

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2025/0074 & HPK/2025/0075	THE STABLES AND COACH HOUSE, BOWDEN HALL BOWDEN LANE, BOWDEN CHAPEL-EN-LE-FRITH	CONVERSION TO 3 DWELLINGS, INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL WORKS, PARKING AND LANDSCAPING (PART RETROSPECTIVE)
Valid 18/03/2025		(FULL - MINOR)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of Development
- Design and Heritage Conservation
- Amenity
- Trees
- Parking Provision & Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application relates to the Grade II Listed Coach House and Stables which lie within the Bowden Hall complex which contains a number of other Grade II Listed Buildings, a short distance from Chapel-en-le-Frith, adjacent to Bowden Lane.

The site is not just sensitive from a heritage and conservation perspective, but also contains a number of trees subject to Tree Preservation Order (TPO's), lies within a sensitive landscape in the open countryside and a short distance from the Peak District National Park boundary.

A public footpath runs southwards from Bowden Lane east of the site, which gives the rear elevation of the building subject to this enquiry a heightened degree of prominence.

The building was subject to Full Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent granted in May 2007 under HPK/2007/0220 and HPK/2007/0221 for the conversion of four buildings to create 5no. independent dwellings.

The nearby Smithy and The Wash House, have been converted into 2no. separate detached dwellings with the former being sold in 2009 and the latter sold in 2019. The remaining 3no. units were to be accommodated by converting the Coach House and adjacent Stables.

Details submitted with a pre-application enquiry prove that works to Unit 1 within the Coach House and Stables have already been completed. However, the Council hold no formal records of any application being submitted by the applicant to seek formal discharge of pre-commencement conditions relating to the 2007 consents and

consequently it is the Council's position that these consents have not been lawfully implemented.

Repair works have been completed in 2021/2022, which amounted to the re-roofing of the building. It was at this time that roof lights were inserted that did not accord with the plans approved in 2007, which following an enforcement complaint and investigation, were found to be unlawful.

Retrospective Full Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent for these (unauthorised) roof lights was refused under HPK/2021/0627 and HPK/2021/0634 respectively, and dismissed by an Inspector at Appeal on 23rd January 2023.

Following this Appeal Decision, it was agreed that the best approach to addressing what has become somewhat 'messy' from a planning enforcement perspective would be for the applicant to apply for part retrospective Full Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent for the conversion of the Stables and Coach House building, which would include changes to the siting and design of the roof lights.

PROPOSAL

In light of the above, the applicant seeks part retrospective Full Planning Permission (HPK/2025/0074) and Listed Building Consent (HPK/2025/0075) for the conversion of the Grade II Listed Stables and Coach House building at Bowden Hall.

Owing to the Council not being satisfied with the quality of the technical details submitted with the application, the applicant sought to instruct a new agent to act on their behalf, which in turn led to a number of additional documents being submitted for consideration.

The new submission aims to carry forward the pre-application discussions held between the Council and the applicant.

In addition to all Floor and Elevation Plans submitted with the original application, the application is supported by a raft of detailed technical information, which includes a detailed schedule of internal works, detailed external door and window schedule a more detailed and comprehensive Heritage Statement, and a revised Site Plan (P03), which shows the relocation of off-street parking provision associated with the proposed residential units.

The works to Unit 1 essentially seeks to regularise internal works already undertaken, which largely follow the 2007 consented arrangement, aside from minor alterations that include the introduction of an additional fourth bedroom created by way of a lightweight partition wall, revised to the configuration of the staircase, and associated structural detailing said by the applicant's agent to retain principal historic elements.

As set out within the latest Heritage Statement and Heritage Impact Assessment (Guy Taylor Associates, (08)001 Rev P02, August 2025), the following relates to Units 2 and 3:

- Portion of ground floor incorporated into the accommodation
- Ceiling heights, exposed beams and plastered soffits maintained
- Non-habitable bay at ground floor used for utility functions
- Introduction of third bedroom in both Units 2 and 3
- Both internal layouts partially reversed, relocating lounge to the attic level with two bedrooms situated on the middle floor
- Dedicated fire escape doors in relation elevation extending from kitchen/dining room
- Minor raising of ground floor levels in Units 2 and 3 to accommodate services, insulation to protect historic flooring, and reduce overall staircase height
- Minor alterations to the elevation fronting the courtyard comprising the partial unblocking of middle floor windows.
- Re-opening of partially blocked ground floor windows on rear elevation

As shown on the latest Proposed Site Plan (P04) allocated parking to serve the three units is shown to be provided between the building and Bowden Lane.

The previous iteration of the Site Plan (P03) showed each residential unit benefiting from an area of amenity space to the rear of the building within their ownership. Following discussions with the Conservation Officer, and in light of latest comments, Officers concluded that this would not be appropriate for reasons set out within the report.

A revised Location Plan, together with the latest version of the Site Plan, showed the red edge drawn more tightly running parallel with the rear elevation of the building, with no residential unit benefiting from any amenity space to the rear.

The proposals seek to address the unlawful rooflights that were the subject of an enforcement investigation and dismissed appeal, removing and replacing these rooflights as appropriate in line with pre-application discussions. This will result in all rooflights being replaced with smaller 'Clement 3' conservation roof lights as shown on Drawing D-CRPM-01, with one (unauthorised) roof light being removed and made good with matching tiles.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Act 2004 requires proposals to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan taking into consideration any material considerations relevant to the determination of the application.

The Local Development Plan for this site comprises the Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan and the High Peak Local Plan (2016). Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance documents and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) are also material considerations in determining applications.

High Peak Local Plan 2016

- S1 Sustainable Development Principles
- S2 Settlement Hierarchy
- S3 Strategic Housing Development

EQ3 Rural Development
 EQ5 Biodiversity
 EQ6 Design and Place Making
 EQ7 Built and Historic Environment
 EQ9 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerow
 H1 Location of Housing Development
 H3 New Housing Development
 CF6 Accessibility and Transport

Supplementary Planning Documents

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

National Planning Policy Framework 2024

Achieving Sustainable Development	Chapter 2
Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes	Chapter 5
Promoting Sustainable Transport	Chapter 9
Making Effective Use of Land	Chapter 11
Achieving Well Designed Places	Chapter 12
Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment	Chapter 15
Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment	Chapter 16

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/0000/5794	Stables and Outbuildings into 6no Dwellings (Approved)
HPK/0003/2847	Retain Storage Huts and Activity Centre (Approved)
HPK/2006/0794 & HPK/2006/0795	Planning and Listed Building Consent for Conversion Of Outbuildings To 5 No. New Dwellings (Refused 31/12/2006)
HPK/2007/0220 & HPK/2007/0221	Planning and Listed Building Consent for Conversion of Outbuildings to 5no Dwellings (Approved 30/05/2007)
HPK/2015/0461	Proposed Amendment to Approved Application HPK/2007/0221 - New Access Staircase from Ground Floor to First Floor involving no change of use and minimal loss of fabric (Approved 21/10/2015)
HPK/2018/0617	Listed building consent for Alteration to rafter and truss (Approved 27/02/2019)
HPK/2021/0627 & HPK/2021634	Full Planning & Listed Building Consent for Rooflights to stables (retrospective) (Refused 07/06/2022) Appeal Dismissed APP/H1033/W/22/3301340 (23/01/2023)

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 30th April 2025

Neighbour consultation period ends: 11th April 2025

Neighbour re-consultation period ends: 14th October 2025

Press Advert: 24th April 2025

Public Comments

6no objections have been received during the original consultation period. The grounds for objection are summarised as follows below:

- Impact on character of Listed Building
- Impact on TPO protected trees
- Narrowness of Bowden Lane with poor visibility and lack of passing places
- Impact on safety of pedestrians
- Impacts on neighbours and users of Bowden Lane during construction
- Lack of parking provision
- Impact on the 'aesthetics' of the site and wider rural landscape
- Queries regarding sky dish and velux roof lights (unlawfully erected)
- Inaccuracies in relation to boundary lines on plans
- Velux rooflights included when they were previously refused and dismissed on appeal
- Harm to neighbouring residential amenity – privacy
- Impact to local wildlife
- Queries regarding Application Form submission (sections relating to i) Parking; ii) Trees and Hedges; iii) Biodiversity Net Gain
- Queries regarding where the trees referred to within the PEA are located
- Absence of information regarding foul sewage
- Potential catalyst for more development
- Hazardous for horse riders

Further to a significant amount of technical information being submitted after the original consultation period had ended, the application was subject to a full 21 day re-consultation period.

During this re-consultation 2no objections have been received, both of whom objected in relation to the original application. Further representations are summarised as follows:

- Attention drawn to latest comments/concerns from Council for British Archaeology
- Attention drawn to Highways Authority comments (unsustainable location)
- Since 2007 there has been a significant increase in traffic/vehicle movements
- No timescale for development has been stated or suggested – impact on amenity of local residents

- Lack of clarification regarding landscaping associated with the scheme – impact on other properties Bowden Hall Cottage, The Wash House, and The Smithy
- Request for following ongoing impacts to be fully considered:
 - How will disturbance to my property and neighbouring properties be managed?
 - Will there be limits on when works can take place?
 - How will such limits be communicated?

Town / Parish Comments

No comments received at time of writing

AES Waste

Properties should be planned so bins can be stored within the property boundary and be moved to the presentation point without the need to go up or down steps or through the property. Garden gates need to be wide enough to accommodate a standard 240l wheeled bin.

Collection vehicles are unable to access private driveways so properties will have to present their bins at a point next to the nearest adopted highway.

Historic England

No comments to make

Council for British Archaeology

Initial Comments

The national importance of the application site is established by its designation as a Grade II building (NHLE No. 1088048). It is an early 19th century stable block with external architectural details that distinguish its polite appearance as a key component to the setting of Bowden Hall, also listed at Grade II (NHLE No. 1334796). It is not possible to understand the extent of survival of historic fabric and internal fixtures and fittings from this application. Along with its plan form these will contribute to the building's significance.

Three other structures within the immediate setting of the application site are also individually designated. These are The Smithy (Grade II, NHLE No. 1088049), the Cartshed (Grade II, NHLE No. 1334797) and Bowden Hall Cottage (Grade II, 1088047). The historical relationship between these buildings establishes their group value. Their separate individual designations identifies that they each have special interest, the sensitivity of which needs to be considered as part of any planned change to their setting.

Whilst the CBA support the adaptation of this stables building to a residential use, the application documents fall short of the requirements set out in chapter 16 of the NPPF for conserving significance in the historic environment.

The lack of detail about the existing building, the fabric which would be impacted by the proposals or consideration of the impact of external alterations on the group value and setting of neighbouring listed buildings renders the 'Heritage Statement' not fit for purpose in its failure to meet the requirements of NPPF paragraph 207. This lack of detail also compromises your LPA's ability to discharge the duties placed on you by NPPF paragraph 208 to minimise any conflict between the proposals and significance of impacted heritage assets.

The List description notes the survival of a considerable quantity of bottle glass in the building's windows. This, as well as the quantity of apertures means that the windows contribute to the significance as well as character of the building. All but two of the existing windows are proposed for replacement with no condition inventory or justification for the removal of so much historic fabric, failing to meet the requirements of NPPF paragraph 213.

Along with the creation of domestic curtilages the wholesale replacement of historic windows will alter the setting of the neighbouring listed buildings, which is in no way considered.

There are many unanswerable questions from the information that currently supports these proposals. These include; The building's form is a representation of its historic function. How will its subdivision and the proposed alteration to ceiling heights impact this historical and architectural value? How are harmful impacts to the building's legibility as a stables and coach house being minimised? The application notes these proposals are partly retrospective. What are the works that have already been undertaken? Significant architectural details to the building include a bell tower and clock. How will they be managed as part of these proposals? NPPF paragraphs 210 and 212 will be relevant in this regard.

To convert these stables into houses their thermal efficiency will need to be improved. To ensure this does not detrimentally impact the historic fabric it is essential that any materials introduced into the built envelope operate symbiotically with the historic fabric. Drawing 115 notes 'tanking and insulation to existing walls'. There are no details of the materials proposed for these works. The use of impermeable materials could cause considerable harm over time. Suitable materials should be 'breathable'. Historic England have produced helpful guidance on retrofitting historic buildings for thermal efficiency, which we advise should inform the specification for methods and materials to be used at this site.

The CBA believe this application lacks the sufficient understanding of the building's significance or consideration of the impacts this scheme of works on the site's significance for it to be positively determined in its current form. We therefore recommend that the application should be withdrawn, revised and better detailed in order to meet the requirements set out in the NPPF for managing change to listed buildings.

Further Comments

The CBA are grateful to the applicants for the additional information submitted in support of these proposals. The CBA broadly support the conservation orientated approaches now detailed towards historic building fabric. The new Heritage Statement enables an improved understanding of the complexity of the site and its heritage interests (significance). However, inconsistencies between architectural drawings prevents an adequate assessment of the impacts these proposals would have on the site's significance. For example, Drg No WEBB 106 is a Proposed GF plan for conversion to three houses whilst WEBB 107 is a Proposed 1F plan for conversion to two houses. The Heritage Statement verbally identifies historically intact areas of the building, but without supporting photographs it is challenging to assess the impact of proposals on these areas. Can it please be clarified which drawings are the correct 'existing' and 'proposed' plans and elevations. Improved labelling would also be helpful.

The CBA are concerned that the subdivision as proposed into three (or two?) units has been superimposed onto the building without an understanding of its significance. The assessment of significance, undertaken since, has not been used to revise plans to reduce their harmful impact on the significance of the building.

Whilst we note permission was granted for three units in 2007, the HS notes this scheme has not been implemented as it was found to be fundamentally flawed rather than delivering a viable re-use. Current proposals also contain considerable compromises for domestic accommodation, including a shared front door for two homes and attic level lounges. Historic fabric will be impacted through the requirement to relocate staircases and alter floors / ceilings.

We advise the application should be revised to reflect the improved understanding of the building's significance. Although this is a large site, achieving three large dwellings is clearly creating avoidable pressure on the listed building to adapt. Reducing the number of units or altering their comparative sizes should reduce the level of harm to the historic form and fabric of the coach house.

This application proposes rooflights which have already been refused retrospective consent and refused consent on appeal. The CBA advise these rooflights should now be removed as part of any consented scheme of works at this site. Application documents propose smaller, conservation style rooflights in the place of all but one of those extant. The CBA advise there are too many rooflights still proposed, which harm the character and significance of the listed building. We specifically object to any rooflights above the stone mullioned windows on the front elevation, which is especially jarring. The three proposed to the west (long) elevation appear likely to have minimal impact and may be achievable.

The CBA are also concerned about the impact the proposed scheme would have on the group value and shared setting of this and the four neighbouring Grade II listed buildings. The proposed site plan involves a wide dispersal of car parking which alongside the creation of domestic curtilages will impact the character and setting of all five listed buildings.

The CBA are not able to support this application due to inconsistencies between drawings as to what is being proposed. We further advise that harm to significance could and should be minimised through revisions based on the improved understanding of the site's significance, as detailed above. The character and shared setting of this group of listed buildings should be regarded as an important consideration to external landscaping. The requirements of NPPF paragraphs 212, 213 and 215 are not currently met. We believe your LPA's ability to meet the requirements of paragraph 208 is currently compromised.

In designing an appropriate scheme for the site, the CBA advise that any permissions granted in 2007 should not be viewed as extant but historic. The National Planning Policy Framework changed the planning decision-making criteria since 2012, whilst conservation philosophy has been radically altered since 2008. Harmful alterations to the building consented to in 2007 do not therefore set the bar for what could / should be granted LBC in 2025.

The CBA advise this application should be withdrawn and revised by the applicants or otherwise refused by your LPA.

Latest Comments

If we have misunderstood which plans are currently proposed and which are superseded, then I apologise.

If your LPA's Conservation Officer is satisfied that the revised scheme for the application site meets the requirements of set out in the 1990 Act, Chapter 16 of the NPPF and High Peak's Local Plan then I am very happy to defer to their professional judgement and familiarity with the application site.

HPBC Conservation Officer

Initial Comments

The application relates to the Stabling at Bowden Hall, a three-storey, L-shaped building located within the Bowden estate. Buildings within the Bowden estate have been listed individually, owing to the individual value of each. However, it is important to understand the complex of listed buildings as a unit, as they each contribute positively to the setting of one another and the evolution of the Bowden Hall estate. The application relates to the conversion of the existing stable block into 3 dwellings. HPK/2007/0221 provided approval for a previous conversion scheme, which has not been lawfully implemented. The scheme before us now looks to right some of the previous harm caused through an alternative conversion scheme. This current scheme is assessed accordingly below.

Firstly, the heritage statement provided is considered insufficient. Sections 4.7 Commentary and 4.8 Harm are brief, providing no justification for the statements made. The Stables are not only of individual significance but contribute to the significance of neighbouring listed buildings within the Bowden Hall Estate. Insufficient assessment has been conducted as to the impact of converting the stables upon the wider estate and its significance. Minimal assessment has been provided as to the

justification behind choices made within the proposal, demonstrating a lack of understanding as to the building significance and how the proposed scheme will retain this as unharmed. The applications therefore fail to comply with para 207 of the NPPF.

There is also inconsistency in regards to the 'existing' plans submitted. There have been a number of works which have been unlawfully completed. This included the installation of a number of rooflights, previously refused under HPK/2021/0634 (dismissed at appeal). 'existing plan' ref 104 shows no rooflights in place, while the proposed roof plan ref 109B shows alternative, more appropriate smaller rooflights. No plans or details have been provided in regards to making good the unlawful works. The current submission is therefore inaccurate and lacking. Full details of all unlawful works, and how these will be made good must be included. For example, how will existing unlawful roof openings be made good in an appropriate and unharmed manner.

In conclusion the application lacks completeness and as such the impact of the proposed works cannot be confidently determined. The application fails to supply an appropriately detailed heritage statement, the statement submitted lacks an exploration of the setting of the heritage asset, assessment of impact on nearby heritage assets and lacks a proper and details assessment and justification of the works being propose. The application therefore fails paras 207 and 213 of the NPPF. Furthermore the submission lacks acknowledgement of previously unlawful works, fails to appropriately demonstrate how these works will be made good. There is no distinction on submitted plans as to clarify which works have already been completed, and which are proposed. The submission therefore lacks appropriate completeness and clarity. All listed buildings must be treated with due care and consideration, as such additional details are requested.

Therefore, appropriate amendments are requested to address the above concerns. Alternatively, if amendments are not forthcoming refusal is recommended. For clarity A list of required amendments is below. Any elements not mentioned within this list are not guaranteed support due to the current lack of information and justification submitted.

- Revised heritage statement including full exploration of the proposed scheme and relevant justification for all elements. Impact upon wider setting of the Bowden Hall estate must be considered.
- Clarification regarding in-situ unlawful elements, and how these will be addressed within the proposed scheme.

Further Comments

These comments are based upon the plans received to supplements the original submission. Unfortunately the revised submission fails to successfully address the concerns raised by Conservation comments dated 23/04/2025. As such the applicant is advised to read the below comments in conjunction with comments dated 23/04/2025. For the purposes of clarity the conservation requirements of any subsequent submission are laid out below.

- A revised heritage statement. Due to the significance of the site, and previous unlawful interventions a revised heritage statement must fully assess the significance of the site, the impact of unlawful works and how these works will be appropriately remedied.
- A full schedule of plans including the site pre-unlawful works, the existing/current site clearly indicating which works have been completed to date, proposed plans clearly indicating how unlawful works will be remedied.
- A schedule of works including full details of how the unlawful works will be remedied. Plans alone are unlikely to provide sufficient details of the current unlawful works and how these will be remedied. The schedule of works should be completed by a competent person (as defined by the NPPF) and is expected to include full 'step-by- step' details of all remedial and proposed work.
- A full windows and door schedule detailing condition of existing windows and doors and how each window will be treated in detail.
- A full material schedule including details of all new materials to be used. For example the natural stone to be used in entrance way, external hard standing etc.
- Plumbing and wiring plans to indicate how proposed plumbing and wiring will interact with the historic fabric of the building.

In conclusion, the current revised submission lacks sufficient details to ensure that the proposed and remedial works will not harm the fabric or significance of the heritage asset. Refusal is therefore recommended on the grounds of insufficient information as detailed above.

Further Comments

The schedule of internal works provides a detailed account of the proposed internal repair, renovation and remedial works when read in conjunction with revised plans received in May 2025 and the additional specifications provided. These details include exact material details within the relevant specifications which are considered to be acceptable in terms of heritage impact.

Details of remedial works to unlawful rooflights have been included within the revised heritage statement, Drawing No.s . D-CRPM-01, 02, 03, and 04 Rev G, and external door and window schedule. These remedial works are considered acceptable. The external door and window schedule also provide sufficient and acceptable details as to the treatment of all external windows and doors.

Plumbing and wiring details have been provided within the schedule of internal works. This confirms that wires and drainage will be fitted to new ceiling finishes, or surface mounted to historical fabric and made good with appropriate materials. This provides sufficient detail to ensure that the required plumbing and wiring will not harm the historical fabric of the building.

In conclusion, the amended information addresses previous concerns regarding the level of detail included within the submission. The additional information has facilitated a full review of the proposed scheme. It is considered that the proposed works and change of use will not harm the significance of the listed building.

Therefore, there are no heritage objections to the scheme, subject to recommended conditions. A building record condition is recommended to ensure that the listed building is fully recorded prior to its conversion. An additional landscaping condition is recommended to protect the existing cobbles and setting of the listed building.

Conditions

1. No works shall commence until a programme of historic building recording in accordance with Historic England's 'Understanding Historic Buildings: A Guide to Good Recording Practice' [Level 1] has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Following approval of the submitted report, the completed building recording report shall be deposited with the relevant Historic Environment Record (HER) within 1 month of this agreement.
2. Prior to occupation a scheme details for the repair and retention of existing cobbles must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the details of which shall be implemented in line with the approved details.

Further Comments

Having reviewed the revised plan I have no objections to the revision in relation to heritage.

I would draw your attention to the previously requested condition relating to the area of existing cobbles. The revised plans show the cobbles area to be 'repaired only where necessary'. I would still require details of these 'repairs' via condition to ensure that they are appropriate.

Latest Comments

The revised site plans confirms that the land to the east of the stables is not included within the application. A stables would not historically have outdoor amenity space associated with the building. Therefore, if this land were to be incorporated within the application scheme and used as residential amenity space the setting and landscaping of the listed stables would be harmed. The revised information makes it clear that this land is not associated with the development. This is considered acceptable to protect the historic character and setting of the listed stables.

HPBC Trees

Latest revised Site Plan (P03) does not offer any conflict with TPO trees or Root Protection Areas.

The existing Cedar Tree that exists in area identified for parking is in extremely poor condition. I am happy for it be removed to facilitate the parking area. Obviously EQ9 would apply re replacements.

Derbyshire County Council Highways

The application proposes the conversion of existing outbuildings to three residential dwellings each with 4+ bedrooms.

It is not clear if the existing outbuildings have a specific use; however, it is assumed that they are ancillary to the main dwelling and are either used for storage or other similar use by the owner of the main residence.

The site is accessed directly off Bowden Lane via two existing vehicular accesses. Both of the existing accesses are proposed to serve the proposed dwellings and associated parking spaces for each dwelling.

Taking in to account the nature and characteristics of Bowden Lane it is considered that each access achieves appropriate emerging visibility in both directions and both are of an appropriate width to accommodate the expected vehicle movements generated by the proposed dwellings.

It is proposed to provide three parking spaces for plot one and two spaces each for plots two and three.

DCC's parking guidance recommends 4-5 bedroom dwellings be provided with three spaces; however, fewer spaces will be considered if there is evidence that parking will not be displaced. It is considered that there is space within the application site to accommodate some additional parking within the site should this be required.

It is generally considered that residential dwellings will generate 6 to 8 movements per day. Considering the locality of the application site, the distance between the application site and local amenities, including bus stops and footways, and the general lack of opportunities for walking and cycling, it is considered reasonable to assume that trips generated by the proposed dwellings will be made by private vehicle; therefore it is considered that the proposed dwellings are more likely to generate a higher level of vehicle movements if not being totally reliant on using private vehicles to access all amenities.

The site is located approximately 1m from the town centre of Chapel-en-Frith and the expected local amenities available within the town centre.

There is a supermarket (Aldi) and public house located some 800m from the application site; however there is no footway facility on Bowden Lane with the nearest footway being on the western side of the access/service road leading to the supermarket and PH.

Bowden Lane itself is a single width road with no footway provision and is not street lit throughout its whole length between the application site and the junction with the A6/A624.

It is also noted that pedestrians travelling from the application site to the supermarket and any other amenities would need to cross the A6/A624/Bowden Lane roundabout junction. This junction has no pedestrian crossing facilities and all pedestrians would need to negotiate the junction using the grassed verges on each approach to the junction. The lack of crossing facilities and footways at this junction present a clear barrier for pedestrians in negotiating the junction.

The nearest bus stop to the application site is located on Hayfield Road some 1200m southwest of the application site. As previously mentioned, the nearest footway facility to the application starts at the junction to the Lidl and public house access road, some 800m away.

National guidance recommends that bus stops are located 400m from buildings; however, in rural areas this can be extended to 800m. However, an important factor to consider is the accessibility of bus stops. In this instance, again as previously mentioned, the distance between the application site and nearest footway provision is some 800m with all pedestrians needing to cross the A6/A624/Bowden Lane roundabout junction to use the footway to then access the bus stop. Considering the clear difficulties faced by pedestrians in negotiating the roundabout junction to then be required to either walk in the road or the adjacent grassed verge to join the nearest footway, this situation is not considered conducive to encouraging occupants of the proposed dwellings to use or even consider using bus services.

The same conditions for pedestrians to access the footway network and local amenities also apply to cyclists with the same barriers significantly reducing opportunities for occupants of the proposed dwellings to choose sustainable travel options.

It is considered that the barriers faced by pedestrians and cyclists in accessing the highway network and all local amenities to the south of Bowden Lane would present a significant highway safety concern as well as presenting a significant barrier in travel choice for occupants of the proposed dwellings.

Based on the above comments, it is recommended that the application is refused on the following grounds:

1. The application would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety and would present significant barriers in prioritising sustainable transport modes and does not give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements contrary to paragraphs 115, 116 and 117 of the NPPF. The application would also be contrary to policies S1 and CF6 in HPBC's Local Plan.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The applicant seeks part retrospective Full Planning and Listed Building Consent to the proposed conversion of a Grade II Listed Building on a site that lies outside of the built-up area boundary of any town or village in the open countryside.

Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan (CNP) Policy H2 refers to smaller housing schemes which amount to infill or redevelopment of less than 6 units, and that such sites should be within the built-up area boundary. Any residential development outside the built-up area boundary is limited to agricultural or rural enterprises or other special circumstance set out under Paragraph 84 of the NPPF and other national and local plan policies. The scheme does not amount to development which would comprise infill and redevelopment sites within the Parish, and therefore it is necessary to consider the scheme against relevant housing policies in the Local Plan.

Local Plan Policies S1, S3, EQ3 and H1 when read together set out the strategic housing policy for the Borough and where new housing development in the rural areas will be supported in principle. Given the fact that the proposal involves the re-use and conversion of an existing building, the general principle of development (with regards solely to relevant strategic housing development policies) is supported, particularly given that the Council has previously established that the principle is acceptable by virtue of granting planning consent in 2007.

However, due to the fact that the building subject to these applications are Listed, the scheme must be found to preserve or enhance the historic significance of the Listed Building including its setting, in accordance with LP Policy EQ7 and relevant restrictive national planning policy contained under Chapter 16 of the NPPF, underpinned by Section 66(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

The NPPF sets out that planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance (including heritage) provide a strong reason for refusing the development proposed, or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well designed places, and providing affordable homes.

Design & Heritage Conservation

Section 66(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Chapter 16 of the NPPF contains the national planning policies aimed at conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Paragraph 210 states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;

- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Paragraph 212-221 sets out how a local planning authority should assess the significance of a heritage asset and the potential impact of a development proposal upon that asset.

Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits.

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 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.

LP Policy EQ7 has regard to the Built and Historic Environment. It states that the Council will conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. This will take into account the desirability of sustaining and enhancing their significance and will ensure that development proposals contribute positively to the character of the built and historic environment.

The High Peak Design Guide SPD (2018) contains further guidance relating to the conversion of buildings. Relevant guidance pertinent to this application is set out as follows:

5.15 The guiding principle behind the design of any conversion should be that the character of the original building and its setting should be respected and retained. This means that in most cases the barn, mill or chapel should afterwards look like a converted barn, mill or chapel, and not like a new house or a new block of flats. When converting traditional buildings, new uses should not normally require the construction of extensions or ancillary buildings. However, if alterations are necessary and approached carefully, it may be possible to bring about a new understanding of historic buildings by making a clear distinction between what is old and what is new.

Objections have been received with regards to the potential impact of the proposed conversion on the character and setting of the Coach House Listed Building and the wider setting of Bowden Hall, in addition to the aesthetics of the rural context in which the building is situated.

These applications have been invited by the Council further to constructive pre-application advice, in order to fully regularise the unauthorised works that have taken place following the original consents for conversion granted in 2007, which include internal works relating to the conversion in addition to larger and additional rooflights added to the roof plane.

All aspects relating to internal and external alterations to the building are broadly consistent with those presented to the Council during pre-application discussions. An external decked area that would have been situated to the rear of the building that was strongly refuted as part of the pre-application discussions have been omitted from this proposal which is welcomed.

In light of the further comprehensive and detailed information submitted by Guy Taylor Associated, the initial objections from the Conservation Officer have been satisfactorily addressed. Latest comments from this consultee acknowledges that the detailed and exact specifications received in May 2025 are acceptable with regards to potential heritage impacts which include the proposed regularising works, revised rooflights, treatments of all external windows and doors, and network infrastructure (plumbing, cabling etc). The conclusions are that no adverse harm to the building results from this proposal, having regard to all latest drawings and technical information.

With regards to the rooflights, the current (unauthorised) rooflights that are in situ are much larger than were approved in 2007, with one additional rooflight being installed to the rear, located so that it does not align with the others.

The latest plans will ensure that the current rooflights are removed and replaced with those of a more appropriate scale, with the most incongruous 'off line' rooflight to the rear being removed.

Appropriately worded conditions are required in order to ensure that the Listed Building is fully and properly recorded prior to its conversion, and that the existing cobbles which are a key feature, are protected.

The Council for British Archaeology (CBA) have confirmed in their latest response that they are happy to follow the recommendations of the Council's Conservation Officer with regards to the acceptability of the scheme and potential impacts to heritage assets.

Further to a review of all latest plans and technical details, including all new information submitted by the new agent Guy Talyor Associates, and latest comments from the Council's Conservation Officer, it is judged that the internal and external works associated with the proposed conversion, including the replacement and removal as appropriate of rooflights will sustain and preserve the historic significance of the Listed

Building including its setting, the wider setting of the Bowden Hall complex and indeed the rural landscape more broadly including the Peak District National Park.

Having regard to paragraph 210 of the NPPF, and in light of comments received from the Conservation Officer, the Council are satisfied that the conversion of this Listed Building to residential development would contribute positively to the long term viable use of the building, and that as a consequence the proposals as set out on the latest plans will sustain the significance of the heritage asset. This is a significant public benefit which will attract significant weight in the overall balance.

Subject to appropriate conditions, the Council are satisfied that the proposed scheme accords with LP Policies S1, EQ3, EQ6 and EQ7, relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance, and relevant paragraphs contained under Chapters 12 and 15 of the NPPF respectfully.

Trees

LP Policy EQ9 relates specifically to trees, woodland and hedgerows, and requires that existing woodlands, healthy mature trees and hedgerows are retained and integrated within a proposed development unless the need for, and benefits of, the development clearly outweigh their loss. The policy also requires development where appropriate to provide replacement tree planting at a ratio of 2:1 and soft landscaping.

Paragraph 136 of the NPPF states that trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments and that policies and decisions should ensure that where possible existing trees are retained.

A row of mature trees is situated to the rear of the building in between the elevation and the public footpath on higher ground. Two of these trees are protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) with a third TPO tree situated north of the building.

An existing Cedar tree is situated in the area earmarked for associated parking.

Concerns have been raised by objectors with regards the potential impacts of the proposed conversion and associated works including parking to any tree located on site which include those protected by a TPO and those that are not.

The latest Site Plan and supporting commentary shows that the proposed dedicated parking area will not result in any adverse harm to any tree including its root protection area that is protected by a TPO. However, one existing Cedar tree that is said to be in poor condition will be removed to facilitate parking associated with Unit 2.

The agent contends that the removal of this tree was previously said to be acceptable by a former Council Tree Officer communicated verbally with the applicant. Officers have sought advice from the Council's current Tree Officer, who has confirmed that there are no objections to this tree being removed, albeit that replacement planting should be explored in accordance with LP Policy EQ9.

As such, having regard to the latest Site Plan and comments from the Tree Officer, the Council are satisfied that the proposed scheme in its latest form will not be harmful to any protected or non-protected tree in accordance with LP Policy EQ9 and

paragraph 136 of the NPPF, subject to an appropriate condition that requires a scheme of replacement planting to be agreed.

Amenity

LP Policy H3 relates to all new housing development and requires that proposals provide a high standard of amenity for all future occupiers by demonstrating compliance with Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS), which provide minimum internal floor areas for residential units based on the number of storeys, bedrooms and occupants, and also minimum standards for bedroom dimensions, again based on occupancy.

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.

LP Policy EQ10 seeks to ensure that people and the environment are protected from adverse impacts relating to issues including air pollution, noise, light pollution or any other nuisance or harm to amenity, by securing appropriate mitigation by way of planning conditions and obligations.

The High Peak Residential Design Guide SPD requires extensions to preserve the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, having regard amongst other things to the relationship between existing and proposed development, the positioning of windows, and the change in land levels. A minimum of 21m should be achieved between existing and proposed habitable windows.

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that planning should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Paragraph 198 of the NPPF states that policies and decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development and in doing so should (amongst other things) mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development.

Residential Amenity

Firstly with regards the amenity for future occupiers, it is accepted that in the interest of preserving the historic significance of the building and its setting, the latest Site Plan shows that the proposed conversion would result in no outdoor amenity space for each residential unit, which in most cases is undesirable.

However, it is not uncommon for residential conversions of buildings with historic significance to not benefit from such amenity space, in the interests of preserving character. As such and given that the principles associated with residential amenity have not materially changed since 2007 when permission was originally granted for

the building's conversion, the absence of outdoor amenity space is considered to be acceptable on this occasion.

Turning to space standards, Unit 1 is shown to be two storey with a further floor in the roof space, having an internal floor area across two floors totalling 240m², containing 4no bedrooms. This far exceeds the minimum NDSS for this size of property based on full occupancy. The Floor Plans show that all four bedrooms exceed 11.5sqm with a minimum 2.15m width and therefore meet minimum space standards for a double bedroom.

Units 2 and 3 have a similar footprint across three storeys each containing three bedrooms totalling 216sqm which far exceeds minimum NDSS for this size of property based on full occupancy. All bedrooms at first and second floor level in both Units 2 and 3 also exceed 11.5sqm with a minimum 2.15m width and therefore meet minimum space standards for a double bedroom.

The proposed conversion therefore provides a high standard of amenity for future occupiers with regards the floor area and occupancy of each residential unit and size of bedrooms in line with LP Policy H3.

Objections have been received from neighbouring residents in relation to potential harm to their amenity, specifically with regards to overlooking and privacy.

The Coach House and Stables building sits northwards of two detached properties – The Wash House (located immediately to the south), and Bowden Hall Cottage (located to the south-east).

Given that the side elevation facing both of these properties does not benefit from any habitable windows, and that none of the units would benefit from any external amenity space, there is no potential for the proposed conversion to cause harm to the amenity of either neighbouring property with regards overlooking and loss of privacy. The orientation of Bowden Hall Cottage and its relationship with the Coach House means that there is no intermittent views between habitable windows, at any angle.

The Smithy is a detached property that is situated west of the Coach House and Stables building. Whilst it is acknowledged that principal habitable windows face out towards this neighbour, the distance separating the two buildings is 25m, in excess of the minimum 21m required by the Residential Design Guide SPD, and therefore this neighbouring property would not be adversely affected by the proposed development.

In light of the above, Officers are satisfied that the proposed development in its latest form would provide an acceptable standard of amenity for future occupiers of the 3no residential units, and would not result in any adverse harm to neighbouring residential amenity in relation to overbearing impacts, overlooking, loss of privacy, or loss of sunlight, in accordance with LP Policy EQ6, the Residential Design Guide SPD, and paragraph 135 of the NPPF.

Public Amenity

Objections and concerns have been raised by neighbouring residents in relation to matters of public amenity that include potential noise, disturbance and disruption

during the construction phase, and how such issues will be managed, and the absence of specific information regarding the discharge of foul sewage.

Firstly with regards potential noise and disturbance issues during construction, these can be suitably controlled via standard conditions and it is recommended that these are incorporated into the Decision Notice. It is acknowledged that some degree of noise and disturbance will occur during permitted construction hours, however this applies to all development.

With regards to foul sewage, drainage details associated with developments of this scale are controlled and secured by means of other legislation (Building Regulations). The properties would not be able to be occupied until such time as these details were effectively signed off by an appropriately qualified professional.

As such, subject to standard conditions limiting the times at which construction works including the delivery of materials can take place, the application is considered to be acceptable with regards to matters relating to public amenity, in accordance with LP Policy EQ10 and relevant paragraphs contained under Chapter 15 of the NPPF.

Parking Provision & 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. Off-street parking provision shall be provided in accordance with guidelines set out under Appendix 1 of the Local Plan.

Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states that in assessing sites for specific applications, it should be ensured that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users.

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF goes on to state that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impact impacts on the road network would be severe.

The site is accessible via Bowden Lane, an adopted single track that extends northwards from a roundabout junction with the A6. The access from this highway into the site is shared with the remainder of the Bowden Hall complex, whereby an internal road forms a circle around The Smithy and adjacent Cart Shed.

Objections have been forthcoming from neighbouring residents and the general public regarding the narrowness of Bowden Lane, its poor visibility and lack of passing places, the resultant impact on the safety of pedestrians caused by an increase in vehicle movements, the lack of satisfactory parking provision, the potential impacts to users of Bowden Lane including horse riders.

Detailed comments from the Highways Authority confirm that the characteristics of the access to Bowden Lane including exit visibility is acceptable having regard to the expected number of vehicle movements generated by the proposed conversion of this

building. As such, Officers agree that the access from Bowden Lane into the Bowden Hall complex is satisfactory in its own right.

Whilst it is the case that there would be some degree of increase in vehicle movements as a consequence of the proposed development, these are considered to be negligible in the context of any perceived intensification of Bowden Lane. Similarly, whilst there would be some short term increases in vehicle movements during the construction period, this would not in the view of Officers be of an increase that would justify a reason for refusal on highway safety grounds.

The comments go on to set out DCC's parking guidance, and that 4-5 bedroom dwellings are provided with 3no spaces. This is consistent with the Council's own parking guidelines that state that residential units with 3 bedrooms provide a minimum of 2no parking spaces, and that units with 4 bedrooms provide 3no parking spaces. The latest Site Plan shows that Unit 1 benefits from 3no spaces, with Units 2 and 3 benefiting from 2no spaces. As such, the proposal provides an adequate amount of off-street parking to serve each unit, in accordance with guidelines set out under Appendix 1 of the Local Plan.

The Highways Authority object to this proposal on the grounds that it is located in an approximately 1 mile from Chapel-en-le-Frith with a heavy reliance on the private vehicle to access everyday services and facilities, particularly given that Bowden Lane is a single track which is not street lit with no footway provision and that these barriers faced by pedestrians and cyclists accessing the highway network and local amenities would present significant highway safety concerns.

It is acknowledged that the proposed development is located in a rural location, and that there would to some degree be a reliance on the private vehicle. However, it must also be noted that the petrol station which contains a number of local amenities and the adjacent Supermarket is located less than 1km. Whilst there are no pedestrian safe routes from the site, which is a highway safety matters, this has to be balanced against the public benefits of the reuse of a listed building.

As such, the harm identified by the Highways Authority and cited conflict with relevant local and national planning policies will need to be weighed against the overall benefits of the scheme in the planning balance.

Other Matters

Concerns have been raised in relation to potential impacts to local wildlife. The application amounts to the conversion of an existing property with no new physical development being included within the application. As such, there will not be any impacts to any areas of habitat value as a consequence of the proposed development.

The Environment Act (2021) places a legal requirement on all applications to deliver a 10% uplift in Biodiversity Net Gain on site or, where this cannot be achieved, off-site which can include purchasing credits from a registered Habitat Bank. However, this does not existing habitat value below 25sqm, which applies in this case.

Reference is made to inaccuracies in relation to the way in which boundary lines are drawn on the submitted plans. This issue has been queried with the agent and rectified by way of revised plans being submitted.

Queries are made in relation to the way in which the Application Form has been completed. The level of information that is the subject of assessment within this report is satisfactory with regards to making an informed decision.

Queries have also been raised in connection with a sky dish that has been added to the building and in relation to the continued inclusion of velux roof lights, citing the previous retrospective application and dismissed appeal for the retention of roof lights. Any infrastructure that doesn't benefit from permitted development rights would, if found to be unlawful, be subject to a separate planning application and/or enforcement action which would be considered on its own individual merits. The velux roof lights that are currently in situ are unlawful and will be removed as part of this permission to make way for the roof lights of a revised siting and reduced scale that are shown on the proposed plans.

Concerns have been raised with regards this development being a catalyst for more residential development. The acceptability of converting this building for the reasons outlined within this report does not in any way give a 'green light' for additional development. All applications are considered and assessed on their own individual merits.

A local resident has in their latest objection raised the issue that no specific timescale for carrying out and completing the development has been stated or suggested, and that this could have consequences for neighbouring properties. In line with planning law, there is no statutory requirement for an applicant to complete a development within a specific timescale (unless otherwise stated in relation to a Prior Notification application). As such, whilst the Council are sympathetic to neighbours with regards to the uncertainty around when the development will be completed, this is something beyond Officer's control.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

These applications follow constructive pre-application advice whereby the Council have invited these applications, in order to regularise and address unauthorised works that have occurred since the Council previously granted the appropriate consents for conversion in 2007.

Having regard to paragraph 210 of the NPPF, the Council are satisfied that the conversion of this Listed Building to residential development would contribute positively to the long term viable use of the building, and that as a consequence the proposals as set out on the latest plans will sustain the significance of the heritage asset. The latest proposals have been found to sustain and preserve the historic interest and architectural interest which it possesses and that subject to appropriate conditions, thereby demonstrating compliance with LP Policy EQ7, relevant paragraphs contained under Chapter 16 of the NPPF, and Section 66(1) of the Act 1990.

The Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and therefore in line with Paragraph 11(ii) set out above, the Council are required to undertake a planning balance, considering whether any adverse impacts associated would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

This planning balance is undertaken below.

Benefits

The proposed conversion of the building to residential units will secure a long term sustainable ongoing viable use of the building which in turn will sustain the significance of the heritage asset, which supports the aims and objectives of Paragraph 210 of the NPPF. This is a significant public benefit that carries significant weight in the overall planning balance.

The application would deliver 3 no open market residential units which would make a limited contribution to the overall housing delivery of the Borough. That being said, there would be economic benefits that would flow from future occupiers spending money in the local economy. Taken together, these benefits are attributed modest weight in the overall planning balance.

Harm

The Highways Authority have objected and recommended that the application be refused owing to being accessed via a single unlit road approximately 1 mile from the nearest settlement, thereby resulting in reliance on the private vehicle, and potential impacts on the users of Bowden Lane, contrary to the aims and objectives of LP Policy CF6 and relevant paragraphs contained under Chapter 9 of the NPPF. It is acknowledged that there are no safe pedestrian routes from the site, which is a highway safety concern, and contrary to Policy CF6 of the Local Plan.

However the proposed development lies less than 1km from the nearest amenities close to the A6 roundabout, and therefore a reasonably accessible location by the private car.

No harm is identified in respect of residential amenity and the impact on trees. This is a neutral benefit of the scheme.

Balance

In the overall balance, the harm identified by the Highways Authority with regards the reliance on private vehicles, and resultant impacts on highway safety are on this occasion considered to be significantly outweighed by the public benefits associated with bringing this redundant Listed Building back into a viable use, the delivery of 3 no residential dwellings and the indirect economic benefits that would flow from the completion of the development.

As such, it is recommended that Full Planning and Listed Building Consent be granted respectively subject to appropriate conditions.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Approve with Conditions

Case Officer: James Stannard

Recommendation Date: 2nd February 2026

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council