



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 February 2026

by N Duff BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 February 2026

Appeal Ref: 6001092

66 Chunal Lane, Glossop, Derbyshire SK13 6JX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Graham Kelly against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is HPK/2025/0154.
 - The development proposed is application for new vehicular access and subterranean garage
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for new vehicular access and subterranean garage at 66 Chunal Lane, Glossop, Derbyshire SK13 6JX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HPK/2025/0154, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location plan, Drawing no. 2960-01 Rev I and Drawing no.2969-02 Rev J.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those as shown on the approved plans.
 - 4) The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the access, parking and turning facilities have been provided as shown on the approved plans.

Preliminary Matters

2. It has been brought to my attention that the Council's decision notice shows an incorrect plan revision number. Based on the information before me, I am satisfied that I have determined the appeal using the plans on which the Council based their decision.
3. The description of development in the application form is described as 'application for new vehicular access and subterranean garage'. I have removed the word 'application' from the formal decision as this is not an act of development.

Background Main Issue

4. The side garden of the appeal site is located within the Green Belt and the appellant and Council agree that the new driveway and pedestrian steps would not

be inappropriate development within the Green Belt, and would not harm the openness or purposes of the Green Belt. I see no reason to disagree with their conclusions in this regard.

5. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is located off Chunal Lane and is an end of terrace property with countryside beyond to the rear, side and opposite the site. The property has a stone wall to the front, with a narrow driveway leading uphill into the garden of the property. The land rises steeply behind the property. The area is rural in character with clusters of residential development along the main roads.
7. The proposed development is for the formation of a garage within the hillside of the existing driveway, the land would be graded up to the roof of the proposed garage. The proposal also includes development of the side garden to form a formal driveway, with associated landscaping together with the creation of steps alongside the proposed garage. Some landscaping would be removed with replacement planting proposed.
8. The proposed garage would be set forward of the host property and would be set back, behind the line of the existing front boundary wall. The land would be built up around it, therefore would appear to be set into the hill slope. The row of properties in which the appeal site sits does not have buildings forward of the building line, however, due to the position of the property at the end of the row of properties, on the hill slope within an undulating landscape, the proposed design would not appear incongruous within this context.
9. The High Peak Design Guide SPD states that garages should be subordinate to the host dwelling. This is also set out in the Residential Design SPD which also states that double width garages are not favoured. Due to the separation from the host property and the property being at a higher level, the proposed garage would appear as subordinate to the host dwelling and would not detract from it. Whilst the footprint of the garage may be large in comparison to the dwelling, due to the context in which the property sits including changes in levels, together with the design being integrated into the landscape. I do not consider the size of the garage to be harmful to the character of the host dwelling or the area.
10. The Residential Design SPD states that doors with a vertical emphasis are usually preferred and timber side hung doors may be required in sensitive locations. The proposed roller shutter door on the garage, although contemporary in appearance, is a common feature on domestic buildings such as the one proposed. The walls would be constructed from natural stone to match the existing. Due to the proposed colour, simple design, and its set back position from the highway, I do not consider that the proposed materials and door would detract from the character of the host dwelling or appear incongruous within its setting.
11. The existing access to the site would be widened to accommodate the proposed garage. However, this would be relatively modest, and much of the dry-stone wall and boundary walling would remain, which I consider to be acceptable.

12. For the above reasons, I am satisfied that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposed development would not conflict with Policy EQ6 of the High Peak Local Plan, which requires that development should be well designed and of high quality that responds positively to its environment.
13. In addition, for the above reasons I am satisfied that the proposal would not conflict with the principles of the High Peak Design Guide SPD or the Residential Design Guide SPD.

Conditions

14. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard time condition, in my judgement, conditions are also necessary in respect of ensuring the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in the materials as shown on the approved plans, to provide certainty and to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
15. I note the comments from the Council's highways adviser who has suggested a condition to ensure that the proposal is not brought into use until the access, parking and turning facilities are provided. I consider that this condition is necessary to ensure safe access and egress into and from the appeal site.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above and taking all matters raised into account, the appeal is allowed.

N Duff

INSPECTOR