

## DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

---

**HPK/2026/0105**  
**Valid 09/03/2026**

**8 QUENTIN ROAD**  
**CHAPEL-EN-LE-FRITH**

**REAR SINGLE STOREY  
EXTENSION TO PROVIDE  
INCREASED LIVING SPACE  
WITH ASSOCIATED  
EXTERNAL WORKS**

**(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

---

### MAIN ISSUES

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

### DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site is a semi-detached property located within the built-up area of Chapel-En-Le-Frith, within the Boroughs Central sub-area.

The host property has previously constructed a single storey rear extension, which accommodates an accessible bedroom and wet room.

The neighbouring property, No.6 Quentin Road, has also constructed a single storey rear extension.

Adjacent to the rear boundary of the site, and a short distance to the north/west, is the 'Town End' Conservation Area. To the north-west of the site are 2x Grade II Listed Buildings, comprising the 'Methodist Junior School' and the 'Townend Methodist Chapel'.

### PROPOSAL

The application seeks permission for a single storey rear extension to facilitate the enlargement of the existing accessible ground floor bedroom. Ramped access from the bedroom to the rear garden area is also proposed.

Revisions have been made to the size of the rear extension since it was originally submitted, resulting in a reduction in its width but an enlargement to its depth from the rear wall. A full re-consultation was undertaken accordingly.

The extension is proposed to attach to the rear of the existing extension, projecting approximately 3.703m from the existing extension. This would result in a total

enlargement (e.g. the new and existing extension) that projects approximately 6.915m from the rear of the original house.

A flat roof is proposed for the extension, connecting to the existing mono-pitch extension roof. The proposed flat roof would have a height of approximately 2.78m and include a roof light.

It is proposed to render the extension to match the existing property.

## **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 (August 2026):**

DM3: Determining development proposals.

DM6: Use of planning conditions and obligations.

S3: Presumption in favour of sustainable development.

S4: Principle of development within settlements.

S6: Neighbourhood plans and the presumption.

DP3: Key principles for well-designed places.

HE4: Securing the conservation of heritage assets.

HE5: Assessing effects on heritage assets.

HE6: Proposals affecting designated heritage assets.

HE9: Conservation areas.

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

No relevant policies.

### **Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):**

High Peak Design Guide (2018).

Residential Design (2005).

**Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.**

**SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS**

**HPK/0003/2342** - Kitchen Extension To Dwelling - Permitted 14/07/1993.

**CONSULTATIONS**

**Publicity**

Site Notice expiry date: 23/04/2026.

Neighbour consultation period ends: 09/04/2026.

Neighbour re-consultation expiry date: 18/06/2026.

Press Advert: 14/05/2026.

**Public Comments**

1 written representations have been received, neither objecting nor supporting the proposal, simply stating 'no object' in the comment.

Other:

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

**Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Council:**

- No objection.

**Derbyshire County Council Highways:**

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

**High Peak Borough Council Conservation:**

- No technical advice is required from Conservation.
- The development site is adjacent to the Chapel-en-le-Frith – Town End Conservation Area, and within the setting of Grade II Listed Methodist Junior School, now known as Wesley Court.

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

**OFFICER COMMENTS**

**Principle of Development:**

Local Policy Position:

The site is located within the built-up area boundary.

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, by, amongst other things, supporting the development of new housing on sustainable sites within the built up area boundary, whilst protecting and enhancing the historic environment.

#### National Policy Position:

Part 20 of the National Planning Policy Framework (August 2026) sets out the national position for considering proposals which affect heritage assets. Policy HE6(1) identifies that when considering the potential effect of a development proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, substantial weight should be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of whether any potential effect amounts to a positive effect, harm, substantial harm, or total loss of its significance.

Policy HE4(2) sets out that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (including from development within its setting) should have a clear and convincing justification in accordance with the policies in this chapter of the NPPF.

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, provided that there is no harm to the setting of any heritage asset, and 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 approximately 3.703m from the existing extension and incorporates a flat roof.

Whilst the use of a flat roof is generally discouraged due to their poor design/appearance, the Council recognises in this case that there are limited opportunities to view the proposed extension within the street scene.

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. Many of the existing residential properties within the immediate vicinity already utilise render in their external appearance.

Overall, whilst it is acknowledged that a flat roof does not display an appearance which matches the prevailing roof pitch etc of the main house, in this instance, given the siting of the extension relative to existing built form and boundary treatments, there would be limited opportunities to view the extension, and as such it would not appear as a prominent addition to the plot. Overall the extension is considered not to cause significant harm to the visual amenity of the area or wider character of the street scene, and on this basis would not warrant a refusal on the basis of its flat roof design.

### **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.

Immediately to the south of the application site is the garden area associated with the neighbouring property of No.3 Barlow Road. The remaining neighbours to the south (Numbers 1 and 5 Barlow Road) either face onto the existing property side elevation/frontage, or existing outbuildings at the site, and therefore it is considered

these two properties would not be unduly affected by the development. Although it is proposed to install a doorway into the southern elevation, which would be positioned 15m from number 3, it would be used solely to access the ramp, providing access the garden. The main window serving the bedroom will be located on the western elevation. As such this relationship is considered to be acceptable.

No.6 Quentin Road, the adjoining semi is located, to the north. No.6 has previously constructed a single storey rear extension with a pitched roof. Based on officers on-site observations, the extension at No.6 appears to have resulted in an enlargement to the kitchen-dining-living area.

To assist with the Council's assessment of possible impacts, the 45-degree tests have been applied to No.6's extension. The 45-degree line would be breached in plan view, and the lower portion of glazing in the bi-fold door closest to the proposed extension would be impacted in elevation view. However this is not conclusive in its own right to suggest that a harmful impact would be experienced by the occupiers of No.6.

The Council recognises that the kitchen-dining-living area within No.6's extension is served by triple bi-fold doors and 3 roof lights, with a window also located on the rear elevation of No.6's extension. Additionally the rear extension of No.6 would still receive varying degrees of direct sunlight from the afternoon onwards. Therefore whilst the 45-degree lines may be breached to varying degrees, it is considered that the amenity of occupiers of No.6 would not be detrimentally affected by the proposed extension. It is also noted that the height of the extension would be 2.7m, which is 0.7m above the height of a boundary fence which would be erected without the need for planning permission. Given all of these factors, it is considered that the development, despite breaching the 45 degree line, would not significantly harm the amenity of the adjoining neighbour to such a degree as to warrant refusing this application.

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 the setting of Listed Buildings, and pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of a Conservation Area (Sections 66 and 72 respectively).

Adjacent to the rear boundary of the site, and a short distance to the north/west, is the 'Town End' Conservation Area. Approximately 10m to the north-west of the site boundary is the Grade II Listed converted and former 'Methodist Junior School', and

beyond this approximately 35m to the north-west is the Grade II Listed 'Townend Methodist Chapel'.

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.

Policy HE6(1) of the NPPF (August 2026) identifies that when considering the potential effect of a development proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, substantial weight should be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of whether any potential effect amounts to a positive effect, harm, substantial harm, or total loss of its significance.

Policy HE4(2) sets out that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (including from development within its setting) should have a clear and convincing justification in accordance with the policies in this chapter of the NPPF.

The setting of a heritage asset is defined within 'Annex B: Glossary' of the NPPF (August 2026), 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.*"

Policy HE5(2) requires an assessment to be undertaken of the developments potential impact on the significance of the heritage asset, and whether the proposal would have either a positive effect, no effect or harm its significance. Where harm would be caused, the degree of harm should be identified, comprising either substantial harm where the development proposal would seriously affect a key element of the asset's significance (HE5(2)(c), or cause the total loss of the significance of a heritage asset (HE5(2)(d).

Only small sections of the Methodist Chapel, including the top section of the spire, are visible from within the application site. Given the intervening built development and extremely limited intervisibility, the proposal is considered not to cause harm to the significance of the Methodist Chapel.

More closely related to the application site is the 'Methodist Junior School', now understood to have been converted into residential accommodation known as Wesley Court.

The site is considered to fall within the setting of Wesley Court and the Town End Conservation Area, however the development would be seen within the context of the existing row of extended residential dwellings in this location, and would not impact how Wesley Court (as the former Methodist Junior School) or the Conservation Area would be appreciated. There would also be limited intervisibility of

the extension from within the grounds of Wesley Court and within the confines of the Conservation Area. Numerous outbuildings and shed lie in between the application site and the listed buildings and conservation area.

On this basis the proposal is considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and preserve the setting of nearby Listed Buildings.

### **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.

The existing driveway to the front of the property can accommodate 2 vehicles.

The development proposes an extension to an existing bedroom, 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 off-street parking scenario will not change as a result of the development, with vehicles still able to park on the driveway.

The Highway Authority raise no objections 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.

### **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 significant 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.

The proposal is considered to have a neutral impact upon the setting of nearby designated heritage assets and would therefore preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and preserve the setting of nearby Listed Buildings.

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: 07/09/2026**

X 

---

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

**On behalf of High Peak Borough Council**