

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2026/0204	21 HORSESHOE AVENUE	DETACHED GARAGE
Valid 20/05/2026	DOVE HOLES	(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design, character and appearance
- Impact upon residential amenity
- Nutrient Neutrality

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site refers to a detached two storey located on Horseshoe Avenue within the defined settlement boundary of Dove Holes. The property as existing comprises a stone and timber boarding external elevations and has previously been extended via a two storey side extension including an integrated garage. The site is also afforded a rear conservatory extension.

The surrounding area comprises a mix of predominantly two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings which are similar in scale and appearance to the application site.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks full planning consent for the erection of a detached garage located to the side (south) of the existing dwelling and owing to the nature of the plot would be viewed at an almost 3/4 angle when viewed from directly in front of the host dwelling.

The proposed garage would have a width of 7.15m and a depth of 7.5m. The proposed garage would measure 2.5m to the eaves with a maximum height of 4.5m.

The proposed garage would feature a single roller shutter door to its front elevation and stone elevations to match the existing dwelling.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Local Plan 2016

S 1 Sustainable Development Principles

S 1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

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

HPK/0003/6823: Two storey side extension including garage, cloakroom, utility, kitchen and bedroom. (Approved 22/01/1998)

HPK/2004//0791: Rear conservatory (Approved 04/10/2004)

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 14/07/2026
Neighbour consultation period ends: 22/05/2026
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

No public comments received.

Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Comments

No objection.

Derbyshire County Council Highways (No Objection subject to Condition)

Whilst DCC's parking guidance does not recognise garages as parking spaces, there will be no loss of parking within the site curtilage should the garage not be used as parking space.

The space between the garage and the highway varies between approximately 5.1m and 6m; the garage should be set back a minimum of 5.5m from the highway boundary to allow a parked vehicle sufficient space to park wholly within the site and not encroach on to the adjacent highway. Depending on the position of a parked vehicle in front of the garage, there is the possibility that a vehicle could encroach on

to the highway; however, if the garage doors are of a roller shutter type, this would assist in reducing the likelihood of this occurring.

Based on the analysis of the information submitted and a review of Local and National policy the Highway Authority concludes that there would not be an unacceptable impact on Highway Safety or a severe impact on congestion. There are no justifiable grounds on which an objection could be maintained.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a garage ancillary to an existing residential property that lies within the built up area boundary for Dove Holes, which is identified as a Larger Village under Policy S2 of the High Peak Local Plan (2016). 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

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF identifies that new development should function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short terms but over the lifetime of the development. Moreover, development should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, sympathetic to local character and the surrounding built environment. Paragraph 139 identifies that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies.

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 respect the character and appearance of the building through an appropriate choice of materials.

The Residential Design Guide SPD gives specific guidance with regard to garage developments and householder developments.

Paragraph 9.7 states that *"Garages and outbuildings should relate to the main dwelling in terms of size, proportion and appearance. They should be subordinate in size and height and match the materials of the existing house"*.

The proposed garage is located within a highly prominent position along Horseshoe Crescent and would on approach be viewed prior to the application site itself owing to its positioning to the south of the plot. Additionally, the proposed garage is to be sited marginally in front and at an angle to the host dwelling itself.

Detached garages which are sited beyond the principle elevation of the host dwelling of which they relate are rarely permissible by virtue of their resultant prominence. Given the significant scale and substantial height of the proposed garage this would result in a detrimental impact upon the street scene and would see the intrusion of a large outbuilding located adjacent to the highway.

The application site upon construction was afforded a generous plot, providing ample amenity space for future occupiers whilst also providing an important visual break between the property of no. 19 Horseshoe Crescent to the south. Over time through the development of a two storey side and single storey rear extensions this plot has become more saturated with built form. The introduction of the large detached garage to the side of the existing plot would result in nearly the entirety of the plot width becoming built development and the visual break between no.'s 21 and 19 would be significantly reduced. This is deemed to have a significant adverse impact upon the spatial character of the street scene and would also severely diminish the amount of amenity space afforded to the occupiers of the existing dwelling.

Furthermore, the substantial scale of the proposed garage does not correspond with the scale of the host dwelling with the proposed garage comprising a similar footprint to that of the existing dwelling, the proposed garage would not appear as a subservient addition to the plot but as an incongruous form of development which would detract from the character of the existing dwelling. This is exacerbated by the requirement for significant engineering works and retaining walls encompassing the proposed garage. This would expand the development works of the proposed garage by a further 0.6m to the south and 0.9m to the north which would mean that the cumulative built form comprising the garage and retaining walls would be larger than that of the original dwelling prior to the construction of the two storey extension. The accruing development works would result in the complete erosion of the original dwellings character and an overdevelopment of the plot.

The proposed garage would be substantial in its height particularly at the apex, which is not in keeping with the nature of Horseshoe Crescent where there are no such similar detached outbuildings and garages of similar heights.

The Design Guide SPD paragraph 5.10 specifically notes that "*Garages – These need to be designed and built in sympathy with the properties they serve.*" In this instance the proposed garage would have a height of 4.5m, with the existing dwelling measuring at 4.7m in height to the eaves. As such when viewed from Horseshoe Crescent there would be no clear distinction between the height of the eaves of the existing dwelling and the maximum height of the proposed garage. This would result in a building visually competing with the proportions of the dwelling and having a harmful impact upon the host dwelling. It highlights the lack of proportionality with the existing dwelling and further demonstrates that the proposed height of the garage is excessive and detrimental to the character of no. 21 Horseshoe Crescent as well as appearing visually obtrusive in a highly prominent location within the street scene.

Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states that *“Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design”*.

Additionally, paragraph 9.7 of the Residential Design Guide SPD states that “Double garages should have two openings wherever possible, to maintain proportion”.

However, in this instance the proposed garage would clearly be of the size of a double garage, yet the design features a singular central roller-shutter design door exacerbates the substantial proportion of the proposed garage, resulting in an overly dominant appearance which would result in adverse harm upon the character of the street scene. This impact would be compounded by existing presence of a large existing roller-shutter door to the existing integrated garage. The combination of two large roller shutter doors is judged to result in a poor quality of design which is out of keeping with the locality and other garage developments within the vicinity.

Therefore with regard to the siting, scale and design of the proposals it is judged that the development would result in an unacceptable visual impact and would not be in keeping with the character of the area in direct conflict with Local Plan Policy EQ6, the Residential Design Guide and Design Guide SPD's further to National Policy contained within the NPPF.

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.

Owing to the siting of the proposed garage and that it would be in excess of 20m from the nearest residential property on the south western side of horseshoe Crescent the 45 degree rule would not be applicable in this instance and the proposed development would not lead to any adverse impact with regards to overshadowing or appear overbearing upon neighbouring occupiers.

The proposed garage would not contain any windows which would face towards the nearest neighbouring occupiers of no. 19 horseshoe Crescent and no. 39 Horseshoe Crescent. As such the proposed garage has been assessed to not result in any unacceptable loss of privacy and would not lead to any overlooking of neighbouring properties.

As a consequence the proposed development has been assessed to not have an unacceptable impact with regards to residential amenity in accordance with Local

Plan Policy EQ6, the Residential Design Guide and national policy contained in the NPPF.

Nutrient Neutrality

The site lies within the catchment of the River Wye which forms the Peak District Dales Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The Council has been notified that action must be taken to address exceedances of phosphorus in the River. As such, the Council cannot grant consent for development unless it can rule out “likely significant effects” on the SAC. A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) will be required when the plan or project creates a source of water pollution or has an impact on water quality and when it is within the catchment of the SAC. Initially, a screening assessment will be required to consider if “likely significant effects” (alone or in-combination) on the SAC can be ruled out. If not, this will be followed by an “Appropriate Assessment” where the impact of the plan or project is considered in detail.

Screening Assessment

The proposal is not directly connected with or necessary for the conservation management of a European site. The proposal will involve additional roof area and will therefore increase surface water run-off. However, given the very limited extent of the additional roof area it will not significantly increase run-off from the site. On the basis, of an average occupancy rate of 2.4 persons per dwelling, there will be no increase in waste water generated by the proposals. Therefore, in terms of both foul and ground water it is not considered that the proposal will risk having a significant negative effect on the SAC either on its own or in combination with other proposals and therefore it is not necessary to carry out an Appropriate Assessment.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

Whilst the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in principle, the proposals would create an oversized garage which would be visually harmful and intrusive within the street scene by virtue of its siting, design, scale, height and prominence within the street scene. It would have an unacceptable impact upon the character of the host dwelling owing to the relationship between the garage and the existing main dwelling contrary to the design guide SPD, Local Plan policy EQ6 and national policy in the NPPF.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Refuse

Case Officer: Stuart Talbot

Recommendation Date: 15/07/2026

X *J Colley*

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council