

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2026/0168
Valid 23/04/2026

14 SOUTH HEAD DRIVE
CHAPEL-EN-LE-FRITH

SINGLE STOREY REAR
EXTENSION

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of development.
- Character & Design.
- Residential amenity.
- Historic environment.
- Highway safety.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site is an existing detached dwelling within the built-up area boundary, within the Boroughs central sub-area.

Public Right of Way Footpath No.188 is located a short distance to the west of the site.

The 'Town End' Conservation Area is located immediately adjacent to the rear of the site.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks permission for a single storey rear extension, to facilitate the enlargement of the kitchen-dining-living area, following the demolition of an existing conservatory.

The extension will project from the rear elevation by approximately 3m. The extension will have a mono-pitch roof, and reach maximum eaves and ridge heights of approximately 2.64m and 3.55m respectfully.

The extension is proposed to be constructed from reconstituted stone and grey concrete roof tiles, to match the existing dwelling.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Borough Council Local Plan (2016):

Policy S 1 Sustainable Development Principles.

Policy S 1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development.

Policy S 2 Settlement Hierarchy.

Policy S 6 Central Sub-area Strategy.

Policy EQ 6 Design and Place Making.

Policy EQ 7 Built and Historic Environment.

Policy CF 6 Accessibility and Transport.

National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024):

Part 2 – Achieving Sustainable Development.

Part 4 – Decision-making.

Part 12 – Achieving Well Designed Places.

Part 16 – Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment.

Chapel en-le Frith Neighbourhood Development Plan (2013-2028).

No relevant policies

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

High Peak Design Guide (2018).

Residential Design (2005).

Landscape Character (2006).

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/0003/7646 - Erection of 25 no Residential Units - Approved 29/06/1999.

HPK/2002/0742 - Conservatory To Rear - Approved 15/10/2002.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 18/06/2026.

Neighbour consultation period ends: 18/05/2026.

Press Advert: 28/05/2026.

A summary of the points raised in the submitted comment(s) is as follows:

Derbyshire County Council Highways:

- No objection as there appears to be no material impact on the public highway.

High Peak Borough Council Conservation Officer:

- No technical advice is required from Conservation.

Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Council:

- No objection.

No other written representations received as part of the consultation process.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development:

Local Policy Position:

HPBC Local Plan Policy S 1 seeks to ensure the delivery of sustainable development, by ensuring, amongst other things, the effective use of land, protecting and enhancing the boroughs natural and historic environments, and securing high quality design and amenity standards. Policy S 1 seeks to locate new development in line with the boroughs Settlement Hierarchy.

HPBC Local Plan Policy S 2 sets out the settlement hierarchy for the borough. The application site falls within Chapel-en-le-Frith, which is identified as a 'Market Town', which is an area which will be the main focus for development and growth.

The Central Sub-area Strategy (Policy S 6) seeks to promote the sustainable growth of the central sub-area boundary, including meeting the housing needs of the local community, and protecting and enhancing the historic environment.

National Policy Position:

Part 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) sets out the national position for considering proposals which affect heritage assets. Paragraph 212 identifies that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Paragraph 213 identifies that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.

In order to establish whether the principle of the development is acceptable the Council needs to first establish, as per the general duties set out in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, whether the proposal will preserve the setting and/or any features of special architectural or historic interest of any nearby Listed Building, or preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This will be discussed and assessed later within the report.

Conclusion:

Taking all these factors into account, it is considered that the principle of development at the site may be acceptable in policy terms, subject to all other material planning considerations being acceptable. The proposal currently complies with policies S1, S 2, and S 6 of the adopted Local Plan (2016).

Character & Design:

Policy EQ 6 of HPBC's local plan identifies that all development should be well designed and of a high quality that responds positively to its environment, whilst also contributing to local distinctiveness and sense of place. It seeks to achieve this by, amongst other things:

1. Requiring developments to be of high quality design that protects, enhances and / or restores landscape character.
2. Requiring that development contributes positively to an area's character, history and identity in terms of scale, height, density, layout, appearance, materials, and the relationship to adjacent buildings and landscape features.
3. Requiring that development achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and does not cause unacceptable effects by reason of visual intrusion, overlooking, shadowing, overbearing effect, noise, light pollution or other adverse impacts on local character and amenity.

The Council's adopted Design Guide, and Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Documents, seek to build upon Policy EQ 6 and provide more detailed and practical advice for aspects such as design (size, siting, scale, materials, roof style etc) and impacts on neighbours in relation to possible overshadowing, massing, and overlooking etc.

As previously identified the extension is proposed to project from the rear elevation by approximately 3m and incorporate a mono-pitch roof.

The roof pitch of the extension is governed by the presence of the first floor windows. Therefore whilst the roof pitch of the extension does not exactly match the main house roof, the provision of a pitched roof is considered to be of greater benefit than a flat roof alternative in this instance, and in any event there are limited opportunities to see the development within the street scene. In addition, the proposal helps to maintain the proportion of the house, and as such broadly complies with the Council's adopted Residential Design (2005) SPD.

The extension is proposed to be constructed in matching materials, and it is considered that a suitably worded condition would be reasonable to secure this.

Residential Amenity:

The requirements of Policy EQ 6 have been set out above, in relation to securing a satisfactory relationship with adjacent development and avoiding harm to amenity etc.

Given the siting and scale of the proposed extension, it is considered that there is sufficient separation distance between neighbouring properties to avoid any undue harm in relation to overbearing and overshadowing impacts. There would be no breach of the 45 degree line when measured from both neighbours. With respect to the neighbours to the rear, a distance of 21m would be maintained, which would comply with the Council's privacy standards of 21m. It is also noted that a close boarded fence is located on the common boundary which would assist with any overlooking concerns.

Given the design of the extension and the location of windows relative to neighbours, it is considered that no harmful levels of overlooking will occur to any nearby resident.

Overall, given the scale, siting and design of the proposed extension, it is considered that the proposal would not result in any detrimental harm to the amenity of any nearby property by virtue of overshadowing, overbearing or overlooking impacts.

Historic Environment:

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires a Local Planning Authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of a Conservation Area (Section 72).

Although the application site is not located within a Conservation Area, the 'Town End' Conservation Area is immediately adjacent to the rear boundary of the site, and therefore the site forms part of its setting.

Policy EQ 7 of HPBC's local plan (2016) seeks to 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.

Paragraph 212 of the NPPF (December 2024) identifies that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 213 also sets out that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.

The setting of a heritage asset is defined within 'Annex 2: Glossary' of the NPPF (December 2024), and is identified as being "*The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.*"

Given the limited scale of the extension and the limited opportunity to view the development from the public domain, the development is considered to preserve the

character and appearance of the Conservation Area by virtue of development within its setting.

Highway Safety:

The existing property benefits from off-street parking on a driveway to the front of the dwelling.

The proposed development proposes an extension to the existing ground floor living space, which would not impact the availability of off-street parking at the address. The proposal would also not result in any additional bedrooms being created at the property.

Given the above, the proposal is considered not to result in any material increase in vehicles at the property, and the existing parking scenario will not change as a result of the development.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact upon the safety and/or capacity of the local highway network.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The principle of development at the site is considered to be acceptable.

The design, scale and siting of the extension is considered not to result in any detrimental harm to the amenity of any nearby resident by virtue of overshadowing, overlooking, or overbearing impacts. The extension is proposed to be constructed from matching materials.

Off-street parking at the property would not be impact during the operational phase of the development.

As such, having reviewed all the submitted information, and assessing this against all relevant policies and material planning considerations, within the planning balance, conditional approval is recommended for this application.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Alex Bonser

Recommendation Date: 31/07/2026

X *J. Colley*

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council