

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2025/0444
Valid 18/11/2025

**LAND BEHIND SUMNER
STREET
GLOSSOP**

**ERECTION OF 25 NO
GARAGES**

(FULL - MINOR)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of Development
- Design & Conservation
- Amenity
- Trees
- Ecology & BNG
- Parking Provision and Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application relates to a rectangular parcel of land which spans a width of approximately 18m and a length of approximately 46m situated to the rear of properties on Sumner Street and Princess Street, Glossop.

The site is characterised by overgrown scrub, whilst a single tree subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) is situated in the north-western corner.

The site is accessed via a single narrow informal track that extends north-eastwards from Sumner Street between Nos. 19 and 21 Sumner Street. Residential properties on three sides of the site are similar in scale and character, comprising rows of two storey terraced properties.

The site has previously benefited from full planning permission for garages, firstly under HPK/2006/0576 and secondly under HPK/2010/0257. However, neither application was implemented and has expired. A review of the Delegated Report associated with the 2010 application reveals that 15no garages used to be in situ on site and were demolished in 2009 due to being in a poor state of repair.

For the purposes of the Local Development Plan, the site lies within the built-up area boundary of Glossop and (aside from the TPO tree) is not constrained by any statutory designation.

PROPOSAL

The application in its original form sought full planning permission for 30 garages. However, owing to issues relating to potential impacts on the TPO tree, revised plans have been submitted which show a reduction in the number of garages which now total 25. The description of development has been amended with the agreement of the applicant to reflect this change.

The plans subject to assessment within this report are presented below as follows:

- Location Plan (Ref: 0113-ORU-XX-00-DR-A-00001-P03)
- Proposed Site Plan (Ref: 0113-ORU-XX-00-DR-A-20100-P04)
- Proposed Floor Plans (Ref: 0113-ORU-XX-00-DR-A-20200-P04)
- Proposed Roof Plans (Ref: 0113-ORU-RF-DR-A-27200-P04)
- Proposed Elevation Plans (Ref: 0113-ORU-XX-ZZ-DR-A-20300-P03)

The latest proposals are also supported by a revised Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement (dated 31st July 2026), together with updated BNG Calculations following comments received from the Council's Tree Officer and Derbyshire Wildlife Trust.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Act 2004 requires proposals to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan taking into consideration any material considerations relevant to the determination of the application.

The Local Development Plan for this site comprises the High Peak Local Plan (2016). Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance documents and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) are also material considerations in determining applications.

High Peak Local Plan 2016

- S1 Sustainable Development Principles
- S1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- S2 Settlement Hierarchy
- S5 Glossopdale Sub-area Strategy
- EQ5 Biodiversity
- EQ6 Design and Place Making
- EQ7 Built and Historic Environment
- EQ9 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows
- EQ10 Pollution and Unstable Land
- E1 New Employment Development
- CF6 Accessibility and Transport

Supplementary Planning Documents

Design Guide SPD (2018)

National Planning Policy Framework 2026

- | | |
|---|------------|
| Achieving Sustainable Development | Chapter 4 |
| Building a Strong Effective Economy | Chapter 7 |
| Achieving Well Designed Places | Chapter 12 |
| Pollution, Public Protection and Security | Chapter 17 |
| Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment | Chapter 20 |

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/2006/0576 Garages (Approved 13/09/2006)

HPK/2010/0257 30 Garages (Approved 26/07/2010)

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 17th December 2025

Neighbour consultation period ends: 10th December 2025

Neighbour re-consultation period ends: 13th May 2026

Press Advert: 25th December 2025

Public Comments

2no neutral comments have been received in connection with this application which raise the following points:

- Potential increase and concerns in relation to surface water runoff
- Request for quality drainage and gutters and down pipes to Sumner Street
- Potential issues regarding safety and security of neighbouring gardens
- Perceived increase in risk of crime and anti-social behaviour

9no objections have been received in connection with this application. The grounds for objection are summarised as follows:

- Increase in traffic generation
- Increase in noise and disturbance
- Additional pollution and health risks to residents (fumes, omissions)
- Impacts on safety of highway users and pedestrians
- Harm to biodiversity
- Increase in flood risk
- Harm to amenity (light and privacy)
- Visual impact
- Absence of legal access rights
- Potential asbestos hazard
- Lack of interest from neighbours in utilising proposed garages
- Inadequate access
- Loss of secondary access as a consequence of 19 and 21 extending properties
- Fails to demonstrate acceptable exit visibility splays
- Harm to character of St James Conservation Area
- Evidence of bats on site – absence of any supporting assessment
- Absence of any assessment on potential impact upon TPO tree
- Land could be better used

Town / Parish Comments

N/A

HPBC Conservation Officer

Summary of Significance

The St James conservation area is characterised by terraced dwellinghouses of gritstone with slate roofs. The development form comprises of narrow terraced streets, interspersed with three landmark buildings (St Mary's Church, St James' Church and Redcourt.

The application site forms a plot of land to the rear of Sumner Street, enclosed by terraced dwellings which line Sumner Street, Princess Street and St Mary's Road.

Assessment and Impact

The application proposes to construct 30 garages of concrete with metal sheet roofing. The 30 garages will be split into 2 terraced rows, accessed via an existing vehicle access from Sumner Street. The application is similar in nature to the previously approved HPK/2006/0576 and HPK/2010/0257. The previous schemes were considered acceptable in terms of heritage impact subject to agreement of materials. Both previous applications approved a render finish with a dark roofing material. It was previously considered that a dark roofing materials would soften the impact on the conservation area, as it is visually in keeping with the surrounding blue slate roofscape. This opinion remains as a dark roof finish will be more in keeping with the surrounding conservation area.

In regard to the proposed concrete walls this is considered equally as foreign to the conservation area as the previously approved render finish. The garages will have very minimal visibility from outside of the application site due to the enclosed nature of the site. Views of units 30 and 29 will be afforded from the entrance at Sumner Street, thus are of particular sensitivity. Therefore, a condition is recommended to agree the final finish of the garages.

Similarly, the plans do not include details of the material treatment of the vehicle entrance. A site visit has confirmed that the existing site entrance contains no visible hardstanding, instead the entrance consists of an area of grass between no.19 and no.21 Sumner Street. It is assumed that a form of hardstanding will be laid in order to accommodate for regular vehicle traffic. Therefore, these details should be provided to clarify how the site entrance will impact the character and appearance of Sumner Street.

Conclusions

In conclusion, there are no heritage objections to the principle of erecting no.30 garages on this site. However, some aspects require clarification to confirm the impact upon the St James conservation area:

- Details of site entrance treatment including details of any hardstanding
- Details of materials should be clarified via pre-commencement condition, with particular concerns to units 29 and 30.

HPBC Tree Officer

Initial Comments

A number of trees are present on the site boundaries with two noted within the site (BNG assessment). No specific Arboricultural detail has been submitted to support the application or to quantify the potential effects on largely third party trees. An Arboricultural impact assessment to BS5837-2012 will be required. Further comments will be made once such detail becomes available.

Further Comments

I have reviewed the submitted information and comment as follows:

G1 as identified in the AMS/AIA is a group of two Sycamore with B1 category as per BS5837-2012. They are protected by High Peak TPO 322.

The proposal seeks to remove these trees to facilitate access to the site and the construction of garages. There is an in principle objection to this approach on the basis that it would be both possible and desirable to retain the trees in the long term. Their removal would be contrary to Policy EQ9 of the adopted Local Plan. Any units or infrastructure within the RPA should be removed via design and the issue of no dig surfacing and levels should be addressed prior to determination. It is not acceptable to leave the issue of no dig surfacing and attendant levels/threshold levels to condition as the use of no dig surfacing (due to increased sub surface depth) can lead to changed levels for the thresholds of the adjacent structures.

Latest Comments

The revised Arb Impact Assessment and Method Statement (31st July 2026) can be accepted. No objections.

Environmental Health

No observations to make

Derbyshire Wildlife Trust

We have checked our Biological Records Database and can confirm the following:

- No records of protected species are present on or adjacent to site
- No notable habitats have been recorded to date on or adjacent to site
- The site is not covered by a statutory or non-statutory nature conservation designation

We have also reviewed the submitted information including the BNG summary and calculations (Pennine Ecological, May 2025) and note comments from objectors with regards to site clearance and therefore the accuracy of the baseline calculation is in question.

The submitted baseline information states that the site was unsealed, unvegetated ground with patches of ruderal/ephemeral vegetation and a small number of trees at the time of the site BNG assessment site visit (May 2025). However, it has been suggested that the site has been cleared of vegetation including tree removal prior to an application being submitted. This is supported by aerial imagery of the site which appear to show the site to be covered by a mosaic of grassland, scrub and trees prior to any clearance.

Where unauthorised degradation of the onsite habitat has taken place on the land after 30 January 2020 the biodiversity pre-development value of the onsite habitat should be calculated as the biodiversity value of the habitat on the date immediately before the carrying out of these degradation activities. Unauthorised degradation of onsite habitat is any degradation which is not in accordance with a previous planning permission.

If there is insufficient evidence about the biodiversity value of the onsite habitat immediately before the degradation, the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat must be taken to be the highest biodiversity value of the habitat which is reasonably supported by any available evidence relating to it. This requirement must be applied to the calculation of pre-development biodiversity value in the metric tool.

We request that the baseline calculation is updated considering the above information. We will be able to provide further comments once we are satisfied that this has been done.

Further Response

An updated BNG Assessment summary (Pennine Ecological, May 2026) and metric have been submitted. These account for suspected habitat degradation on site since 2020. The current proposals would result in a loss of -0.16 habitat units (- 26.03%). This is despite the proposed of planting of mixed scrub, neutral grassland and additional trees. It is not considered feasible to deliver any additional gains on site within the current scheme. We also have some reservations about the limited access to the rear of the eastern row of garages for future management of the scrub and trees. Should the LPA require amendments to the proposed landscaping, the metric

will require updating when the Gain Plan is submitted and a greater number of offsite units will be required.

Given the limited areas of onsite habitat creation and poor condition targets, onsite habitat creation is unlikely to be considered significant. We suggest that it could be secured through a detailed landscaping plan and management specification. Responsibility for management of the habitat areas should also be confirmed.

At least 0.23 habitat units are required from an offsite provider, however if these cannot be found within the LPA, it is likely that the required units will increase due to the application of the Spatial Risk Multiplier. The report identifies a Habitat Bank near Chisworth, Glossop, which may be suitable.

Whilst it is encouraged to engage with an offsite provider to determine if they could deliver the required units, it is not mandatory, and it is acceptable to provide full details when the post-determination Gain Plan is submitted, particularly when we are only dealing with fractions of a unit. In addition to the statutory biodiversity gain condition, the following conditions are advised:

1. Prior to commencement of works, a detailed Hard and Soft Landscaping Strategy, which includes a comprehensive planting schedule and management specifications, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The soft landscaping scheme shall align with the proposals presented within the Biodiversity Gain Plan.

Derbyshire County Council Highways

Initial Response:

The site is accessed from Summer Street, a residential road with on-street parking. The access point is located close to the junction where Summer Street meets Tedcroft Street.

Garage sites of the scale and type as that proposed are expected to generate a relatively small increase in vehicle movements, typically around 1 to 2 movements per day per garage.

While the proposed garages could potentially reduce on-street parking by providing off-street parking options for local residents, there is no certainty regarding how many residents will choose to purchase or rent these garages which may lead to reduced vehicle movements generated by the garage site.

Whilst it is recognised that the site access is of single width only and may lead to some vehicular conflict on Sumner Street and also that the existing on street parking reduces the width of Sumner Street, considering the expected and likely low vehicle flows generated by the proposed garages, this is considered to be more of an inconvenience rather than an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

The proposed garages do not comply with the nationally recognised minimum internal dimensions of 6m x 3m. It is recommended that the proposed layout plan and the garage dimensions are revised accordingly.

It is noted that the layout plan does provide an aisle width of 6 metres in front of each garage, in accordance with PGND.

On receipt of a revised plan indicating that the garages meet the minimum recommended dimensions, further comments and recommended conditions will be provided.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

LP Policy expects that all new development makes a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities and to protecting, and where possible enhancing, the environment; and mitigating the process of climate change, within the Plan Area. This will be achieved (amongst other things) by supporting the local economy and businesses by providing for a range of economic development that provide employment opportunities suitable for local people in sustainable locations.

The site lies within the built-up area boundary of Glossop, one of the larger Market Towns that sit at the top of the settlement hierarchy under Local Plan (LP) Policy S2 and are the focus for housing and economic growth.

LP Policy E1 relates to new employment development (which includes the B8 Use Class) and states that new business and industrial developments in sustainable locations that contribute towards the creation and retention of a wide range of jobs, education and training opportunities will be supported. One of the ways in which this will be achieved is by supporting business development outside of allocated employment sites or Primary Employment Zones but within the built up area when it would not create undue harm to the character, appearance or amenity of the area.

The application seeks full planning permission for the introduction of 25no garages with associated vehicular access and hard standing. Garages fall within the B8 Use Class (storage and distribution). The principle of this type of development in this location is supported by LP Policies S1, S2 and E1, in addition to relevant policies contained under Chapter 7 of the NPPF.

The application site does however lie within the St James Conservation Area and as such the application must demonstrate that the proposals preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the site and its wider setting within the Conservation Area, in accordance with LP Policy EQ7, relevant paragraphs contained under Chapter 20 of the NPPF, and Section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Design & Conservation

Section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that with respect to any buildings or land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of that area.

LP Policy S1 sets out a number of sustainability principles which all new development proposals should incorporate in order to make a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities and to protect, and where possible enhance the environment.

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 Design Guide SPD (2018) contains further design guidance to ensure that all development proposals are of a high quality and respond positively to the characteristics of the site and its surrounding context.

Chapter 14 of the NPPF contains national policies aimed at achieving well designed places. NPPF Policy DP3 contains a number of key principles for well-designed places. Sub-paragraph (1) states that development proposals should respond to their context so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of plots and buildings, and the use of materials and architectural features.

Chapter 20 of the NPPF contains national policies aimed at conserving and enhancing the Historic Environment. NPPF Policies HE4-HE6 and HE9 are the relevant national decision making policies for this application.

Taken together, these policies confirm that heritage assets should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance and that an assessment of the potential effects on development proposals on the significance of heritage assets should support an application, identifying whether the proposal will have a positive impact, no impact, harm to, or total loss of the significance of a heritage asset,

Where a development proposal is judged to harm the significance of a heritage asset, the effect on the asset and its significance should be weighed against any public benefits from the proposal.

The site lies within the St James Conservation Area, and as such the introduction of new development should be handled in a sensitive manner. However, based on a site inspection, it is the case that this is one of the least sensitive areas of the Conservation Area, and therefore there is scope of development of an appropriate scale, height, and visual appearance, as evidenced by the fact that the Council have previously granted planning permission in 2006 and 2010, albeit under a previous Local Development Plan.

The application is supported by a Heritage Statement which has been prepared by the agent, and does not appear to have been written by a suitably qualified heritage professional. The Statement (page 10) identifies that the proposal is expected to have a positive impact on the St James Conservation Area. Whilst it is the case that the Heritage Assessment does not appear to have been written by a suitably qualified heritage professional, the application is nevertheless supported by an appropriate level of information having regard to NPPF Policy HE5.

The latest revised plans shows the 25no garages to be laid out in two rows (one containing 9no garages, and the other containing 16no garages, both of which have principal elevations that face inwards into the site and its shared internal access.

The Elevation Plans show that both row of garages reach an eaves height of 2.25m and an overall ridge height of 4.21m, with each row characterised by dual pitched gables. The notes on the Elevation Plans note that the external walls will be finished in concrete panelling and brick, with up and over garage doors, with roofs finished in profile meeting sheeting.

In commenting on the application, the Conservation Officer acknowledges that the proposals are indeed similar to proposals approved in 2006 and 2010 which were both found to be acceptable in heritage terms, subject to garages having a rendered finished with a dark roofing. The comments received from the Conservation Officer notes that the proposed concrete walls as shown are not appropriate, and that a condition is recommended to agree materials of the garages as well as the vehicular access from Sumner Street, which is the most prominent aspect of the scheme from public vantage points.

It is acknowledged that the applicant has justified the use of materials by virtue of the fact that these are consistent with those approved in 2006 and in 2010. However, the planning policy context has moved on considerably in the proceeding 15 years, with a far greater emphasis on high quality design and heritage conservation which justifies a greater scrutiny on the use of materials.

Therefore subject to a suitably worded planning condition that makes clear that notwithstanding details submitted, a materials schedule will need to be submitted and agreed prior to commencement of development, and having regard to comments from the Council's Conservation Officer, Officers are satisfied that no harm will occur to the significance of the heritage asset.

In light of the above, Officers are satisfied that concerns raised by objectors with regards to matters relating to design and heritage have been fully addressed, and that the proposal will in turn preserve the character and appearance of the St James Conservation Area, in line with LP Policies S1, EQ6 and EQ7, relevant Supplementary Design Guidance, paragraphs contained under Chapters 14 and 20 of the NPPF, and Section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

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.

LP Policy EQ10 seeks to ensure that people and the environment are protected from adverse impacts relating to issues including air pollution, noise, light pollution or any other nuisance or harm to amenity, by securing appropriate mitigation by way of planning conditions and obligations.

Chapter 17 of the NPPF contains national planning policies concerned with Pollution, Public Protection and Security. NPPF Policy P2 refers to ground conditions and requires proposals to be located on sites suitable for their proposed use and that matters of contamination are adequately mitigated.

NPPF Policy P3 refers to living conditions and pollution and states that development proposals should be appropriate for their location taking into account the likely effects of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, whether these effects are on or off site, and whether this is as a result of the development itself or the product of pre-existing conditions in the vicinity.

The application in its latest form seeks permission for 25no single storey garages to be situated on land that is located to the rear of residential properties on Sumner Street and neighbouring Princess Street. Concerns have been raised from neighbours and members of the public relating to adverse impacts to their amenity, with regards to loss of light and privacy, increase in noise and disturbance, pollution and health risks (fumes, omissions etc.) and asbestos risk.

This application is similar to a scheme approved in July 2010, where objections were similarly received in connection with potential harms to residential and public amenity. Owing to the fact that the garages are single storey, and that the characteristics of the site have not materially changed since 2010, Officers are satisfied that there would be no adverse impact to loss of privacy or sun light to any neighbouring property, consistent with conclusions reached by the Council in 2010.

It is considered that the comings and goings associated with this proposed development would be infrequent, and that any perceived noise and disturbance generated from the use of the garages would not lead to a level of noise that could be judged as resulting in a material adverse impact. Environmental legislation sits outside of the planning system which allows controls and limitations to be placed on any anti-social behaviour. Similarly, any omissions from cars would not be material in so far as generating any adverse impacts.

As such, and in line with conclusions previously reached by the Council in connection with a similar development in 2010, the application is considered to preserve the amenity of neighbouring properties and the public more widely, and

thus complies with LP Policies EQ6 and EQ10 and relevant paragraphs contained under Chapter 17 of the NPPF.

Trees

LP Policy EQ9 relates specifically to trees, woodland and hedgerows, and requires that existing woodlands, healthy mature trees and hedgerows are retained and integrated within a proposed development unless the need for, and benefits of, the development clearly outweigh their loss.

NPPF Policy N2 presents a list of requirements for new proposals that aim to improve the natural environment stating that proposals should (amongst other things):

- d. conserve and enhance existing natural features of visual, historic or nature conservation value (such as established trees and hedgerows) where possible, and use appropriate landscaping to help create well-designed places and integrate development into its surroundings.

NPPF Policy N3 refers specifically to trees within new development and states that proposals should (amongst other things) make provision for the long term maintenance of both existing and newly planted trees which form part of the development.

The site contains a group of 2no Sycamore Trees which are considered by the Council's Tree Officer to be of Category B quality, both of which are protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) that was confirmed in February 2025.

The application was initially not supported by any impact assessment relating to these trees as identified within objections made by local residents. Having requested that such information be provided, the Tree Officer has confirmed his objection to the removal of these trees to facilitate the 30no garages, as there is simply no justification for removing trees for this quality.

In response to this strong objection from the Council's Tree Officer a revised layout has been submitted that omits 5no garages that are within close proximity of these two protected trees and their root protection areas. This revised layout has been reviewed by the Council's Tree Officer and found to be acceptable subject to appropriate planning conditions.

In light of the revised layout and latest comments from the Council's Tree Officer, it is considered that previous concerns raised by neighbours and shared by the Council have not been suitably addressed, in line with LP Policy EQ9 and NPPF Policies N2 and N3.

Ecology & BNG

The Environment Act (2021) places a legal requirement on all applications to deliver a 10% uplift in Biodiversity Net Gain on site or, where this cannot be achieved, off-site which can include purchasing credits from a registered Habitat Bank.

LP Policy EQ5 requires all new development proposals to demonstrate that any protected species and habitats within the site will not be adversely affected and seeks to promote a nett gain in biodiversity by securing appropriate mitigation and ecological enhancements where appropriate.

NPPF Policy N2 sub-paragraph (1) presents a list of requirements for new proposals that aim to improve the natural environment stating that proposals should (amongst other things):

- a. Consider the environmental qualities of land proposed for development, including habitats, landscape character and the natural beauty of the countryside, and identify opportunities for those qualities to be conserved or enhanced
- f. Minimise any adverse impacts on biodiversity and include features which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats and hedgerows...

Sub-paragraph (2) states that if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for, then the development should be refused.

Protected Species

The site is not constrained by any sensitive statutory designation and lies within the built-up area boundary of Glossop surrounded on four sides by residential development. An objection states that there is evidence of bats on site and that potential impacts on protected species should be fully assessed.

Whilst these comments are noted, the first consultation response from Derbyshire Wildlife Trust notes that a check of the Biological Records Database confirms that there are no records of protected species present on or adjacent to the site, and that no notable habitats have been recorded to date on or adjacent to the site.

On this basis, Officers are satisfied that there is no justification for any additional ecological surveys or assessments relating to protected species to undertaken by the applicant and to do so would be unreasonable.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

The site qualifies for the delivery of a 10% uplift in BNG owing to the fact that there is more than 25sqm of habitat value that would be lost to development on site. In light of comments provided by Derbyshire Wildlife Trust (DWT), a revised BNG Assessment and Metric has been submitted and subject to further comment from DWT.

The latest calculations identify that there would be a loss of 0.16 habitat units (26%) as a result of the proposed development, and that there are no credible opportunities for the 0.23 units (which includes the 10% uplift) to be delivered on site. The gains are not considered to be significant and therefore do not trigger the need for a S106.

A Gain Plan and Habitat Monitoring and Management Plan will be required to be secured by way of pre-commencement conditions in order to make the application acceptable.

Subject to these conditions, Officers are satisfied that the application will preserve and not adversely impact upon any protected species or habitat and fulfil its requirements under the Environment Act (2021) to deliver 10% BNG in line with LP Policy EQ5 and relevant paragraphs under Chapter 19 of the NPPF.

Parking Provision and Highway Safety

LP Policy CF6 seeks to ensure that development can be safely accessed in a sustainable manner and that all new development is located where it can be satisfactorily accommodated within the existing highway network.

Chapter 15 of the NPPF contains national decision making policies that aims to promote sustainable transport. NPPF Policy TR3 refers to the need for development to be located in sustainable locations, and that (amongst other things):

- a. development proposals which could generate a significant amount of movement, in the context of the area within which they would be situated, should be in locations that are sustainable (or which can be made so)
- c. any significant adverse impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion) or on highway safety, should be mitigated to an acceptable degree..

The proposed development is to be served from an existing single access from Sumner Street between the blank gables of No.19 and 21 Sumner Street. This is consistent with a previous application for 30no garages that was approve under HPK/2010/0257. Whilst this application is being assessed under a different Local Development Plan and other material considerations including the NPPF, the fact remains that the principle of utilising this access to serve garages has been found to be acceptable to the Local Planning Authority.

Whilst objections are noted in relation to the nature of this access being substandard with regards to its exit visibility and potential intensification resulting from vehicle movements, Officers consider that when taking account of planning history, and comments provided by the Highways Authority, it would be unreasonable to arrive at a different conclusion to that reached in 2010, in so far as the access being acceptable to serve the proposed development.

The latest plans show that there would be a distance of 6m separating each row of garages, which allows for a suitable area for vehicles reversing from garages so that each vehicle can enter and exit the site in a forward gear, and in doing so not resulting in any unacceptable highway safety impacts.

With regards to parking provision, each garage in its original form was shown to span a width of 2.85m and a depth of 5.85m. Comments from the Highways Authority make clear that it is desirable for garages serving vehicles to have

minimum dimensions of 3.0m x 6.0m. Further to correspondence from the agent challenging the policy justification for this requirement, Officers sought clarification from the Highways Authority, who responded as follows:

There is no formal minimum garage size stated in any National Policy documents; however, it is, and has been for many years, standard industry best practice for LHA's to require minimum internal garage sizes of 3.0m x 6.0m for single and 6.0m x 6.0m for double garages to allow sufficient internal space to park a vehicle and for the vehicle to be accessible. Reduced internal garage dimensions are more likely to lead to a garage(s) not being used as parking spaces and more likely to be used for other purposes e.g. storage.

"These requirements are reflected in most, if not all, LHA Highway Design guidance/policy documents and is specified in DCC's Planning Streets and Places highway design guide.

Should the applicant wish to provide garages which are smaller than the recommended sizes, the LHA would not consider them to be parking spaces. However, should the garages not be used as parking spaces, the trip generation for each garage would not be considered to be any higher than if it were used as a garage. Regardless of the proposed garage sizes, the LHA considers that there are no grounds for an objection to the application."

Further to discussions with the agent, revised plans have been submitted which show each garage to have an increased depth of 6m with a width of 2.85m being sustained, resulting in a very marginal shortfall of 150mm with regards to the desired width of a single garage.

There are no requirements within the Local Development Plan or any Supplementary Planning Document adopted by HPBC with regards to parking dimensions although it is acknowledge that the County Highways Authority are relying on other supplementary guidance to request these dimensions.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the latest plans fall short of the desired width of 3m, it is important to note that the shortfall amounts to 150mm. When considering that each future owner of this garage will be fully aware of the dimensions prior to purchase, and on the basis that a planning condition is applied which limits the use of each garage solely for the storage of private vehicles, it is considered that there would be no unacceptable highway safety impacts arising from the proposed development that result in any conflict with LP Policy CF6 and relevant paragraphs contained under Chapter 15 of the NPPF.

Other Matters

Other concerns that do not relate to the material planning issues discussed and assessed above have been received and these are addressed below.

Objections have been received in relation to the potential impact on flood risk from the development of what is currently overgrown scrubland, to a permeable surface and built development. The site lies in Flood Zone 1 and the proposed development falls below the threshold of Major development. As such there is no requirement for a

Flood Risk Assessment and it is judged that based on these specific circumstances the proposed development will not give rise to any adverse flood risk impacts.

Comments have been received regarding the absence of any interest from local residents in using the proposed garages. The Local Planning Authority must assess and determine the application on its own individual merits. Whilst these comments are acknowledged, the uptake for the proposed development is not a material consideration for assessing and determining this application.

Attention has been drawn to the absence of any access rights that are required to utilise the access point from Sumner Street. The Application Form clearly shows that notice has been served on both No.19 and No.21 Sumner Street, and have therefore fulfilled their procedural responsibilities. It remains the case that the granting of planning permission does not outweigh or override any other civil matters including rights of access. Civil matters are not material to the determination process.

A comment has been received stating that the land could be better used. As expressed above, the Local Planning Authority must assess and determine a planning application on its own individual merits in line with the Local Development Plan and all other material considerations.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

LP Policy S1a reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

The presumption in favour of sustainable development is set out under NPPF Policies S3-S5. NPPF Policy S3 confirms that the presumption under Policy S4 should be applied when considering development proposals within settlements and that in all locations, development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan should be approved without delay.

NPPF Policy S4 makes clear that development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision making policies in the Framework.

A detailed assessment of this application which in its revised form seeks permission for 25no garages to the rear of Sumner Street, Glossop has confirmed that subject to appropriate planning conditions, there are no adverse impacts generated by the proposal that results in conflict with the Local Development Plan and other material considerations which includes the NPPF.

The application thus constitutes a sustainable form of development and in line with LP Policy S1a and paragraph 11 of the NPPF the application is recommended for approval subject to appropriate conditions.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: **Approve with Conditions**

Case Officer: James Stannard

Recommendation Date: 7th September 2026

X *B.S. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council