



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 March 2025

by **L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/D/24/3356089

Moorings, 111 Manchester Road, Chapel-en-le-Frith, Derbyshire SK23 9TN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Wilson against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is HPK/2024/0274.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and single storey rear extension with raised patio to rear and detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side and single storey rear extension with raised patio to rear and detached garage at Moorings, 111 Manchester Road, Chapel-en-le-Frith, Derbyshire SK23 9TN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HPK/2024/0274, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: 111MR/PL/01/D (Location, Site Plan and Elevations), 111MR/PL/02/D (Ground Floor Plans and Garage Elevations) and 111MR/PL/03/C (First Floor Plans and Roof Plans).
 - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 4) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the first floor window on the side facing, west elevation has been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of that window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the window is installed and once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.
 - 5) Demolition or construction works shall take place only between 08:00 – 18:00 on Mondays – Fridays, 08:00 – 13:00 on Saturdays and shall not take place at any time on Sundays or on Bank or Public Holidays.

Main Issue

2. The proposed development includes several elements, but the reason for refusal relates to solely the garage. I have no reason to disagree with the Council's findings in relation to the proposed extensions and patio. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposed garage on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. No 111 is a detached, two storey dwelling. It forms part of a row of dwellings that are set back from the main road and accessed via a secondary road which runs parallel with the main road. A strip of grassland, which contains trees and shrubs, separates these dwellings from the main road.
4. The character and appearance of dwellings vary along Manchester Road. There are small clusters of similarly designed dwellings, as well as individually designed dwellings. Thus, the form, scale, design, siting and age of dwellings in the vicinity of the site varies which results in a varied street scene. Detached garages forward of the principal elevation are not common in the locality. Nonetheless, there are examples of where garages project beyond the main front elevation, such as Nos 81-101 Manchester Road. Furthermore, the distance between dwellings and Manchester Road varies, but in general dwellings are set back from the highway which provides a sense of spaciousness.
5. The garage would be sited forward of the principal elevation of the dwelling and beyond the building line. Nevertheless, this part of Manchester Road does not have a distinctive building line due to the strip of grassland and varied siting of dwellings. The proposed garage would maintain the open and spacious character of the street scene. This is because there is a parcel of vegetated land between the appeal site and main road, the garage would be single storey, No 111 is individually designed and benefits from a larger area to the front of the dwelling than other nearby plots. The garage would be subordinate in size and height. Furthermore, due to the vegetated land and gap to the main road, the garage would not be a prominent addition to the street scene.
6. Consequently, given the unique circumstances of the site, the proposed garage would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. It would therefore accord with Policies S1 and EQ6 of the High Peak Local Plan (2016). These seek, amongst other things, to ensure development is well designed and respects and positively contributes to the character of the area.
7. The proposal would also accord with the High Peak Borough Council Local Development Framework: Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (2005), the Council's Design Guide SPD (2018) and chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. These seek, amongst other things, to ensure garages relate to the main dwelling in terms of size, proportion and appearance, and state development should be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

8. Residents have raised concerns in relation to parking, noise and working hours. Highways have not objected to the development and confirm that there would be sufficient parking. I see no reason to disagree as there would remain space for numerous vehicles to park towards the front of the dwelling. In addition, I am satisfied that, given the scale of the development and subject to planning conditions, the proposal would not result in unacceptable disturbance during construction.

Conditions

9. It is necessary to attach a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. A condition relating to materials is also necessary to integrate the appearance of the proposal with that of the dwelling and to preserve the character and appearance of the area.
10. The Council stated in the delegated report that, if considered reasonable and necessary, conditions restricting hours of construction and obscure glazing could be attached. They have not suggested these conditions within their appeal submission, but the appellant has confirmed that they would agree to such conditions. It is necessary to attach a condition relating to obscure glazing to protect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Furthermore, a condition relating to demolition and construction working hours is necessary to protect the amenity of local residents.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

L Wilson

INSPECTOR