

12. FULL APPLICATION - EXTENSION/RE-MODELLING OF LOWER GROUND FLOOR AND RENDERED REAR EXTENSION AT GROUND FLOOR, SPITAL HOUSE, HOW LANE, CASTLETON (NP/HPK/0716/0595 P.8579 415271/ 383091 12/07/2016 DH)

APPLICANT: ALAN BASKERVILLE

Site and Surroundings

Spital House is a mid-terrace red brick Victorian dwelling on How Lane (the A6187), opposite the junction with Weaving Avenue, at the eastern end of the village of Castleton. It lies approximately 20m outside the nearest boundary of Castleton Conservation Area. The property is currently in use as guest house providing 4 rooms for bed and breakfast accommodation. The living quarters for the applicant's family lies to the rear of the property and comprises a kitchen and breakfast room (used for storage) on the ground floor and two bedrooms, a small kitchen and wet room on the lower ground floor. At the rear of the premises there is a yard used for parking at the lower ground floor level. This yard gives access to the two garage spaces contained within a single storey flat roofed extension on the rear of the property, the roof of which forms a terrace for the owner accessed from the kitchen and breakfast room (the breakfast room being a later lean-to extension over the terrace)

The adjacent property known as Talbot House is sited to the immediate south-west of Spital House. It is in the same ownership as Spital House and is also included within the application site area along with Spital House. Talbot house is a four bedroom property that the owner lets out as an 8 person holiday rental property. Both properties front onto How Lane. A water course known as Peaks Hole Water runs to the rear (north) of the properties and access to the rear parking area is via a shared access to the south-west of the property between Talbot House and Swiss House. There are six parking spaces to the rear, comprising a double garage (one is shorter space at 3.8m), a double car port and room for two other vehicles in the yard area tandem parked outside the garage spaces.

Other than Talbot House, the nearest neighbouring properties are Mount View, which is the adjacent end terrace property to the immediate north-east of Spital House, Swiss House, which lies 10m to the south-west of the property, and The Old Police House and 2 Weaving Avenue, which lie on the opposite side of How Lane, to the south-east and south of Spital House respectively.

Proposal

The erection of a single-storey lean-to extension on the terrace to the rear of the property. This extension would be constructed from white rendered walls under a blue slate roof and would extend the existing single-storey lean-to breakfast room sited on the raised terrace, across the rear of Spital House. Plans show the revised accommodation would comprise a dining area and 'snug' with the lean-to form matching the profile of the lean-to across the rear of Talbot house. The extension across Talbot house which is currently in matching red brick would also be rendered to match.

The submitted plans also show proposals to convert part of the existing garage to allow the two existing bedrooms on the lower ground floor to be made slightly larger and to create a new entrance hall. The garage and terrace would be extended out by a further 2m to accommodate the 2 garage spaces, now both full size, which would be pushed out by the lower ground floor bedroom and bathroom extension.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions / modifications:

1. **The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years of the date of the permission.**
2. **The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the submitted plans, drawing numbers BHC_PL007 (proposed lower ground floor plan), BHC_PL008 (proposed ground floor plan), BHC_PL009 (proposed roof plan), and BHC_PL010 (proposed elevations), received by the National Park Authority on 29th June 2016 and subject to the following amendments;**
 - i) **The walls of the lean-to extension shall be clad with red brick to match the main house.**
 - ii) **Rooflights to be conservation type and fitted flush with the roof slope.**
3. **The development shall not be carried out other than in complete accordance with specifications for minor design details including specifications for construction materials, external doors and windows, and rainwater goods.**
4. **The existing garaging shown on the approved plans shall be retained for the garaging of domestic vehicles throughout the lifetime of the development hereby permitted.**

Key Issues

- Whether the proposed development would detract from the character, appearance or amenity of Spital House, its setting or neighbouring properties.
- Whether the parking arrangements are acceptable

History

Spital House and Talbot House were originally one house known as Spital House.

1992/3 - The original house received planning permission for the construction of a garage in (NP/HPK/0003/2056) and later, a double garage to the rear of the property (NP/HPK/0003/2971).

2005 - Planning permission granted to subdivide the original house into two dwellings (NP/HPK/0105/0100).

2007 – permission granted to sub-divide Spital House into one dwelling and one guest house (NP/HPK/0407/0321). Spital House was subsequently divided into Talbot House and Spital House.

Consultations

Highway Authority - Notes the shared access and the current 6 parking spaces, including that the 2 garage spaces are blocked by the 2 vehicles parking in the yard. Recognise that the proposal results in a reduced area for parking and turning and whilst the parking arrangements are not ideal in either the existing or proposed layout it is considered that an objection based on this would not be sustainable at appeal. On this basis do not wish to raise objections.

District Council – No response to date

Parish Council – Object on the grounds of layout and density of buildings, the overshadowing and overbearing presence near a common boundary that is to the detriment of the neighbours and the loss of privacy and loss of light.

Representations

One letter of objection has been received which considers the development will result in loss of light to the neighbouring property to the north-east and be overbearing.

Main Policies

The property is currently used as a guest house providing bed and breakfast accommodation for visiting guests so it does not benefit from householder permitted development rights but Policy RT2(B) of the Authority's Core Strategy is permissive of appropriate minor developments which extend or make quality improvements to existing holiday accommodation.

By virtue of a condition attached to the permission (NP/HPK/0407/0321), the guest house use has to cease in the event the applicant sells the adjacent Talbot House, Spital House would then revert back to use as an ordinary dwelling house (.). Aside from the current use of the property, Spital House retains the character and appearance of a dwelling house in all other respects. Therefore, it is also appropriate to consider the current application with due regard to the provisions of Local Plan policy LH4 – Alterations and extensions to dwellings and LC4 – Design, layout and landscaping considerations.

In principle, DS1 of the Core Strategy is supportive of extensions to existing buildings and policy LH4 of the Local Plan provides specific criteria for assessing extensions to extensions to house including outbuildings. LH4 says 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 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.

The Authority has adopted three supplementary planning documents (SPD) that offer design guidance on householder development namely the Design Guide, the Building Design Guide and the Detailed Design Guide on Alterations and Extensions. This guidance offers specific criteria for assessing the impacts of householder development on neighbouring properties.

Wider Policy Context

The provisions of policies DS1 and LH4 and guidance in the Authority's adopted SPD are supported by a wider range of design and conservation policies in the Development Plan including policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3 and L1 of the Core Strategy and policy LC4 of the Local Plan, which promote and encourage sustainable development that would be sensitive to the locally distinctive building traditions of the National Park and its landscape setting. Policy LC4 and GSP3 also say the impact of a development proposal on the living conditions of other residents is a further important consideration in the determination of this planning application.

As the proposed development would be close to the boundary of the Conservation Area, policy L3 of the Core Strategy and Local Plan policy LC5 also have some relevance. These policies seek to ensure the existing character and appearance of the Conservation Area will be preserved and, where possible, enhanced, including its setting and important views into or out of the area. Local Plan policy LT18 otherwise says safe access and adequate parking provision are a pre-requisite of any new development in the National Park.

These policies are consistent with national planning policies in the Framework (the National Planning Policy Framework) not least because core planning principles in the Framework require local planning authorities to always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings; and to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations.

Assessment

Single-Storey Extension

The proposed ground floor extension replaces an existing red brick and blue slate lean-to at the rear of Spital House, following the same form and linking as before to the lean-to across the back of Talbot House. The outer walls would now be constructed in block finished with a white render under a blue slate roof. The existing brick lean-to across the rear of Talbot house would also be rendered to match. The new extension would have two large openings in the rear wall, one fitted with three folding doors with full length glazing opening and one further pair of double doors with full length glazing both opening out onto the terrace. The roof would be fitted with three rooflights.

The proposed extension would not provide any additional bedroom accommodation and would accommodate a single dining table for guests. Consequently, the proposals would not give rise to any significant intensification of the current uses of the property because they would not be increasing the amount of visitor accommodation or ancillary living accommodation. Therefore, there are no overriding objections to the principle of the extension which can be considered to be a minor development which would extend or make quality improvements to existing holiday accommodation permitted by policy RT2(B) of the Core Strategy. Nonetheless, any approval for the current application would be subject to normal planning considerations such as design of the extension and its potential impact on the character, appearance and amenities of the property and the local area.

Whilst there are no objections to the form or massing of the design the proposed use of white render would not be in keeping with the red brick walls of the Spital House. Although the extension would be a relatively modest addition to the existing building it should still harmonise with its existing character and appearance and to ensure this, a condition specifying the use of a matching red brick is suggested. Subject to this amendment the extension would simply extend the length of the existing lean-to and would be constructed from materials to match the existing. The full length glazed doors would also look more in keeping with the property than the existing windows in the rear of the building. The rooflights would be reasonably well related to the doors in the lean-to below and to the existing windows above, however, given their location on a traditional property close to the edge of the conservation area it is considered important that they are fitted flush with the roofline and are of a conservation type. A condition to secure this detail is recommended.

By virtue of the siting of the proposed development at the rear of the building, and its relatively modest size and scale, the extension and associated alterations to the existing lean-to would have a limited impact on the setting of the property and would not have any impact on the special qualities of the nearby Conservation Area. Similarly, the siting and the size and scale of the extension means that the extension would not block any significant amount of natural light to the neighbouring properties. The extension would be sited on the north facing elevation of Spital House and therefore the extension would not block light from the sun that is not already blocked by the existing building already.

Although it is acknowledged the extension would be sited on a raised terrace, it would only extend out from the existing building by three metres to match the depth of the existing lean-to, it would be single-storey in height and would have a mono-pitch roof with a low eaves height.

Taking these factors into account, and taking into account the orientation of the extension relative to the nearest neighbouring properties, the absence of any windows facing directly towards the proposed extension and the intervening distances between any other windows, the extension would not be unduly overbearing. In these respects, it is not considered that the proposals would impact on the quiet enjoyment of any other property so substantially by virtue of the size and scale of the extension or constitute over development of the property to such an extent that planning permission should be refused on amenity grounds for these reasons.

Taking into account there is an existing raised terrace and a range of windows at ground floor level and above in Spital House that are already north facing, it is not considered that the introduction of glazed doors or the rooflights could result in a loss of privacy as there is already a high degree of overlooking experienced by any property broadly to the north of Spital House. The gable end of the extension would be a blank wall so any properties beyond the end of the extension, including the immediately adjacent Mount View, would not experience any loss of privacy because there would be no additional windows facing out of the extension in a north easterly direction.

It is concluded that the proposed extension meets the requirements of the relevant policies in the Development Plan because it would not detract from the character, appearance or amenity of the original building, its setting or neighbouring buildings and in all other respects; the proposed extension would be of an appropriate design that would harmonise with the existing property.

Alterations to Lower Ground Floor

The submitted plans show proposals to extend the guest house into part of the existing double garage at lower ground floor level, with the consequent extension of the garage and terrace out by 2m in the yard using matching materials. The plans show that the two existing bedrooms at lower ground floor would be re-modelled by converting part of the existing garage and an entrance hall would be provided. The yard provides off-road parking for two cars. The proposals would result in the loss of some yard space that could be used by the two cars but essentially no change in circumstances as the existing arrangement is not ideal and the outside yard parking spaces would block the garage spaces with or without the proposed development.

The proposed extension to the flat roof is modest addition to the existing extension and considered acceptable in scale, design and its impact on neighbouring properties. The alterations to the bedrooms would take place within the existing building so there is no likelihood that these would have any visual impact or any direct impact on any neighbouring property. Although the two bedrooms on the lower ground floor would be slightly larger than the existing bedrooms, the proposals would not give rise to any significant intensification of the current uses of the property because they would not be increasing the amount of visitor accommodation or ancillary living accommodation. Therefore, the main issue with regard to these proposals is whether the rearranged layout of the existing off-road parking spaces means that there would no longer be adequate off-road parking provision for the guest house, and as such, whether these proposals could be considered to be over development of the property.

In the first instance, the Highway Authority has no objection to these proposals but has stated very clearly that the parking arrangements are not ideal in either the existing or proposed layouts. This is because in the existing situation, two of the six spaces available at the property would be 'blocked in', as noted above, and there is also a limited amount of space at the rear of the property to manoeuvre cars off the public highway. In the proposed situation, two of the six spaces proposed would block in the four spaces that would be retained in the existing garaging and car port because they would be sited within the limited amount of manoeuvring space for vehicles at the rear of the property.

The current proposals would be difficult to refuse on the grounds of inadequate parking provision because they would not provide additional accommodation or a loss of parking spaces and in

these terms, the proposed parking arrangements are not materially different from the existing arrangement in terms of how they would generate demand for additional off-site parking or how they would affect other highway users.

In summary, although parking on-street does occur to the front of the property, there are Traffic Regulation Orders restricting parking in the vicinity and the proposals would not result in any additional on-street parking compared to the current situation. Moreover, there are a number of guest houses and properties offering bed and breakfast accommodation that do not have adequate on-site parking provision for guests in Castleton and the National Park more generally. It is therefore not uncommon for visitors to park elsewhere in the local area and in some settlements and villages, this does cause a problem. However, there is a significant amount of public parking in Castleton within walking distance of Spital House that would mitigate concerns about where guests will park overnight.

To a lesser extent, concerns about demand for parking at the property is mitigated by the fact that Castleton also has reasonable public transport connections, which means that visitors to Spital House would not be totally dependent on a car. Therefore, because the proposals would not lead to additional demand for parking spaces, they would not create any significant amount additional accommodation, there is public parking available in the settlement, and not every guest would be dependent on a car, it is difficult to sustain an objection to the current application because it would lead to additional on-street parking or that it would make the current situation any worse through over development of the property, for example.

In terms of highway safety concerns, the Highway Authority has made no further comments on the suitability of the access to the property and even though the Highway Authority considers the parking arrangements to be less than ideal; there is no suggestion that these arrangements would lead to any road safety hazards. Therefore, granting planning permission for the proposals would not conflict with the specific provisions of Local Plan policy LT18, which requires safe access and adequate parking provision for all new development in the National Park.

In all other respects, the proposed alterations to the property are considered to be appropriate minor developments which would extend and make quality improvements to the existing accommodation at Spital House that is permitted by policy RT2(B) of the Core Strategy.

Conclusion

It is therefore concluded that the application meets the requirements of policies in the Development Plan and national planning policies in the Framework because the proposed extensions and associated alterations constitute appropriate minor developments which would make quality improvements to the existing guest house that would not harm the valued characteristics of the local area through over development or a substantially more intensive use of the existing property. Subject to the above mentioned conditions covering the detailed design of the rooflights and specifying the walling to be matching red brick in the lean-to, the proposals would also meet the specific requirements of LC4 and LH4 dealing with design matters and extensions to houses because they would not detract from the character, appearance or amenity of the existing house, its setting or neighbouring properties. Accordingly, the revised application is recommended for conditional 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