
12. HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION – CONSTRUCTION OF REAR AND SIDE EXTENSIONS, FIELD VIEW, EYAM (NP/DDD/1115/1057, P.2152, 06/11/2015, 421296 / 376727, MN)

APPLICANT: MR JULIAN WRIGHT

Proposal

Construction of a single storey extension to the rear of the property, and an infill extension to the side of the property, replacing an existing car port.

Site and Surroundings

Field View is a semi-detached dwelling situated on the western outskirts of Eyam village. The property is within the Eyam Conservation Area. It fronts the southern side of the road known as Townhead, with the adjoining neighbour to the eastern side.

The property is of gritstone construction under a blue slate roof. To the western side is a narrow two storey side extension. The ground floor of this serves as an open carport leading through to the rear garden of the house. To the rear is a small glazed single storey extension with flat roof.

In addition to the adjoining neighbour, there are further neighbours to the west.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Statutory time limit**
- 2. Completion in accordance with the revised plans**
- 3. Conditions to specify architectural and design details including, stonework, roof materials, windows and door design and finish and rainwater goods**

Key Issues

1. Whether the development has an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling
2. Whether the development has an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area
3. Whether the development has an acceptable impact on the use and safety of the highway.

History

No relevant history.

Consultations

Derbyshire County Council – Highways – Recommend that the extension is set back at least 5m from the highway to provide a parking space or alternatively installs measures to prevent all parking onsite. Whilst this would result in a loss of all on-site parking it is not considered that a refusal based on the lack of parking would be sustainable at appeal. Additionally given the substandard exit visibility from the access, the Highway Authority considers that on balance, and

in this instance only, that there is a benefit of removing traffic movements to and from a substandard access onto a classified road.

Derbyshire Dales District Council – No response at time of writing.

Eyam Parish Council – Object to the proposal on the grounds that by adding the proposed extension to the property, it would infill more than half of the already available parking space, therefore only leaving one space remaining. This will put more vehicles on an already restricted highway sited in very close proximity to a blind bend, already made dangerous by on-street parking.

Main Policies

Core Strategy: GSP1, GSP3, DS1

Policy DS1 allows for the extension of existing buildings in all settlements in the National Park.

Policy GSP1 requires all new development in the National Park to respect and reflect the conservation purpose of the National Park's statutory designation.

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.

Local Plan: LH4, LC4, LC5, LT11

The policies of the development plan are generally permissive of householder development provided it will not harm the character and appearance of the original building or its setting and will not harm the amenities of the site, neighbouring properties or the area (policies LC4 and LH4).

These policies are consistent with the wider range of conservation and design policies in the Development Plan, which promote high standards of design and support development proposals that would be sensitive to the locally distinctive character of the site and its setting and the valued characteristics of the National Park.

Local Plan policy LC5 states that development in conservation areas should assess and clearly demonstrate how the existing appearance of the conservation area will be preserved and, where possible, enhanced.

Policy LT11 Residential parking states that the design and number of parking spaces associated with residential development, including any communal residential parking, must respect the valued characteristics of the area, particularly in Conservation Areas.

National Planning Policy Framework

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 these policies detailed are consistent with the core planning principles set out in paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the policies in the Framework when taken as a whole because both documents seek to secure high quality design, and promote the importance of landscape protection within the National Park.

Assessment

Revised plans have been submitted during the course of the application that adjust the size and position of the infill side extension. These have been submitted in an effort to address the highway matters raised by the Highway Authority.

Impact on character and appearance of building

Rear extension

The rear extension is a simple lean-to of modest size. Whilst it does run the full width of the property, which can detract from a building's legibility, in this case there is not such character that this is considered to detract from its appearance, particularly given the existing out-of-keeping rear extension. Materials would match the house, being a slate roof with gritstone walls, helping to unify the old and new development.

The cut-out in the roof to accommodate the first floor window is unfortunate. The alternatives would be to lower the roof pitch of the extension to avoid it – which would result in an untraditionally low pitch that relates poorly to that of the main house – or to reduce the height of the first floor window, which would result in an uncharacteristically squat window. The approach adopted is considered preferable to these alternatives, and the impact on the appearance of the overall property is not considered to be significant.

Side extension

The extension would infill the existing open carport to the western side of the house. As revised it would be set back from the existing first storey element above. This has allowed the applicant to increase what would otherwise be an undersized parking space in front of the extension to a space that is in accordance with the recommendations of the Highway Authority (this matter is discussed in more detail below). Whilst it would be preferable for the side extension to have an unbroken frontage, the proposal still represents an improvement over the existing carport arrangement by virtue of creating a more traditionally solid appearance. Given this, the subsidiary nature of the extension and the degree of setback from the road, the form is considered to conserve the appearance of the dwelling and site.

In design terms, openings are limited to a single window and door that are appropriately detailed in relation to the house. Overall, the development is considered to conserve the character and appearance of the building, as required by policy LC4.

Impact on character and appearance of Conservation Area

The building is visible within the Conservation Area, although the affected rear elevation is not seen in any public views. Given the limited nature of the changes proposed, the impact on the appearance of the conservation area is not considered to be significant.

Highways

The proposal would result in the loss of one parking space. The Parish Council has objected to the loss of parking on the grounds that it would increase on road parking in what they consider to be a dangerous location.

The Highway Authority has been consulted on the proposal and has advised that a refusal based upon a loss of on-site parking at this site would not be sustainable. Officers agree with this as there is over 30m of visibility from the application site in a westerly direction before the road

bends and visibility reduces. Additionally, the speed limit in force on the road in this location is 30mph.

The Highway Authority commented on the original proposal, which left one sub-standard parking space. In commenting they advised that either the development should be adjusted to provide a large space, or that all onsite parking should be removed by permanently obstructing the driveway. The applicant has revised the scheme to incorporate the former suggestion, overcoming the concerns of the Highway Authority.

Based upon the above, it is considered that the development as revised would not lead to a significant inconvenience to road users, nor would it detract from highway safety.

Other matters

Due to the size, height, and orientation of the extensions they are not considered to affect the amenity of any neighbouring property.

Conclusion

The form, design and size of the extensions are all considered to conserve the character and appearance of the built environment and conservation area as required by the policies of the Development Plan. Officers also consider that, having considered the advice of the Highway Authority, the proposal would not result in a detrimental effect to the use of the highway.

Given these considerations, and having taken account of all other material matters, the application is recommended for approval.

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