Policy EQ3 refers to rural development proposals which lie outside of the defined built-up area boundaries and seeks to ensure that new development is strictly controlled in order to protect the landscape's intrinsic character and distinctiveness.

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 9 of the High Peak residential design guide (2005) provides the most relevant guidance for testing the acceptability of any domestic extension. It introduces two key tests for the overall scale and mass of any proposed extension.

“Extensions should be designed so as to [be] subordinate to the main form of the house. It is important that the extension results in a dwelling that is well designed in itself” (paragraph 9.1) Chapter five of the 2015 Design Guide SPD, takes this further setting out that extensions should harmonise with the parent building, be subordinate in scale and massing, with the frontage of extensions ‘set back’ from the original dwelling (paragraph 5.5).

Planning permission is sought for a single-storey front/side extension and a rear extension at Ellibanke Farm, to serve as a new kitchen/dining area. The proposal introduces a gabled element and a recessed porch/utility room, using matching stone and slate-effect materials. The external materials, including stonework and roofing materials, would match those of the existing dwellinghouse and will be secured by condition.

Given the property’s location, the proposed extensions would complement the character of the existing dwelling and would not be visible from the public realm and would therefore have no impact on the character or appearance of the surrounding street scene.

Green Belt considerations

Paragraph 154(c) of the NPPF states development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of the following exceptions applies: the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; The proposed extension amounts to the extension or alteration of a building under para 154(c).

The NPPF does not define the term ‘disproportionate’ however as a typical guide, a figure of 30% increase in volume from the original dwelling is not uncommon and is usually considered to be a modest enlargement within the green belt that would not result in a disproportionate addition to the main house.

Revised plans have been submitted by the applicant, demonstrating a slightly scaled-back scheme, in order to show an extension that would not go beyond that of what was approved in 2022.

The property has an established planning history and has previously been subject to alterations that have increased the footprint and volume of the original dwelling. Planning permission HPK/2011/0254, granted in 2011, approved a new roof, external alterations, and single-storey extensions to the front and rear. Although not all elements of that permission were implemented, however the works that were carried out have resulted in significant changes to the building’s original form.

A subsequent application, HPK/2022/0088, was approved in 2022 for further extensions. During the assessment of that application, revised drawings were submitted showing a reduced scheme. The case offer stated within their delegated report:

“As a final point, it should be noted that much of what existed as the original dwelling’s form, scale and appearance has now been completely lost – most of this

as a result of the 2011 permission – and as such, this property has now reached the point at which further alteration or extension is unlikely to be considered acceptable. As a result it is considered that the dwelling has now reached a point where further extension and alteration would be inappropriate in both design and Green Belt terms. As a result, all permitted development rights for further extensions or alterations (Part 1 Class A, AA, B, C and D) should be removed by way of a condition. This will allow further extensions and alterations to be considered carefully through a planning permission.”

Original Floor Space Pre 2011	Floor Space Approved in 2022	Floor Space of Current Proposal	Overall % Increase
162sqm	220sqm	225sqm	38%

The current proposal represents a 385 increase and 2022 proposals represented a 36% increase in floor area compared with the original dwelling. However, this figure does not account for the roof alterations permitted in 2011, meaning the overall increase in volume would be greater. The extensions approved in 2022 have not been constructed. It is noted that the current proposal includes a modest extension to dining room, which was not evident on the 2022 consent, but no longer proposes to extend what is now termed the living room, which was included in 2022 consent. Nevertheless, the Council maintains the position set out in the previous officer report: any further enlargement of the dwelling beyond what has already been approved would be unacceptable and inappropriate in Green Belt terms.

In this instance, the current proposal very marginally exceeds the floorspace approved under the 2022 permission and the design is acceptable. As such, the level of Green Belt harm would be comparable to that previously accepted. On this basis, and given that the 2022 scheme was considered acceptable, the impacts associated with the current proposal are also judged to remain acceptable in green belt terms. The extensions would not result in a disproportionate addition to the dwelling.

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.

Due to the location and orientation of the proposals, it is not anticipated that they would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties in terms of loss of outlook, overshadowing or overbearing impact.

Highway Safety

The Highway Authority advises that, provided the applicant benefits from a legal right of access along this track to the public highway, there are no highway objections to

the proposed extensions. The proposals would not affect the parking arrangements on site, and therefore the scheme is considered acceptable in highway terms.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

Whilst this is an extension to a building that has been much expanded and altered over the years, the applicant has worked effectively with officers to deliver an appropriately scaled proposal which almost falls in line with previous permissions. The proposals are deemed to be appropriate in terms of design, impact on the greenbelt.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Agatha Dutton

Recommendation Date: 23/01/2026

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council