

## DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

---

HPK/2025/0489  
Valid 12/12/2025

5 MILL COURT  
CHINLEY

PROPOSED TWO STOREY  
SIDE EXTENSION TO FORM A  
HALL, DINING AND OFFICE

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

---

### MAIN ISSUES

- Design, character and appearance
- Impact upon residential amenity
- Highways Safety and Parking

### DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site refers to a detached stone built property which lies on Mill Close within the Forge Works, a relatively new residential development and is fully within the defined settlement boundary of Chinley. The site as existing is afforded a detached double garage which is shared with no. 4 Mill Court with each property being afforded one space.

The surrounding area comprises predominantly semi-detached and detached dwellings which are similar in scale and appearance to the site. To the southwest of the site lies an ProW which runs from north to south.

### PROPOSAL

The application seeks full planning consent to create a two storey side extension. The proposed two storey side extension would project 4.5m from the existing side elevation and would have a depth of 5.4m. The proposed extension would have a height of 5m to the eaves and a maximum height of 8m, the proposals are set down from the existing eaves by 0.9m and set down from the ridge by approximately 1.2m.

The proposed extension would utilise facing materials to match those of the existing dwelling.

The proposed extension has subsequently been revised to clarify the off-street parking arrangements and the red line arrangements further to the omission of a window to the north facing first floor elevation as requested. Neighbours have not been reconsulted as the changes do not alter the overall size and scale of the development.

## **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  
EQ 6 Design and Place Making  
CF 6 Accessibility and Transport

### **Supplementary Planning Documents**

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

### **National Planning Policy Framework**

Chapter 2 - Achieving Sustainable Development  
Chapter 12 - Achieving Well Designed and Beautiful Places

## **SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS**

There is no site history pertaining to the application dwelling itself but there are a significant number of applications which relate to the wider residential development as a whole.

## **CONSULTATIONS**

### **Publicity**

Site Notice expiry date: 05/02/2026  
Neighbour consultation period ends: 12/01/2026  
Press Advert: N/A

### **Public Comments**

3 public comments have been received from 2 neighbouring occupiers two in objection the other being neutral.

The comments in the objection raise concerns regarding:

- Size and scale would be overbearing and dominating
- Loss of light
- Design is out of keeping
- Location of front door and potential issues regarding shared access and safety

- Highly visible location / ProW
- High solid to void ratio

The comments raised in the neutral comment:

We note the plan attached and wanted to draw attention to the fact that the plot of land adjacent to 5 Mill Court does actually belong to 6 Mill Court. We currently use this area as a parking space and trust that the process of the development and the development itself will not interfere with this. Other than that we would just seek assurance that disruption in the cul-de-sac will be kept to a minimum.

### **Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Comments**

Does not object.

### **Derbyshire County Council Highways**

#### Initial comments 22.12.2026

This planning application is seeking permission for a proposed two storey side extension to form a hall, dining and office at 5 Mill Court, Chinley. Mill Court is a private road, and Derbyshire County Council (DCC) has no knowledge of any proposals for its adoption. As such, it falls outside the highway authority's jurisdiction. Nevertheless, the highway authority has commented below.

The existing property has 3 bedrooms with a fourth bedroom on the second floor proposed. However, the proposed office within the extension could reasonably be used as an additional bedroom. As a result, the total number of bedrooms within the property could increase to five.

In accordance with the highway authority's Parking Guidance for New Developments (PGND) 4.2 Table 2, the minimum number of car parking spaces required for dwellings with 4-5 bedrooms is 3 spaces. Paragraph 4.5.1 of the PGND states that, in all circumstances, garages are not counted towards parking provision. Site Plan 20.02 shows provision of three car parking spaces. However, is it not clear if these parking spaces are within the access road or within the property boundary. Whilst the three spaces would meet the PGND requirement, the applicant is required to clarify if the spaces are intended to be within their property boundary or are on the access road. If the applicant is not providing off street parking, this also needs to be clarified.

The aforementioned comments on parking are DCC's parking requirements but is it assumed car parking will be assessed against your own High Peak parking standards.

In view of the above, the highway authority recommends that this planning application should not be determined until the applicant has submitted revised details which satisfactorily address the above issues. The highway authority will comment again following receipt of further information.

### Updated comments 18.02.2026

Initial comments were submitted by the highway authority on 08/01/25. The applicant has submitted a site layout plan which show the proposed car parking spaces are within the applicant property.

Having regard to the above, the highway authority would have no objection to this planning application subject to the following recommended planning condition being attached to the decision notice if planning permission is granted:

No part of the development hereby permitted shall be brought into use until the parking/turning areas are provided in accordance with the scheme illustrated on the approved site plan 02.02 Rev A. The parking/turning areas shall not be used for any purpose other than parking/turning/loading/unloading of vehicles.

REASON: In the interest of highway safety.

## **OFFICER COMMENTS**

### **Principle of Development**

The application seeks full planning permission for an extension to an existing residential property that lies within the built up area boundary for Chinley, which is identified as a Larger Village under Policy S2 of the High Peak Local Plan (2016). The site is not constrained by any sensitive statutory designations and given the nature of the proposed development is deemed to be acceptable in principle subject to an assessment of material considerations such as design and residential amenity which are discussed in greater detail below.

### **Design**

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.

The High Peak Residential Design Guide SPD (2005) and more recently adopted Design Guide SPD (2018) contains further design guidance for extending and altering domestic properties. Extensions and alterations should respect the scale and height of the parent building reading as a subordinate and secondary addition and respecting the character and appearance of the building through an appropriate choice of materials.

The site itself is somewhat unique with regards to its siting in that the existing dwelling appears to "have its back" to the wider Forge Works development to the North and instead visually appears to face towards the south. The proposed development would create a two storey extension and would place a front door on

the north facing elevation of the extension, with the existing north facing elevation only containing a single window and no doors. The internal layout would then be altered to use the north facing side of the dwelling as the entrance to the property effectively switching the orientation of the property. This would reflect the access arrangement into the property, as is found in other properties in the street scene.

With regards to the design of the two storey extension itself, the proposed development whilst creating a large extension would appear as a visually subservient and subordinate addition to the main dwelling by virtue of the notable set down of the ridge and eaves as well as being set back from the north facing elevation. This allows the proposals to appear as less visually prominent and enables the development to harmonise with the existing dwelling.

The neighbouring property of 7 Mill Court has objected to the proposed works partly on the grounds of design and appearance.

These areas of concerns relate specifically to the size of the proposed extension which would appear as overbearing by virtue of its size. As the proposed extension would occupy less than 50% of the width of the existing dwelling the existing dwelling is judged to be able to accommodate such a scale of development. Additionally with regard to the large set down the proposed extension is not deemed to be overly dominant and would not have any overbearing impacts in terms of its appearance.

The neighbouring objection also raises that the site is highly prominent and the location of a ProW directly to the west, which affords views of the site. It is noted that the site as existing is in close proximity to a ProW however given the site context and that the ProW runs along the boundary of a large residential development the development of a two storey extension is not deemed to have any unacceptable impacts upon the street scene or prejudice the use and enjoyment of the ProW.

The neighbour has also raised concerns regarding the design and the large solid to void ratio of the proposed works. The existing development, particularly on the northern elevation is characterised by its large solid to void ratio and the proposals would utilise materials to match that of the existing dwelling. Consequently, the proposed development is deemed to be in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling and that of the wider street scene.

The proposals previously included a north facing window to the first floor however following advice from the case officer this has been omitted from the design proposals firstly in the interests of residential amenity but also to retain the visual appearance of the existing dwelling which is characterised by a high solid to void ratio to the north facing elevation.

As a consequence of the above, the proposed development would not have any unacceptable impacts by virtue of its design, character and appearance in accordance with Local Plan Policy EQ6, the Design Guide and Residential Design Guide SPD's further to national policy detailed within the NPPF.

## Amenity

LP Policy EQ6 requires all new development to have a satisfactory relationship with existing land and buildings to protect 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.

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.

The proposed extension would comply with the 45 degree line to the nearest adjoining neighbouring properties and the 45 degree rule is not judged to be applicable to the properties of 7 & 9 Mill court which would be 16 and 17m respectively from the application site and the proposed development would therefore not have any adverse impacts with regard to overshadowing or appear overbearing to neighbouring occupiers.

The objection received makes note that the proposals would result in an overbearing extension which would cause overshadowing and a loss of light, however given the interface distances present, and the orientation of the extension to the south east it is not judged to result in any unacceptable loss of light or appear as an overbearing extension.

Paragraph 8.6.1 of The Residential Design Guide SPD identifies that “*A distance of 21 metres between habitable room windows of adjacent properties will provide an acceptable level of amenity.*”

The proposed development would retain approximately 16m and 17m to the properties to the northwest of 9 & 7 Mill Court respectively. Nonetheless the floor plans identify that the room which faces towards the north would serve an office which does not constitute a habitable room window. Nonetheless in the interest of ensuring future neighbouring amenity is retained (further to design considerations raised above) the north first facing window has been omitted from the proposed development through revised elevations. The proposed ground floor windows, either side of the new doorway would serve a hallway, and as a non habitable room would not cause any undue loss of privacy.

Therefore, the proposed extension is not judged to have any detrimental impacts with regards to overlooking and would not lead to any loss of privacy as a result.

Consequently, the proposed development would not have any unacceptable impacts with regards to neighbouring amenity in accordance with Local Plan Policy EQ6, the Residential Design Guide SPD further to national policy detailed within the NPPF.

## **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 and provides suitable off-street parking provision in accordance with guidelines set out under Appendix 1 of the Local Plan.

The proposed development would increase the bedroom provision from three to four. Appendix 1 of the High Peak Local Plan parking standards states the dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms should provide 3 off road car parking spaces.

DCC highways had initially raised concerns regarding whether the area of off-street parking was within the applicants ownership and could reasonably be secured.

Following additional information and revised plans to confirm the onsite arrangements the site would be able to accommodate 3 off-street parking spaces as per the High Peak Local Plan Parking Standards. It is judged that the site would not lead to any on street parking as a result.

Comments from neighbours have raised that the proposed extension would change the location of the front door to be on the north facing elevation in close proximity to the shared driveway and raises concerns regarding boundary lines and safety.

The revised information above clearly shows the front door area would open up to an area within the red line of the site and following confirmation from the agent falls within the owners control. Furthermore boundary issues are a civil issue and not a material planning consideration.

With regards to public safety driveways are commonly in close proximity to front doors / entrances and therefore the alteration to move the front door to the north facing elevation is not judged to result in any detriment to public safety.

The neighbouring occupiers directly to the north raised that the plot directly adjacent to the site falls within their control and trust that the development will not prevent parking of their vehicles on the driveway area associated with their property. Given that the proposed development is judged to comply with the High Peak Parking Standards there are no reasons as to why the proposals would interfere with the parking associated with the neighbouring property.

In light of the above the proposed works comply with Local Plan Policy CF6 and High Peak Local Plan Appendix 1 Parking Standards further to national policy contained within the NPPF.

## **CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE**

The proposed development is considered acceptable principle, would be of an acceptable design and will not result in any adverse impacts upon visual or residential amenity. The proposals are in accordance with the relevant policies of the

High Peak Local Plan, Supplementary Planning Documents and the National Planning Policy Framework. Therefore the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION :    Approve**

**Case Officer: Stuart Talbot**

**Recommendation Date: 03/03/2026**

X 

---

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

**On behalf of High Peak Borough Council**