
**12. FULL APPLICATION – REPLACEMENT DWELLING AT HURLINGHAM, BAMFORD
(NP/HPK/1215/1159, P.8423, 08/12/2015, 420469 / 382661, MN)**

APPLICANT: MR PAUL COOK

Site and Surroundings

Hurlingham is a bungalow situated in open countryside on the northern side of the A6187 Hope Road, just over half a mile south-west of Bamford village.

The dwelling has a deep plan layout and a semi-hipped roof with a small roof gable above the front door. The principal elevation is clad with artificial stone with the walls to the side and rear clad with render. The property has large white timber window frames and a front-facing patio door. The roof is clad with concrete tiles.

The property is set amongst a small group of other post-war bungalows of varying ages and sizes and one traditional two storey dwelling which is directly opposite Hurlingham on the southern side of the A6187. The dwellings to the immediate west and north-west of the site, Thornhill View and Holm-Lea, share the driveway of Hurlingham to gain vehicular access to the rear of the site where the garages of Hurlingham and Holm-Lea are located. This is also the location of the dwellinghouse Thornhill View, which only has access to the highway over the driveway of Hurlingham.

The site is outside of any conservation area.

Proposal

This application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing bungalow and the construction of a replacement dwelling.

Specifically, the application proposes a detached two storey four bedroom dwelling built from natural gritstone under a pitched blue slate roof. It would have UPVC windows and door frames with stone surrounds. A porch is proposed to the front and there is a single storey projecting gable to the rear.

The existing access, parking and turning space would be retained and there would be no changes to the existing garden or landscaping.

A number of energy management measures have been proposed, including solar panels, an air source heat pump and a biomass boiler.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Statutory 3 year time limit for implementation.**
- 2. Development not to be carried out otherwise than in accordance with specified plans.**
- 3. Removal of permitted development rights for external alterations, extensions outbuildings, hard standing, walls, fences and other means of enclosure to approved dwelling.**
- 4. Conditions to specify or require prior approval of architectural and design details for the dwelling including, stonework, roof materials, windows and door design and finish and rainwater goods.**

5. Prior approval of space within the site for accommodation, storage of plant, materials and parking for site operative's vehicles during construction works.
6. Prior approval of environmental management measures prior to commencement.
7. Parking to be provided prior to occupation.

Key Issues

1. Whether the principle of the replacement dwelling meets the requirements of saved Local Policy LH5.
2. Whether the proposed development would otherwise conserve or enhance the valued characteristics of the National Park and be acceptable in all other respects.

Relevant Planning History

1992 – Permission granted for re-siting of garage and change from flat to pitched roof.

Consultations

Derbyshire County Council – Highways – No objections subject to parking being provided prior to occupation

High Peak Borough Council – No response at time of writing.

Bamford with Thornhill Parish Council – Support the proposal as it is felt to represent an improvement visually on the existing building.

Representations

Two letters of representation have been received, one supporting the development, the other making general comments. The points raised are:

- Wish to ensure that the driveway is not blocked during construction
- Querying how well a two storey house would fit in to the street scene, given that the neighbouring properties are bungalows

Main Policies

Core Strategy

Policy GSP3 states amongst other things that development must respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings that are subject to the development proposals.

Policy L1 requires that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character, as identified in the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan, and other valued characteristics. Valued characteristics specifically identified in the pre amble to L1 include amongst other things – trees, woodlands, hedgerows, stone walls, field barns and other landscape features.

Policy CC1 requires development to take account of the energy hierarchy, to achieve the highest possible standards of carbon reductions and water efficiency, whilst CC2 encourages low carbon and renewable energy development where they can be acceptably accommodated.

Local Plan

Policy LC4 of the Local Plan states that where development is acceptable in principle it will be permitted provided that its detailed treatment is of a high standard that respects, conserves and where possible enhances the landscape, built environment and other valued characteristics of the area.

Local Plan policy LH5 – Replacement Dwellings states that the replacement of unlisted dwellings will be permitted provided that:

- i. the replacement contributes to the character or appearance of the area.
- ii. it is not preferable to repair the existing dwelling.
- iii. the proposed dwelling will be a similar size to the dwelling it will replace.
- iv. it will not have an adverse effect on neighbouring properties.
- v. it will not be more intrusive in the landscape, either through increased building mass or the greater activity created.

Adopted design guidance within the ‘Design Guide’, the recently adopted Climate Change and Sustainable Building Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the Authority’s Landscape Strategy and Action Plan offer further guidance on the application of these policies. These policies and guidance are supported by a wider range of policies in the Development Plan listed below.

Wider Policy Context

Relevant Core Strategy (CS) policies: DS1, GSP1, GSP2, GSP4 and L2

Relevant Local Plan (LP) policies: LC17, LT11

National Planning Policy Framework

In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority’s Core Strategy 2011 and saved policies in the Peak District National Park Local Plan 2001. Policies in the Development Plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park’s statutory purposes for the determination of this application. It is considered that in this case there is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and more recent Government guidance in the NPPF with regard to the issues that are raised.

Assessment

Whether the principle of the replacement dwelling meets the requirements of Local Plan policy LH5 (ii)

The existing dwelling has no particular architectural or historic merit and is built from non-traditional materials. The low massing and square form of the building coupled with large window openings do not reflect the form or detailing of traditional vernacular buildings within surrounding settlements or in the National Park more widely.

Additionally, whilst not a material planning consideration, it is noted that when exploring options for extending the dwelling the applicant commissioned surveys that found that around 90% of internal walls comprise asbestos boarding. As a result they have been advised that extension of the building is not undertaken.

It is therefore considered that the principle of replacing the existing building with a more appropriate design which enhances the site and its surroundings and incorporates energy saving measures would be acceptable in principle and in accordance with LH5 (ii).

Whether the proposed dwelling is of a similar size to the dwelling it will replace (Local Plan policy LH5 criteria (iii))

This aspect of the policy uses the phrase ‘similar size’ as a means to control the size of replacement dwellings to protect the landscape, instead of insisting upon a simple like-for-like floor space or volume calculation. This enables a degree of flexibility to both achieve enhancement of the Park and to allow the scale of a replacement dwelling to respond to what is appropriate in the context of different sites and their setting.

The table below shows the difference in size between the existing dwelling and the proposed replacement dwelling. Figures have been provided for both footprint and volume. However, members will be aware of officer advice in previous replacement dwelling applications that volume is considered to be a more reliable indicator of ‘similar size’ in relation to the key issues of massing and landscape impact than either floorspace or footprint.

	Existing house	Proposed replacement house (percentage increase/decrease)
Footprint (m ²)	114m ²	92m ² (-19%)
Volume (m ³)	419m ³	541m ³ (29%)

Although the proposed two storey dwelling would actually have a smaller footprint than the existing bungalow as a result of providing accommodation over two floors, it would increase the volume of the building. The preamble to policy LH4 notes that extensions up to 25% are more likely to be acceptable than larger extensions. The proposed dwelling is 29% larger so would not therefore result in a dwelling that is substantially larger than what the Authority would be likely to consider acceptable were the existing house to be extended. It is also possible that the existing house could be further extended under permitted development rights, which could actually result in a larger property. Therefore whilst the proposed building would not be a similar size to the existing dwelling it will replace it would be no larger than it could be reasonably be expected that dwelling might be extended to. On that basis there is considered to be no conflict with the intent of policy LH5. It is also considered, importantly, that in terms of form and massing the extension of the property is likely to be less desirable than replacing the property with a more traditional and coherent building.

Notwithstanding this point, the relative size of the proposed dwelling is only one criterion of the policy and should not be looked at in isolation from the context of the site or its setting within the landscape. In these respects criteria (i), (iv) and (v) of Local Plan policy LH5 are particularly relevant. These are discussed in detail below, and have led to the Officer conclusion that the increased scale is acceptable in this context.

Whether the proposed dwelling meets the requirements of Local Plan policy LH5 (i), (iv) and (v)

The applicant has entered into pre-application discussions with the Authority’s officers before making this planning application to try and develop an acceptably designed replacement building.

One representation letter has queried how the design of the proposed house relates to the street scene, being a two storey house rather than a bungalow. The form of the dwelling is a relatively simple two storey house with a horizontal mass and narrow gables reflecting the local vernacular. The proposed form, massing, materials and detailing are all considered to be in accordance with adopted design guidance and better reflect the local vernacular compared to the existing building.

The proposed dwelling would be seen in the context of the neighbouring single storey dwellings. The proposed dwelling would be higher than the neighbouring buildings, having a ridge height around 2m above that of the bungalow to the east and 1.3m above the taller bungalow to the west. Due to being in-line with and between the two neighbouring bungalows as it would be, being set back from the road, and in the context of the two storey dwelling opposite – which is similar in height to the proposed dwelling – it is not considered that the development would be an unduly dominant feature within the street scene or out of keeping in the context of neighbouring buildings.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed replacement dwelling would make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area in accordance with saved Local Plan policies LH5 (i) and LC4. If permission is granted, officers would recommend that architectural details and specifications are secured by condition and that a condition to remove permitted development rights for alterations and extensions is also necessary to ensure that the Authority retains control of domestic development which could undermine the character and appearance of the development and the amenity of the area – as well as the intent of LH5 (iii) in terms of the size of the dwelling.

The property is located within the Derwent Valley landscape character area identified within the Landscape Strategy and specifically within the ‘valley farmlands with villages’ landscape character type. The landscape around the application site is characterised by low lying, gently undulating topography, a network of streams with gritstone villages and outlying farms with associated dwellings within pastoral farmland enclosed by hedgerows and some dry stone walls. The landscape around the application site reflects a great deal of identified landscape character.

In this case the application proposes a replacement dwelling which better reflects the local built vernacular and in these respects the proposal would make a positive contribution to identified landscape character. The proposal would not encroach into nearby fields, skyline or be more visually obtrusive in wider views from the surrounding landscape. Any increase in activity on the site from the proposed four bedroom dwelling would not be so significant to be any more intrusive in the landscape.

It is therefore considered that the proposed replacement dwelling would not be more intrusive in the landscape and that the proposal would conserve the character of the surrounding landscape in accordance with Local Plan policies LH5 (v) and LC4. A condition to require finished floor levels to be submitted and approved is recommended if permission is granted in order to ensure that the land upon which the building is constructed is not raised up, which could alter the impacts that it has.

Despite the proposed increase in height, the proposed dwelling would not be overbearing and would not result in any significant loss of daylight or sunlight to habitable rooms or garden of any neighbouring property, predominantly due to it sharing a similar building line to those properties. There are no facing windows between properties which could give rise to any issues of overlooking.

Therefore it is considered that the proposed replacement dwelling would not have an adverse impact upon neighbouring properties in accordance with Local Plan policies LH5 (iv) and LC4.

In summary, it is considered that the proposed replacement dwelling is in accordance with Local Plan policies LH5 and LC4. Although the replacement dwelling is not a similar size to the existing dwelling, in the context of this site and its setting within the landscape, the proposed dwelling would make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area, would not have an adverse impact upon neighbours and would not be more intrusive in the landscape or street scene either through increased building mass or greater activity.

Environmental management

Core Strategy policy CC1 states that development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and resources and take account of the energy hierarchy.

The applicant has indicated that advised that they are prepared to introduce renewable energy measures to accord with this policy, and are considering installing either a biomass boiler, solar panels or tiles, a ground source heat pump, or grey water recycling – or a combination of these. It is considered that it would be possible to incorporate one or more of these without detracting from the appearance of the building, and that this would be sufficient to meet the requirements of CC1. However, as no firm details have been provided and no elevation or block plans incorporating the measures have been submitted it would be necessary to ensure that these details are secured by planning condition if permission was granted.

Other matters

The proposed dwelling would be served by the existing access which would be unaltered. There is ample space within the application site to park three vehicles clear of the highway and no changes to the site layout are proposed. There would be a slight improvement in access to the rear of the site – and for the neighbours sharing the driveway access – as it would be widened adjacent to the house. The Highway Authority has raised no objection to the proposals. Therefore subject to appropriate conditions recommended by the Highway Authority to require the parking to be provided prior to occupation it is considered that the proposed development would be served by satisfactory parking and access arrangements in accordance with saved LP policies LT11 and LT18.

Foul sewerage would be disposed of to the existing main sewer which is acceptable and in accordance with Government guidance within the National Planning Practice Guidance.

The proposal falls outside of the Authority's requirement for a protected species survey because of the age of the building. The Authority's officers are not aware of any protected species or habitat that could be affected by the proposal.

The demolition of the existing building would disturb the asbestos within the building. Any removal of asbestos would need to be in accordance with the 2012 Control of Asbestos Regulations and as any impact and risk related to the demolition of the building and removal of asbestos is controlled by separate legislation it is not necessary to repeat this control by way of a planning condition.

Conclusion

It is therefore concluded that the proposed development dwelling is in accordance with Local Plan policy LH5 because although the replacement dwelling is not a similar size to the existing dwelling, taking in to account policy LC4 and the context of this site and its setting within the landscape, the proposed development would make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area, would not have an adverse impact upon neighbours and would not be more intrusive in the landscape either through increased building mass or greater activity. There are no objections to the access, parking and manoeuvring space.

The proposal would not harm the valued characteristics of the National Park including its landscape character and biodiversity.

In the absence of further material considerations, the proposed development is considered to be in accordance with the development plan and accordingly is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

Human Rights

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

Nil