# 13. FULL APPLICATION - NEW GARDEN SHED AND PORCH AT STATION HOUSE, STATION ROAD, UPPER PADLEY, GRINDLEFORD (NP/DDD/0616/0556, P.8975, 425010 / 378826, 22/08/2016/AM)

Applicant: Michael Clark

## **Site and Surroundings**

Station House is located adjacent to Grindleford railway station and within the designated Grindleford Station Conservation Area.

The property is a detached dwelling constructed from natural gritstone and dark stained horizontally boarded timber cladding under a pitched roof clad with natural blue slate. The house is set within a large domestic curtilage and to the rear is a large stone built outbuilding which has recently been extended and converted to two dwellings without the benefit of planning permission. A timber shed has also been erected within the curtilage of the property and is the subject of this application.

Access to the property is via shared track which joins the highway to the east. The nearest neighbouring properties in this case are the Midland Cottages to the west of the red-edged application site.

## **Proposal**

This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a garden shed and a porch to Station House. The garden shed has already been erected and therefore this application is partially retrospective and seeks to retain the shed.

The shed is sited in the south-western corner of the site and is constructed from timber walls under a pitched roof clad with blue slate. The shed measures 3.5m wide by 5m long.

The proposed porch would be located on the front of the dwelling and would be constructed to match the appearance of the existing conservatory located to the side of the dwelling. The glazed roof and upper walls would have uPVC frames to match the conservatory above stone dwarf walls to match the stonework of the existing house. The porch would measure 2.7m wide by 1.5m deep.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The development shall be carried out in accordance with specified approved plans.
- 2. The window and door frames to the porch shall be finished to match the existing conservatory.
- 3. The stone work for the porch shall be natural gritstone, faced, coursed, laid and pointed to match the existing dwelling.
- 4. Notwithstanding the submitted plans no planning permission is granted for any change of use within the application site or any alterations or extensions to buildings within the application site other than in relation to the proposed porch and garden shed.

#### **Key Issues**

- Whether the proposed development would conserve the character, appearance and amenity of the existing building, its setting and that of neighbouring properties.
- Whether the proposed development would conserve the designated Grindleford Station Conservation Area.

# **History**

1996: NP/DDD/0996/389: Planning permission granted conditionally for extension to dwelling and provision of garage, stable block and store.

2005: NP/DDD/0705/0748: Planning permission granted conditionally for conservatory.

2013: NP/DDD/1013/0903: Planning permission granted conditionally for alterations and extension to existing outbuildings.

2014: NP/DDD/0114/0061: Planning permission granted conditionally for alterations and extension to existing outbuildings

2014: NP/DDD/0814/0901: Planning permission refused for new store and workshop extension.

April 2015: NP/DDD/0215/0089: Planning permission granted conditionally for new store and workshop extension.

December 2015: The Authority became aware that the building was being extended and converted not in accordance with the approved extensions. Following investigations the applicant was advised that it appeared that the building had been converted and extended to form two dwellings and that this represented a different and unauthorised development to that previously approved.

August 2016: Retrospective planning permission refused for conversion of part of outbuilding to holiday let and ancillary accommodation.

August 2016: Retrospective planning permission refused for extension to existing workshop/store/office.

#### **Consultations**

Highway Authority – No objections.

District Council - No response to date.

Parish Council - Recommend refusal. The Parish Council strongly object to this application due to the over-development of the site. Despite a lack of details in the plans submitted, the "shed" is very large & is totally out of scale with the existing buildings & surrounding environment.

# **Representations**

Two letters of representation have been received to date; both object to the proposed development. The reasons for objection are summarised below, the letters can be read in full on the website.

- The proposed shed is a substantial building and could be used for other purposes such as accommodating people which would result in additional traffic causing congestion on the access track, noise and overloading a small residential area.
- The proposed shed is out of keeping with the architecture in the Conservation Area, destroying the front view of the traditional railway house from the station.
- Object to the fact that the shed has been built without planning permission.
- The porch would add to the out of scale over-development of the site.

## **Main Policies**

Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP3, L1 and L3

Relevant Local Plan policies: LC4, LC5, LH4, LT11 and LT18

## 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 in this case there is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and more recent policy in the Framework with regard to the issues that are raised because both documents seek to promote a high standard of design which conserves the valued characteristics of the National Park.

GSP3 and LC4 together say that all development must respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings subject to the development proposal. Particular attention will be paid to impact on the character and setting of buildings, scale of development, design in accordance with the design guide and the impact upon living conditions of communities. L1 says that all development must conserve the landscape character of the National Park.

LH4 is directly relevant to the proposals and allows for extensions and alterations to existing dwellings provided that:

- i. detract from the character, appearance or amenity of the original building, its setting or neighboring buildings; or
- ii. dominate the original dwelling where it is of architectural, historic or vernacular merit; or
- iii. amount to the creation of a separate dwelling or an annexe that could be used as a separate dwelling.

L3 and LC5 together seek to ensure that all development conserves and where possible enhances the National Park's designated heritage assets including its Conservation Areas. Development which would have a harmful impact upon significance should be refused unless there are exceptional circumstances.

The Authority's design guide (2007) and Alterations and Extensions Detailed Design Guide (2014) have been formally adopted by the Authority and therefore are relevant material considerations in the determination of this application. The Grindleford Station Conservation Area Appraisal is also a relevant material consideration.

# **Assessment**

The design and appearance of Station House does not reflect the local vernacular but does reflect built development related to the railway and therefore is an important building of historic significance within the designated Grindleford Station Conservation Area. The design of the dwelling along with the use of timber cladding reflects 'railway architecture' found in the National Park.

The proposed porch would be located on the front of the dwelling and would be designed to appear as a modest sized glazed structure of a similar design and detailing to the existing conservatory which was granted planning permission in 2005. The porch would be sited in front of the existing door and window but the glazed design would reduce the visual impact of the structure such that it would not be intrusive or harm the character or appearance of the existing building. The detailed design of the porch would result in a light-weight structure which reflect the existing conservatory which is considered to be acceptable subject to the window and door frames matching the dark finish of the conservatory and the stonework for the dwarf wall matching the existing house.

The shed is sited to the front and side of the dwelling in a position where it is visible from the station platform and from the track which runs around the property. However due to the high hedge around the site only the slate clad pitched roof is visible from these vantage points. The size of the building is not considered to be dominant when read in front of the dwelling and the fact that the shed is set to the side of the dwelling means that it does not interfere with either key views of Station House or its historic relationship with the station itself. Therefore while the structure is a relatively large shed it is not considered that it would result in a dominant or harmful impact upon the setting of Station House or the Conservation Area.

The use of timber is considered to be acceptable for a garden shed especially in the context of the existing house, the upper part of which is timber clad. The timber for the shed is currently unfinished and has a bright appearance which will weather down with time. Alternatively the timberwork could be required to be finished a dark colour to match the house if this is considered to be necessary to make the shed acceptable.

It is therefore considered that subject to conditions neither the proposed shed nor the porch would result in over-development of the site or harm the character or appearance of Station House or its setting within the Conservation Area.

Given the distance between the shed and porch to the nearest neighbouring properties and the intervening hedge there are no concerns that the proposal would result in any loss of sunlight or daylight or privacy which could harm the amenity of neighbouring properties. Officers note concerns in regard to the potential future use of the shed, however the proposal is for a garden shed and must be determined on its own merits. Neither the proposed shed nor the porch would affect existing parking or access arrangements and therefore Officers agree with the Highway Authority that there are no objections to the proposals on highway safety grounds.

As the development is partially retrospective, if permission is granted it would not be necessary to impose the statutory time limit for implementation. Conditions would be required to secure the proposed plans along with the design details outlined above. The submitted plans include alterations to the two storey outbuilding at the rear of the site which were recently refused planning permission. If permission is granted a condition would be recommended to state that no permission is granted for any alteration, extension or change of use of that building for clarity and the avoidance of doubt.

#### Conclusion

It is considered that subject to conditions that the proposed development would conserve the character, appearance and amenity of the existing building, its setting and that of neighbouring properties and that the development would conserve the significance of the designated Grindleford Station Conservation Area in accordance with policies GSP3, L3, LC4, LC5 and LH4. The proposed development would not harm highway safety or affect existing parking arrangements.

The proposed development is therefore considered to be in accordance with the development plan. In the absence of any further material considerations the proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable and therefore recommended for approval subject to the conditions outlined in this report.

# **Human Rights**

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

<u>List of Background Papers</u> (not previously published)

Nil