

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2026/0102
Valid 05/03/2026

26 SCHOOL ROAD
PEAK DALE

CONSTRUCTION OF
DETACHED DOUBLE GARAGE
FOR DOMESTIC USE

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of development.
- Character & Design.
- Residential amenity.
- Highway safety.
- Arboriculture.
- Drainage.
- Nutrient neutrality.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site is a semi-detached residential dwelling located within the built-up area. The property is located on a corner plot, on the junction of School Road and Meadow Avenue.

The area is primarily residential, although this section of School Road has open fields and a play park opposite, which are located within designated Countryside.

The site is bound by low level stone walls along School Road and Meadow Avenue, with a high level conifer hedge along a section of Meadow Avenue providing boundary screening to the rear garden area of the application site.

The house has previously been extended to its side and rear, with the side extension comprising an existing double garage.

The site falls within the Nutrient Neutrality SSSI Catchment for the Buxton area.

PROPOSAL

The proposal under this application relates to the construction of a single storey double garage located in the rear garden of the property, and an area of hard surfacing.

It is also understood that it is the applicants intention to convert the existing garage into a habitable room, but this does not form part of this application.

The proposed garage would measure approximately:

- 7metres in width,
- 6.5metres in depth,
- 2.5metres eaves height, and
- 4.5metre ridge height.

The existing garage benefits from planning permission, granted under application HPK/0002/4826. No conditions require the garage to remain available for garaging purposes, only that it shall be used for domestic purposes.

The Council raised concerns with the agent in relation to the design and scale of the proposed garage and provided the opportunity for amendments to be submitted. Following discussions, the agent confirmed they wished for the application to be determined as submitted.

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 7 Buxton Sub-area Strategy.

Policy EQ 2 Landscape Character.

Policy EQ 6 Design and Place Making.

Policy EQ 9 Trees, woodland and hedgerows.

Policy EQ 11 Flood Risk Management.

Policy CF 6 Accessibility and Transport.

National Planning Policy Framework (August 2026):

DM3: Determining development proposals.

S3: Presumption in favour of sustainable development.

S4: Principle of development within settlements.

DP3: Key principles for well-designed places.

F8: Sustainable drainage systems and watercourses.

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

High Peak Design Guide (2018).

Residential Design (2005).

Landscape Character (2006).

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/0002/4826 - Single Storey Extension To Form Garage - Approved 12/12/1986.

HPK/0003/0894 - Extension - Approved 16/09/1991.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 21/04/2026.

Neighbour consultation period ends: 01/04/2026.

Press Advert: N/A.

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

High Peak Borough Council Arboricultural Officer:

- No objections from an arboricultural perspective.

Derbyshire County Council Highways:

- No objection subject to conditions.
- There is space within the curtilage of the property to accommodate several parked vehicles without utilising the garage as a parking space.

Peak District National Park Authority:

- No comments to make on the application.

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

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development:

The site is located within the built-up area.

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 Peak Dale, which is identified as a 'Larger Village', where a moderate scale of development may be acceptable, consistent with meeting local rural needs, and maintaining or enhancing their distinctive character or appearance whilst also maintaining existing facilities and services.

The Buxton Sub-area Strategy (Policy S 7) seeks to establish Buxton as England's leading spa town and principal service centre for the Peak District. This will be

achieved by, amongst other things, protecting and enhancing the unique character of Buxton's spa heritage, townscape and natural environment, meeting housing needs, encouraging growth of employment opportunities and the local economy, and enhancing community services and infrastructure.

Therefore the principle of development is considered to be acceptable, subject to all other material planning considerations being found to be acceptable.

Character & Design:

HPBC Policy EQ 2 seeks to 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. It seeks to achieve this by, amongst other things,

- a) Requiring that development proposals are informed by, and are sympathetic to the distinctive landscape character areas as identified in the Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document and also take into account other evidence of historic landscape characterisation, landscape sensitivity, landscape impact and the setting of the Peak District National Park and where appropriate incorporate landscape mitigation measures.
- b) Requiring that development proposals protect and/or enhance the character, appearance and local distinctiveness of the landscape and landscape setting of the Peak District National Park.
- c) Resisting development which would harm or be detrimental to the character of the local and wider landscape or the setting of a settlement as identified in the Landscape Impact Assessment.

This approach is reinforced by Policy EQ 6 in relation to design and place making, requiring development to respond positively to its environment and the challenges of climate change, whilst also ensuring a contribution to local distinctiveness and sense of place. The development proposal should therefore seek to

- a) Respect the character, identity and context of the landscape.
- b) Be of high quality design to protect, enhance and/or restore landscape character.
- c) Contribute to the areas character by virtue of its scale, layout, appearance, and materials, including the relationship with adjacent buildings and landscape features.
- d) Achieve a satisfactory relationship with adjacent development, and does not cause unacceptable effects or adversely impact local character and amenity.
- e) Retain significant landscape features such as mature trees.

The Council's adopted 'Landscape Character' SPD (2006) sets out that the Plateau Pastures landscape character area is characterised by nucleated limestone villages, dry stone walls, a pastoral land-use, and open and expansive views.

Along this section of School Road residential properties are located on the west side. Opposite the application site are open fields and a children's play park, located within designated Countryside. Open views of the countryside are obtainable beyond. The street scene is therefore considered to have a rural character in this location.

The application site is located on a prominent corner plot within the street scene, with garden areas to its front, side and rear.

Despite the application site and the property on the opposite corner (No.28 School Road) having previously extended to their sides, the street scene maintains an open character with low forms of hard boundary treatments, set-back of buildings from the highway edge, and a generally pleasant verdant character due to the presence of soft landscaping.

The Council's adopted Residential Design (2005) SPD sets out design expectations for building such as garages, detailing at Paragraph 9.7 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. Double garages should have two openings wherever possible, to maintain proportion, and with the roof ridge parallel to the doors. Flat roofs should be avoided. Doors with vertical emphasis are usually preferred and timber side hung door may be required in sensitive locations."

The adopted High Peak Design Guide (2018) SPD is consistent in its expectations for garages, with Paragraph 5.10 highlighting how they "*need to be designed and built in sympathy with the properties they serve*". Paragraph 5.5 also identifies that development should respect the dominance of the host building and be subordinate to it in terms of its size and massing.

The proposed double garage would appear as an unduly prominent feature within the street scene in views along Meadow Avenue, as a result of its width, height, and roof design, which is considered to be harmful to the character of the street scene. The extensive expanse of hardstanding in combination with the garage would cover a significant portion of the rear garden, resulting in there being more hard surfacing and built development than soft landscaping which is a feature of the locality. It is also considered to be harmful to the areas character, and only accentuates the stark contrasting appearance of the proposed development within its setting.

The garage is considered to be disproportionate in its scale comparative to the main dwelling, garden area, and overall size of the plot.

The design of the garage also appears disproportionate due to its front elevation having a single door opening, with large areas of render present on the façade. This is contrary to Council's adopted design guidance which seeks to ensure two garage doors are present to provide vertical emphasis to the appearance of a garage. At

present the appearance of the garage, with its single door providing a horizontal emphasis, is compounded by the desire to re-use the existing garage door.

The proposed area of hardstanding, equating to approximately 64sqm, in conjunction with the existing hardstanding, would represent a significant area of hard surfacing which would be a dominant feature within, and detrimental to, the character of the street scene.

Opposite the application site, within the rear garden of No.28 School Road, is a large detached garage. This garage does not benefit from planning permission, and has been in-situ since at least July 2009 as evidenced by historic Google Street View imagery.

Also to the south-west of the application site is another detached garage belonging to No.30 School Road, which was granted planning permission under application HPK/2015/0698. The garage at No.30 is located beyond the rear elevation of No.1 Meadow Avenue and is largely screened in views along Meadow Avenue by the aforementioned unauthorised garage at No.28, and by the dwelling of No.1 Meadow Avenue itself. The garage at No.30 is therefore considered not to be a prominent feature within the street scene.

It is recognised that some comparison could be drawn between the application proposal/site and the garages opposite, however the garage and area of hardstanding at No.28 is considered to represent a poor example of a development which does not integrate appropriately with or enhance its surroundings, and in any event does not benefit from planning permission. The proposal as submitted as part of this application is therefore still considered to be harmful to the areas character.

Policy DP3(1) of the NPPF (August 2026) highlights that development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings. DP3(3) states that development proposals should be refused if, without clear justification, they conflict with DP3(1) or with any explicit design standards set out in the development plan (including those in locally specific policies, guides, codes or masterplans). Substantial weight should be given to compliance with relevant development plan policies when assessing the design quality of proposals.

As set out above the development is considered to be harmful to the character of the street scene by virtue of the width, height, and roof design of the garage, and extensive expanse of hardstanding. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy EQ 6 of the High Peak Borough Council Local Plan (2016), which requires proposals to be well designed and of a high quality that responds positively to its environment, whilst also contributing to local distinctiveness and sense of place. The proposal also conflicts with design guidance contained within the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Documents, particularly with regards to the design and scale of the garage. The proposal also conflicts with Policies DP3(1) and DP3(3) of the NPPF (August

2026) which seek to integrate well designed development into their surroundings to enhance the area.

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.

The proposed garage would be sited along the northern site boundary, situated approximately 0.8m from the boundary line. To the north of the proposed garage is the neighbours (No.24 School Road) garden area.

The garage would present a gable end to the neighbouring property, which would reach a maximum height of approximately 4.5m from ground level. At present the ground level where the garage would be sited is slightly higher than the ground level immediately adjacent to the host dwelling.

The garage would be located approximately 7.8m away from the rear elevation of the neighbouring property at No.24. By virtue of the design, scale and siting of the garage, there are concerns in relation to its impact upon the amenity of the neighbour at No.24. Whilst the impact upon the dwelling of No.24 itself is likely to be limited, the proposed garage is considered to be harmful to the amenity of the occupiers of No.24 by virtue of impacting their enjoyment of their private outdoor amenity space. The design, scale and siting of the garage is considered to represent an overbearing form of development which is likely to cause substantial overshadowing to the private amenity space of No.24. Consequently, the proposal is considered to result in an oppressive form of development.

During communication with the agent during the application the Council requested that the scale of the garage be reduced, including the incorporation of a hipped roof into its design, to help reduce the impact of the garage. However the applicant/agent was not prepared to alter the design (height, width, scale etc) of the proposed garage.

The neighbour to the west of the application site, No.2 Meadow Avenue, would be located approximately 7.6m away from the proposed garage. No.2 has three windows in its side elevation facing the application site, two at ground floor and one at first floor. The driveway serving No.2 is located between the dwelling and the application site. Based on the Council's on-site observations, the ground floor windows appeared to be secondary windows, with the first floor side window anticipated to serve a circulation space. Given the siting and relationship between the garage and No.2, it is considered that the amenity of occupiers at No.2 would not be detrimentally impacted by the proposed development.

In addition to the impact on neighbours, it is also important to consider the impact of the development on future occupiers of the application site.

The application site has garden areas to its front, side and rear. The front and side areas are bound by low level stone boundary walls and as such would not represent private amenity space. The only area of private amenity space at the property would be the rear garden which is currently enclosed by a mature boundary hedgerow and trees. The proposed detached garage and hard surfacing would significantly reduce the size of the private garden area.

The host dwelling is an existing 3-bedroomed property, which is considered to be suitable for a family and children. In this circumstance the typical needs for a garden would include a space to sit out, hang out washing and for children to play, which the existing garden space could accommodate all of these needs at once.

It is unlikely that the resultant garden area would be useable for these purposes, and the nature of play available to children would be limited by the size of the garden and presence of vehicle parking etc, and it is unlikely that more active play, such as sports and other games, would be possible in this space. The quality of the garden's use and its contribution to the living conditions of occupiers would, therefore, be eroded.

The Council acknowledges that there is a play park within the vicinity of the application site, however it is considered that this would not allow for spontaneous play and would likely require direct supervision from parents/guardians. Therefore it is considered that the nearby play park would not serve as an appropriate replacement for the loss of garden at the application site.

Overall it is considered that the proposal would unacceptably erode living conditions at the site by causing harm to the amenity of neighbours and also by not providing a suitably sized garden to meet the typical needs of existing and future occupiers. The development is therefore contrary to policy EQ 6 of the High Peak Borough Council Local Plan (2016), which requires proposals to achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and not to cause unacceptable effects by reason of shadowing, overbearing effect, or other adverse impacts on local character and amenity as a result of their scale, height, and layout. Policy EQ 6 also requires private spaces to be well-designed, safe, attractive, and to complement the built form, and to require the inclusive design of the spaces surrounding buildings to ensure accessibility.

The proposal is also considered to be contrary to Policy DP3(2)(a) of the NPPF (August 2026), which seeks to create well-designed places that support healthy, mixed, vibrant and integrated communities, which will function well over the lifetime of the development.

Highway Safety:

HPBC Policy CF 6 requires details to be submitted in relation to a developments proposed level of parking provision, with further parking guidance provided at Appendix 1 of the Local Plan.

Appendix 1 details that for a 3 bedroomed property, 2 off-street car parking spaces should be provided.

It is understood that it is the applicants intention to convert the existing garage to a habitable room, however this does not form part of this application submission nor have any details been submitted in relation to this matter.

Notwithstanding the above, the development which is subject to this application proposes an additional double garage and driveway area, over and above the existing provision on site.

Details have been submitted illustrating parking and turning areas. No objections have been received from the Highway Authority in relation to the proposal.

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

Arboriculture:

HPBC Policy EQ 9 identifies that the Council will protect existing trees and hedgerows from loss or deterioration. This will be achieved by:

- a) Requiring that existing healthy mature trees and hedgerows are retained unless the need for, and benefits of, the development clearly outweigh their loss.
- b) Requiring new developments where appropriate to provide tree planting and soft landscaping, including where possible the replacement of any trees that are removed at a ratio of 2:1.

A section of the existing mature conifer hedge would require removal to facilitate vehicle access into the new garage and hardstanding area. It is considered that given the scale of hedgerow requiring removal as part of this proposal, a condition could be attached to any favourable decision requiring replacement hedgerow planting elsewhere on the site, utilising native species.

The Council's Tree Officer raises no objections to the development.

Drainage:

Policy F8(1) of the NPPF (August 2026) identifies that development proposals which could affect drainage on or around a development site should incorporate sustainable drainage systems to control flow rates and reduce volumes of runoff, in ways which are proportionate to the nature and scale of the proposal.

The application seeks to significantly increase the area of hard surfacing at the site. To account for this, a soakaway is proposed to be installed close to the southern site boundary. Limited details have been submitted in relation to this soakaway, and the submitted plan does reference that the use of a soakaway is "subject to successful percolation test on site", however it is considered that a pre-commencement

condition would be a suitable mechanism requiring details of surface water drainage to be submitted for approval.

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 not increase overnight stays. However, the proposal does involve additional hard surfacing / roof area and will therefore increase surface water run-off. However, given the relative limited extent of the additional roof / hardstanding it will not significantly increase run-off from the site and in turn will not 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

The principle of development in the built-up area is considered to be acceptable.

However the development is considered to be harmful to the character of the street scene by virtue of the width, height, and roof design of the garage, and extensive expanse of hardstanding.

The garage is also considered to harm the amenity of neighbouring residents as a result of its design, scale and siting, and also erode the living conditions of existing/future occupiers of the application site.

The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy EQ 6 of the High Peak Borough Council Local Plan (2016), which requires proposals to be well designed and of a high quality that responds positively to its environment. The proposal also conflicts with design guidance contained within the Council’s adopted Supplementary Planning Documents, and Policies DP3(1) and DP3(3) of the NPPF (August 2026), which seek to integrate well designed development into their surroundings to enhance the area.

There is considered to be no detrimental impact upon the safety and/or capacity of the local highway network arising from the development, and conditions could be attached to address arboricultural and surface water drainage matters.

However overall, having reviewed all the submitted information, and assessing this against all relevant policies and material planning considerations, within the planning balance, a refusal of planning permission is recommended for this application.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : REFUSE

Case Officer: Alex Bonser

Recommendation Date: 20/08/2026

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council