

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2026/0089
Valid 20/02/2026

18 ECCLES TERRACE
WHITEHOUGH

SINGLE STOREY REAR
EXTENSION AND REAR
PLATFORM

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principal
- Design
- Highways

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site comprises of a semi-detached dwelling situated on the northern side of Eccles Terrace, Chapel-en-le-Frith. The property has a long rear garden, while to the front there is an area of hardstanding that provides off-street parking for one vehicle. The surrounding street scene is characterised by a short row of modest two-storey terraced dwellings, predominantly constructed of stone with red brick detailing, beneath pitched slate roofs. The site lies within the open countryside and is not subject to any heritage designations.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension and rear platform.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Local Plan 2016

S 1 Sustainable Development Principles
S 1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
S 2 Settlement Hierarchy
EQ3 Rural Development
EQ 6 Design and Place Making
CF 6 Accessibility and Transport

National Planning Policy Framework

Chapter 4 - Decision Making
Chapter 12 - Archiving Well-designed Places

Chapel Neighbourhood Plan

No relevant policies

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

No planning history

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 07/04/2026

Neighbour consultation period ends: 20/03/2026

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

No comments

Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Council

No object

Derbyshire County Council Highways

There appears to be no material impact on the public highway and therefore the Local Highway Authority (LHA) has no further comments to make.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

Local Plan Policy S2 outlines that in areas outside settlement boundaries, including within the Green Belt and the Countryside 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 policy EQ3.

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. Policy EQ3 allows for extensions to existing dwellings within the countryside, provided they are subsidiary to the host building and do not have an adverse impact on the character of the landscape.

In this instance, a single storey rear extension would be supported by policy EQ3, in principle, however it is necessary to consider whether the proposals comply with design and amenity policies.

Design

LP Policy EQ2 seeks to resist development which would harm or be detrimental to the character of the local and wider landscape and 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 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 5 of the more recently adopted Design Guide SPD contains guidance in connection with proposed residential extensions and alterations, with the following paragraph considered to be relevant: 5.5 All extensions should harmonise with the parent building. An extension should respect the dominance of the original building and be subordinate to it in terms of its size and massing.

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension measuring 3m in depth, 3.9m in height and would span the full rear width of the property. Stairs and a small platform leading to the extension are included to accommodate the changes in land levels. The proposed extension would be built in stone and brick that would match the existing dwelling and this will be secured by a condition. The extension would serve as a new lounge/dining area.

A review of neighbouring properties demonstrates that rear extensions of a similar nature are present within the surrounding area. Planning permission has previously been granted for rear extensions at Nos. 4 and 12 Eccles Terrace, and rear conservatories are present along the street, including at the attached neighbouring property, No. 20 Eccles Terrace.

While some rear elevations of properties to the east of Eccles Terrace are visible from Whitehough Head Lane, No. 18 Eccles Terrace is positioned to the west and is largely screened by mature trees, limiting its visibility from public viewpoints.

The proposed rear extension is of a scale that remains subordinate to the existing dwelling and reads as a secondary addition while being appropriately designed. Due to its position and limited visibility from public vantage points, the proposal would not significantly affect the wider street scene.

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.

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.

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

Nos. 16 and 20 Eccles Terrece are the neighbouring properties located to the east and west of the application site respectively.

No. 20 Eccles Terrace is the attached neighbouring property sharing a boundary with the application site. This property includes a rear conservatory measuring approximately 4m in depth and features two rear windows located close to the shared boundary. Based on available photographs from Zoopla, these windows serve a combined kitchen and dining area. This space benefits from natural light from two rear windows. The proposed rear extension would project approximately 3m beyond the rear wall of No. 20 and would disrupt the 45-degree line of sight taken from the closest rear window. However, the proposal would not breach the 45-degree line of sight from the second rear window or from the rear conservatory. Whilst the 45-degree guideline would not be fully met in relation to one window, the kitchen and dining area would continue to receive a good level of natural light due to the presence of the additional window and the conservatory.

The associated raised platform and steps would measure approximately 1m in depth. This limited depth would not be sufficient for the platform to function as usable amenity space capable of being comfortably enjoyed by the occupiers of No. 18 Eccles Terrace. However if they were to use this space, the platform would be enclosed by railings and fencing along the boundary with number 20 measuring 1.8 metres in height, which would provide adequate screening and would prevent any unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy to the neighbouring occupiers at No. 20 Eccles Terrace. A condition will be imposed to secure this.

No. 16 Eccles Terrace is set back from the application site and is separated from it by a distance of approximately 4.5m. The proposed rear extension would not affect the 45-degree line of sight from any habitable room windows at this property. The two side facing windows, as with the application site are likely to serve a WC and stairs, which would not be affected by the extension. The associated stairs and raised platform, located approx. 2m from the shared boundary, are considered unlikely to result in overlooking. This is due to the separation distance and the presence of a substantial outbuilding positioned along the shared boundary.

Overall, the proposed rear extension would not result in an unacceptable relationship with neighbouring properties and is considered to comply with Policy EQ6 and the High Peak Residential Design Guide SPD.

Highway Safety

Policy CF6 seeks to ensure that development can be accessed safely and sustainably. The application proposes single-storey extensions which would not result in any increase in the number of bedrooms at the property.

No additional bedrooms are proposed as part of the development and, as such, there is no requirement for the provision of additional parking. The existing parking arrangements at the property would remain unchanged, and no objections have been raised by the Highway Authority.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of design, amenity and highways. The proposal is in accordance with the relevant policies put forward in the Local Plan and NPPF. The application is recommended for approval.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Agatha Dutton

Recommendation Date: 12/05/2026

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council