

18. HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION – PROPOSED REAR NORTH EXTENSION TO FORM A KITCHEN. CONSTRUCT A SUMMER HOUSE ON THE NORTH-EAST BOUNDARY LINE WITH THE REMOVAL OF THE EXISTING HEXAGONAL SUMMER HOUSE AND ADDITIONAL GROUNDS WORK REQUIRED TO ACCOMMODATE THE EXTENSION AND CREATING A PATHWAY TO THE NEW SUMMERHOUSE. HAWTHORNE HOUSE, STANTON IN PEAK (NP/DDD/0923/1085, RD)

APPLICANT: MR HUTCHINSON

Summary

1. The application seeks planning permission for a rear extension to form a kitchen, and to construct a summer house on the north-east boundary line with the removal of the existing hexagonal summer house and additional grounds work required to accommodate the extension and creating a pathway to the new summerhouse, at Hawthorne House, Stanton In Peak.
2. Planning policy supports alterations and extensions to dwellings in the National Park provided they are of a suitable design, scale, form and massing and would not harm the character, appearance or amenities of the host property or the amenities of neighbouring properties.
3. In this case, following revised plans, by virtue of scale, design and massing, the proposed extension is considered to harmonise with, and adequately respect, the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the immediate surrounding Conservation Area. Consequently, the application is recommended for approval.

Site and Surroundings

4. Hawthorne House is a detached dwelling constructed from coursed sandstone walling with a quarter-faced tooling finish, with clay plain tile roofing and with traditional timber 9-light sash windows and timber panelled doors detailed with gritstone cills, head and jambs. The property is also detailed with gritstone quoins, parapeted gables with Kneelers and stone pinion detailing, and with black cast-iron guttering on rise and fall brackets with circular downpipes. The chimneys are Ashlar stone with tight joints, lower corbelled stringcourse with splayed top stone cornice and clay circular cannon head Chimney pots.
5. The property has previously been extended with permission granted in 2001 with works completed in 2003. This scheme consisted of extending the property along the roadside to the east to lengthen the building with a detailed gabled addition providing ground floor kitchen, and a first floor bedroom, along with remodelling to the rear North Elevation with the current lean-to Kitchen addition and another lean-to structure accommodating the Snug.
6. The nearest neighbouring property is Holly House, approximately 5.5m to the west.
7. Hawthorne House is located within Stanton-in-Peak Conservation Area.

Proposal

8. Planning permission is being sought to construct a rear extension to form a kitchen.

9. The proposal is to extend to the North with utilisation of the existing two-light windows which would be reconfigured to the East elevation with all the stonework re-used including the stone window surrounds. The wall is to be moved out to extend the kitchen dining area with new aluminium bi-fold doors introduced to open onto the terrace.
10. Planning permission was also originally being sought to construct a summer house on the north-east boundary line. However, revised plans omit this as an alternative design and location of summer house has been selected which falls under General Permitted Development rights, and as such the Authority no longer has control over this element of the application.
11. Stanton In Peak Parish Council objected to this application on grounds of massing and overdevelopment, commenting that *'In relation to the original cottage footprint this further extension takes an already significantly expanded building to a disproportionate scale. It is noted that the summer house appears overly large and that there is already a, recently renovated, standalone stone built office in the garden. The building is in the Conservation Area of the village and although the impact of the majority of the extensions are to the rear, they can still be seen from the road to the school and possibly from the area by the bus stop.'*
12. Amended plans have been submitted which reduce the size of the footprint of the extension, so as not to extend beyond the existing rear projection of the house and also amended the roof pitch to harmonise better with the existing roofs. The summer house was omitted from the application entirely.
13. Stanton In Peak Parish Council raised further objections to the amended plans *'...on the basis that this is an extension of an extension and therefore of greater mass than the original footprint allows for under policy. It sets a dangerous precedent to the rules if allowed for incremental creep'*.
14. Materials and detailing would match the existing.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application is APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- **3 year implementation time limit**
- **Carried out in complete accordance with amended plans (Proposed Site Plan 1296-008 Revision B and Proposed Elevations 1296-005 Revision C)**
- **Design and materials**

Key Issues

15. Design and scale, location, landscape impact and amenity issues.

History

October 2003 – NP/DDD/1003/0662: Re-arrangement of vehicular access – Granted Conditionally

April 2002 – DDD0402176: Extensions to dwelling – Granted Conditionally

January 2002 – DDD0102002: Extension to dwelling – Withdrawn

Consultations

Highway Authority: No response at time of writing.

Parish Council: Objects to the proposal on the grounds of massing and overdevelopment.

District Council: No response at time of writing.

Representations

The Authority has received two letters of representation, one in support from a neighbour on the grounds that the proposal is well designed and in keeping with the property and the village; and one objecting to the summerhouse but in support of the rear extension.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

1. The Government's intention is that the document should be considered as a material consideration and carry particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date.
2. Paragraph 134 states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, considering any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.
3. In particular Para: 176 states, that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.
4. Paragraph 199 states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset (in this case being the Conservation Area), great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
5. In the National Park, the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy and the new Development Management Policies (DMP). These Development Plan Policies provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application.
6. In this case, it is considered there are no significant conflicts between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and government guidance in the NPPF.

Main Development Plan Policies

Core Strategy

16. GSP1, GSP2 - *Securing National Park Purposes and sustainable development & Enhancing the National Park*. These policies jointly seek to secure national park legal purposes and duties through the conversion and enhancement of the National Park's landscape and its natural and heritage assets.

17. GSP3 - *Development Management Principles*. Requires that particular attention is paid to the impact on the character and setting of buildings and that the design is in accord with the Authority's Design Guide and development is appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park.
18. DS1 – *Development Strategy & L1 - Landscape character and valued characteristics*. Supports agricultural development in the open countryside, provided that development respects, conserves and enhances the valued characteristics of the site paying particular attention to impact upon the character and setting of buildings and siting, landscaping and building materials.
19. CC1 - *Climate change mitigation and adaption*. Sets out that development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources. Development must also achieve the highest possible standards of carbon reductions.

Development Management Policies

20. DMC3 - *Siting, Design, layout and landscaping*. Reiterates, that where developments are acceptable in principle, policy requires that design is to high standards and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape. The siting, mass, scale, height, design, building materials should all be appropriate to the context. Accessibility of the development should also be a key consideration.
21. DMC8 - Conservation Areas. States, that applications for development in a Conservation Area, or for development that affects it's setting or important views into or out of the area, across or through the area should assess and clearly demonstrate how the existing character and appearance of the Conservation Area will be preserved and, where possible, enhanced.
22. DMH7 - Extensions and alterations. States that extensions and alterations to dwellings will be permitted provided that the proposal does not:
 - (i) detract from the character, appearance or amenity of the original building, its setting or neighbouring buildings; or
 - (ii) dominate the original dwelling particularly where it is a designated or non-designated cultural heritage asset; or
 - (iii) amount to the creation of a separate independent dwelling; or
 - (iv) create an adverse effect on, or lead to undesirable changes to, the landscape or any other valued characteristic; or
 - (v) in the case of houses permitted under policy DMH1, exceed 10% of the floorspace or take the floorspace of the house above 97m².
23. DMT3 - *Access and design criteria*. States amongst other things, that a safe access should be provided in a way that does not detract from the character and appearance of the locality and where possible enhances it.

Supplementary Planning Documents

24. The Authority has adopted three separate supplementary planning documents (SPD) that offers design guidance on householder development namely the Design Guide, the Building Design Guide and the Detailed Design Guide on Alterations and Extensions.

Assessment

Principle of the development

25. Extending a dwelling is generally acceptable in principle, subject to the extension being of a satisfactory scale, design and external appearance and where development pays particular attention to the amenity, privacy and security of nearby properties, in accordance with the principles of policies DS1 and DMC3.
26. Policy DMH7 states that extensions and alterations to a residential dwelling will be permitted provided that the proposal does not detract from the character, appearance or amenity of the original building.
27. In addition, the Authority's design guidance sets out that it may be possible to add a well-designed extension provided it would be in harmony with the original building and subject to being appropriate in scale, design and external appearance, in accordance with good design principles.

Siting, Design & Materials

28. There were two elements to the proposed works; firstly, to extend the rear of the property towards the north, and secondly to construct a summer house on the north east boundary line.
29. Following objections from the Parish Council and a neighbouring property to the summer house, this element has been revised and now falls under GPDO and as such the Authority has no control over this component.
30. Proposals now seek permission for the rear extension only.
31. As existing, Hawthorne House has a side extension, which was approved in 2002, and three separate lean-to elements on the rear of the property. This proposal would see the demolition, and replacement, of the most easterly extension.
32. Originally, submitted plans proposed a single storey rear extension, with a low pitched roof extension on the north elevation of the dwelling. It would extend approximately 2m off of the rear of the existing side extension. This would extend beyond the existing rear projection, adding a third, incongruent roof pitch to the dwelling. The walls would be constructed in coursed sandstone walling, under a clay plain tile roof. Materials for which would be sourced, where possible from the demolition of the existing lean-to.
33. Following comments from Authority Officers, amended plans have been submitted stepping this extension back in order to bring it in line with the existing rear projection, and adjusting the roof pitch to be more in keeping with those on the existing property. This would retain a simpler form between the parent dwelling and the proposed development, allowing the extension to be read as a subservient addition to the property in accordance with Authority design guidance.
34. The amended design of the rear, single storey extension is an appropriate scale for the current building and would replace an existing discordant extension in this location. It would not dominate the parent dwelling. The proposed materials would conform to the existing property creating a sense of harmony with the original building which would not detract from its character or appearance.

35. Revised drawings show an amended design for the patio doors to the South Elevation, which would reduce the original glazing to a single pair of double doors, to be double glazed and constructed out of hardwood and painted. The window on the east elevation was revised to a single window.
36. The proposed extension would be modest in size and would not significantly increase the size of the existing building. Therefore, they do not dominate the existing property and are considered to be subservient to the dwelling. The proposed development is concluded to conserve the character and appearance of the property, in line with adopted policies GSP3, L1, DMC3 and DMH7.

Amenity Impacts

37. Outlook, amenity, privacy and daylight are fundamental considerations when altering or extending a property. This is to ensure that habitable rooms achieve a satisfactory level of outlook and natural daylight, and that there is adequate privacy and outdoor private amenity space, and that no overbearing or harmful overshadowing of neighbouring property results.
38. The only residential neighbour is Holly House approximately 5.5m to the west.
39. The single storey rear extension would not be overbearing, nor overshadow the neighbouring property on account of its location on the eastern end of the property behind existing rear lean-tos.
40. The revised proposal reduced the existing heavy glazing filling a large proportion of the extension, with a single pair of glazed double doors. This would be facing into the occupants' own curtilage and beyond that to an un-occupied area of fields. This element is therefore not considered to raise negative amenity issues on any neighbouring property.
41. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not adversely affect the neighbouring property with regard to outlook, amenity, privacy and daylight. The proposal accords with policy DMC3 in this regard.

Environmental Management and Sustainability

42. Policy CC1 requires that new development makes the most efficient and sustainable use of land, building and natural resources and achieves the highest possible standards of carbon reductions and water efficiency.
43. The application would utilise the existing stonework and materials on the site, therefore reducing its carbon footprint as materials would be sourced locally and materials on site re-used.
44. Given the scale of development, this is considered sufficient to comply with Policy CC1.

Conclusion

45. The proposed scheme would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling, its immediate setting or the wider area. The alterations and extensions are relatively modest, are replacing an existing incongruent rear extension, and would not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of the nearest neighbouring properties.

46. The proposals are therefore considered to be in line with the requirements of GSP1 and GSP3, DMC3, and DMH7, and as such are recommended for **APPROVAL**.

Human Rights

47. Any human rights issues have been considered and addressed in the preparation of this report.

48. List of Background Papers (not previously published) Nil

49. Report Author: Rachael Doyle, Assistant Planner, South Area Planning Team.