



**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE AGENDA**

**Date: Monday, 6 June 2022**

**Time: 1.30 pm**

**Venue: The Octagon, Pavilion Gardens, Buxton**

You can view the agenda online by using a smart phone camera and scanning the code below:



**27 May 2022**

**PART 1**

4. Update Sheet (**Pages 3 - 6**)

**MARK TRILLO**

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND MONITORING OFFICER**

Membership of Development Control Committee

Councillor R McKeown (Chair)

Councillor A Barrow

Councillor C Farrell

Councillor G Oakley

Councillor P Roberts

Councillor J Todd

Councillor D Lomax (Vice-Chair)

Councillor L Dowson

Councillor I Huddleston

Councillor J Perkins

Councillor E Thrane

Councillor S Young

This page is intentionally left blank

**6<sup>th</sup> JUNE 2022**

**HPBC DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**UPDATE SHEET**

**HPK/2021/0645 & HPK/2021/0646 – GLOSSOP MARKET HALL**

No updates

**HPK/2022/0147 – 1 ROYLE AVENUE, GLOSSOP**

The applicant has submitted a Supplementary Design Statement which can be read at:

<http://planning.highpeak.gov.uk/portal/servlets/AttachmentShowServlet?ImageName=497868>

**HPK/2022/0124 – 28 PARK ROAD, BUXTON**

Call-in

The report states that the application has been called in by Cllr Kemp and Cllr Hall. It is noted that Cllr Hall is a neighbouring resident and objector to the application and therefore has an interest in the application. It is therefore appropriate, in the interests of openness and transparency of decision making that the will be determined by the Committee.

Amended Plans

Revised and updated Floor and Elevation Plans have been received that accurately reflect the elevations of the main house and associated garage.

Having regard to paragraph 3.4 of the Committee Report, the plans also confirm that the converted garage does form part of the proposed use and that no physical or internal changes to the garage are proposed.

The plans show that the garage comprises 3no. single bedrooms with associated living and kitchen area. When considering these plans against the plans for the main house, this takes the total number of bedrooms to 9.

Officer Comments:

The updated plans are welcome and having regard to the existing use as a larger HMO, the location of the site within the built-up area boundary and its close proximity to the Town Centre, and the provision of off-street parking, the increase in the number of bedrooms does not alter the recommendation as set out within the report.

### **HPK/2022/0056 – 157 ASHLEIGH**

#### Objection

An additional objection has been received from 19 Manchester Road stating:

*“The property borders need to be clarified - our legal border with the applicant's land protrudes across the HMLR title border and this does not appear to be on the plan. The borders of the site plan also appear to cross into the land of 155 Park Road different to the block plan.*

*The building is too high and wide and will overlook our property that is naturally set back away from the front of the entrance.*

*It is not clear what the final elevations are as the building is proposed on a slope - if groundworks are carried out then the effect on the loss of earth will need to be carried out e.g. load bearing retaining wall*

*There will be a loss of light especially during the autumn and winter months with the falling of foliage. The historic views to the park will be lost or obscured.*

*There will be a loss of privacy with 3 roof windows facing our property and a raised side entrance that will directly face through our windows.*

*In conclusion, we object to the application.*

Officer Comment:

Concerns regarding boundaries are a private civil legal matter and not a material planning consideration. Neighbour amenity has been considered in detail in the main report. Loss of view is also not a material planning consideration. Structural considerations relating to the retaining wall would be a matter for building regulations.

### **HPK/2021/0627 & HPK/2021/0634 – BOWDEN HALL, CHAPEL**

No updates

### **HPK/2022/0065 – 2 HAWTHORN BANK, HADFIELD**

Upon publication of the report, the applicant has asked Officers to confirm whether the rear single storey extension constitutes permitted development. This would allow this aspect to be constructed in the event that the application is refused in line with Officer recommendation, owing to the proposed two storey front extension.

No further comments have been received from members of the general public.

Officer Comments:

Due to the fact that the garage formed part of the main house, and having regard to the dimensions and appearance of the proposed extension, it is considered by the case officer that the proposed rear single storey extension does indeed constitute permitted development and thus could be constructed in the event that the application is refused in line with Officer recommendation. However, formal confirmation and determination by the Council would need to be sought via a Certificate of Lawful Development.

This page is intentionally left blank