
9. FULL APPLICATION - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE AND ERECTION OF NEW TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT 14 PARK ROAD, BAKEWELL (NP/DDD/1016/0974 P.5903E 421779 / 368025 22/11/2016 LB)

APPLICANT: MR AND MRS JOHN HUTCHINSON

Site and Surroundings

14 Park Road is a modern (1960s) detached dwelling located in a relatively prominent position on Park Road, overlooking Woodside Close, south east of Bakewell town centre, within Bakewell's Development Boundary but outside of the designated Conservation Area. It is part of a modern housing estate of houses, bungalows and split-level dwellings

The property is constructed from artificial stone under an asymmetrical pitched roof with Hardrow tiles, brown Upvc windows and black rainwater goods. A single storey flat roofed garage and entrance projects off the eastern gable and a single storey lean-to projects off the western gable. A yard area to the south west of the dwelling provides a parking area and access off the highway. A large terraced garden is located to the south east of the dwelling.

The nearest neighbouring dwellings are No.12 Park Road, approximately 4 metres to the east, (at its nearest point) and No. 16 Park Road, approximately 4 metres to the west. No.12 Park Road, a detached dwelling under an asymmetrical roof, has a single storey flat roof extension which projects off the western gable providing a kitchen and a single storey flat roofed garage projecting off the eastern gable. No. 16 also has an asymmetrical roof and a single storey flat roofed extension which projects off the eastern gable providing a garage. Due to the steep nature of Park Road the dwellings are staggered in both height and location.

Proposal

The application proposes the erection of an asymmetrical pitched roof over the existing flat roofed garage. On the road facing elevation (south west) the proposed development would have the appearance of a single storey garage attached to the house and at the rear the proposed development would read as a typical two storey side extension.

The extension will measure 4.9 metres wide x 9.2 metres long, 6.8 metres to the ridge and an eaves height of 3 metres at the front of the dwelling and 4.8 metres at the rear.

The extension will be constructed from artificial stone to match the existing under a Hardrow tile roof with Upvc fenestration. Amended plans show a single leaf door and garage door will be maintained on the south west elevation. Double glazed doors and sidelights are proposed at ground floor on the north eastern elevation with a window serving the first floor. Four roof lights are also proposed. The extension will provide a reception room, bedroom and en-suite.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions;

- 1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within 3 years from the date of this permission.**
- 2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the amended plan, drawing number '1617-02 'D' titled 'Prop Details' received by the Authority 22 November 2016, and submitted plan titled 'Block Plan', received by the Authority on the 4 October 2016; subject to the following conditions;**

3. The door openings shall be provided with a natural gritstone lintel.
4. All new stonework shall be in natural or artificial gritstone faced, coursed and pointed to match the existing stonework.
5. The roof shall be clad with Hardrow slate to match the existing.
6. The rainwater goods shall be black. The gutters shall be fixed directly to the stonework with brackets and without the use of fascia boards. There shall be no projecting or exposed rafters.
7. The roof light(s) shall be fitted flush with the roof slope.

Key Issues

- Whether the proposed development would be of an appropriate scale, form and design which would conserve the character, appearance and amenity of the host property, (i.e. 14 Park Road), its setting and nearby Bakewell Conservation Area and would not otherwise harm the amenities of the neighbouring properties and in particular the amenities of 12 Park Road, Bakewell and 16 Park Road, Bakewell.

History

NP/DDD/0606/0539: Single storey extension and alterations; granted conditionally.

Consultations

Highway Authority – No objection subject to no loss of parking.

District Council – No response to date.

Bakewell Town Council – Object to the proposal on the grounds it will cause overshadowing / loss of light and be an overbearing presence near a common boundary that is to the detriment of neighbours. It is further felt it will overlook a neighbouring property potentially resulting in a loss of privacy.

Representations

The Authority has received 3 letters of representation.

Representations from No. 12 Park Road, Bakewell state:

'Our house (No.12) sits below our neighbours house next door (No.14) by over one metre, due to the gradient of Park Road (see photos 1 & 2 enclosed). A double storey extension built at the side of their house and particularly the closer, higher roof, would overwhelm our property, because our house starts off lower before any such extension'.

'Our kitchen, on the same side as the proposed extension and built in 1980, had roof light domes installed to ensure sufficient daylight entered the kitchen. Because the proposed extension would come much closer to our house and would be significantly higher, we believe that the daylight in our kitchen, especially the dining area, would be detrimentally affected. The proposed height of the extension would, we believe, also affect the amount of light entering our upstairs side windows'

‘The architect, who drew the plans for No. 14, stated on Form DAI that the proposals for (No.14) will be ‘slightly’ higher than the existing structure and will therefore be more apparent to neighbour at the immediate east (that is us at No.12). That we believe, was an understatement. He goes on to say that it will not affect the amenity of the neighbour to enjoy their property’s they currently do. That is his view, but we at No. 12 have to disagree. His statements do not take into consideration, nor do his plans show, the relative differences in base height between No. 12 and No.14 and how building closer and higher will exacerbate the impact of that’.

‘The side patio retaining wall belonging to No.14 is in poor condition. If the extension wall is built where proposed, there is a concern that the stress on the retaining wall will cause it to fail, endangering anyone passing along the neighbouring path at the time’.

A further representation letter was also received from No. 12 which expressed concerns that *‘If the proposed extension goes ahead, then their new wall (behind their garage) will be just 1.7 metres from my kitchen wall and just over 4 metres from my side bedroom windows’.*

Furthermore *‘houses in the immediate locality of Park Road being substantially increased in size. The concerns I have regarding this are that Number 14 will look out of place between its’ neighbours. Also, that the proposed extension will take away any view that houses across the road has of the hills across the park. Lastly, that if permission is granted this will be the beginning of ‘big house creep’ all the way down this part of Park Road. For it is surely the case that when the current occupants of Numbers 16 & 12 eventually vacate, new owners will rely on the precedents set by existing developments. Park Road will then become overdeveloped with consequences on parking, traffic and quality of life’.*

Officers note that the concerns from No. 12 Park Road in regard to the stress on their retaining wall from the proposed extension is a building regulations matter and not a material planning consideration.

A representation letter from No. 23 Park Road expresses concerns as the proposed development would block their view which may also affect the value of their property. Officers consider that the concerns from No. 23 Park Road in regard to view and value are not material planning considerations and therefore cannot be taken into account when assessing the application.

Main Policies

Core Strategy

GSP1, GSP2 and GSP3, 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. In principle, DS1 of the Core Strategy is supportive of extensions to existing buildings.

Local Plan policy LH4 provides specific criteria for assessing extensions to dwellings. 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.

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.

Assessment

Design

The amended plan shows an extension which will project off the south east elevation of the property. The proposed form and design of the addition will mirror that of the dwelling due to the proposed asymmetrical roof which will maintain the simple character and appearance of the dwelling. The footprint of the extension matches that of the existing garage at the front of the property, maintaining the same width and south west building line as existing, but projects northwards resulting in a two storey extension at the rear of the dwelling, creating a simple addition and plan of a modest size.

As the extension is set back from the front elevation (south west) by 1.8 metres and the rear (north east) 350mm, with the ridge set below at 0.5 metres and eaves set below at 1 metres (maximum distance) from the existing, it will be clearly subservient to the form and massing of the dwelling it will serve. Overall it is considered that the proposed extension would sit comfortably on the side of the dwelling and would not look out of place. Therefore the proposals are in compliance with the general principles of LC4, LH4, GSP1 and GSP3.

Furthermore, officers consider that the scale, form and design of the extension are in keeping with the styles of the surrounding properties on Park Road. In particular a very similar extension in terms of design, form and scale was approved, and built, at No. 20 Park Road in 2007, (NP/DDD/1007/0931). Officers consider that the current proposal will not appear out of place within its immediate setting or detract from the surrounding street scene and views in and out of the area. Moreover, the addition of a pitched roof would provide enhancement to the dwelling.

The extension is also supported by Local Plan Policy LC4 (i) which pays particular attention to scale, form, mass and orientation of the proposal and, (iii) the degree to which design, materials and finishes will reflect the style of the building.

In terms of its design there are no sustainable objections to the size and scale of the extension, (as noted above) so the key issue in terms of compliancy with design conservation policies is whether the detailed treatment is appropriate.

Initially, submitted plans proposed a small projecting conservatory on the rear of the extension. Officers raised objection to this as it was considered to detract from the proposed extension and subsequently has been removed and replaced with simple glazed doors and side lights which are considered acceptable. The rear elevation also proposes a window at first floor and two roof lights which raise no objection as this mimics the size and style of other openings in the dwelling and the surrounding area. The front elevation almost mimics the existing; a single entrance door will be provided alongside a garage door, which raises no objection.

The proposed material for all fenestration and doors is UPVC which in this case is considered acceptable. The house is outside Bakewell Conservation Area, and as all the existing windows in the property and the surrounding are UPVC, it is considered this material would not detract from the character or appearance of the property or its setting. The roof lights also raise no objection. However, if approved, it is considered necessary to attach a condition to ensure they are flush with the roof slope to maintain a high level of design and to reduce any prominence they may have. The proposed materials for the walls and roof are to match the existing and the proposed location and dimensions of proposed openings raise no concern.

Furthermore, Officers consider the extension meets the requirements of Policy GSP2 of the Core Strategy as the extension would result the loss of the existing flat roofed garage, replacing it with a pitched roof structure and overall enhancing the property.

Taking all these factors into account, it is considered that the proposed two storey extension would be constructed from materials that are deemed to be acceptable in this case and would have a simple design of appropriate form and massing, which would provide a subsidiary extension which would not harm the character and appearance of the dwelling, its setting or the surrounding area, in accordance with the principles set out in LH4 and LC4 of the Local Plan, and GSP1 and GSP3 of the Core Strategy.

Neighbourliness

Local Plan LC4 states where proposals are acceptable, particular attention must be paid to the amenity, privacy and security of the development and of nearby properties. In this case considerable concerns have been raised from the neighbouring property No. 12 Park Road, in regard to the possibility that the proposed extension will have a great impact upon their amenity due to potential overbearing, and loss of daylight to the ground floor kitchen and secondary bedroom, both located in the north west part of the dwelling.

Officers have visited No. 12 to assess how the proposed extension may affect the internal living spaces and external amenity areas of the dwelling. Due to the elevated position of No. 14 Park Road above the ground level of No. 12 Park Road, (due to the steep nature of Park Road itself) officers do acknowledge that the proposed extension may result in some overbearing presence to the external space at the front of the dwelling, (orientated south west), particularly within the small yard area which provides access to the kitchen and storage for bins as in this space the ground level is set much lower than the driveway of No. 12 Park Road, or the ground level of the neighbouring property No. 14 Park Road. Officers also acknowledge there may also be some overbearing along the access down the side of the dwelling against the western elevation of No. 12 Park Road due to the narrow width between the properties and neighbouring boundary. However, it will be limited as the extension will be located approximately 3 metres away and does not extend the full length of the north west elevation due to the staggered position of the dwellings and the height south of the extension is 1 metres below the existing dwelling.

Officers further conclude that these spaces are mainly used for access purposes and are not considered to be the main external amenity space to the dwelling which is the large garden located to the north east of the dwelling. With regards to this garden space, officers conclude that that the proposal will not have any effect upon this area as the garden is set forward of the location of the extension due to the staggered nature of the properties.

In regards to the single storey extension which provides a kitchen space to No. 12 Park Road, officers do not consider that the extension would result in the loss of a significant amount of natural light as the room is served by two large light tunnels, a partially opaque glazed door and a window which overlooks the garden space at the rear of the dwelling, which is not in close relation to the extension. As the south west roof slope of the extension is also stepped down 1 metre from the dwelling it is considered that it will not block significant amounts of daylight entering the kitchen.

Furthermore, officers also conclude that due to the staggered position of the dwellings, the location and scale of the extension would not result in significant overbearing or loss of light to the secondary bedroom located north west of the dwelling of the neighbouring property No. 12 Park Road. The bedroom is served by three windows, two located on the western elevation, of which both are obscurely glazed and one on the rear (north) elevation of the dwelling which is clear glazed. It is clear from the plans that the location of the extension would not result in the obstruction of two windows in the north west corner of the room serving the bedroom. Furthermore, the third obscurely glazed window would approximately overlook the northern elevation of the extension and would be approximately 4 metres away which is not considered to be result in significant overbearing or loss of light harming the amenity of the room.

Whilst visiting No. 12 Park Road the residents also raised concern that a 1st floor bathroom, which was served by an obscurely glazed window on the western elevation would result in loss of light from the proposed extension. The window will be located approximately 4 metres away from the extension which officers consider to be a significant distance not and as the bathroom is not considered to be a key amenity space within the dwelling officers consider the proposal would not result in significant harm to the room. Officers also conclude that there will be no loss in privacy from the extension onto No. 12 as no windows are proposed on the eastern elevation.

Overall officers conclude that proposed extension may result in some overbearing to the external space serving the kitchen at the front of the dwelling and the access down the side of the property, but the officers do not consider that this is sufficient to warrant refusal. Officers consider that the main amenity spaces to the dwelling, such as the living room and garden, will not be affected by the proposal. Therefore officers conclude that the proposed extension meets the requirements stated and is in accordance LC4 and GSP3.

Conclusion

The proposed development is of a sufficiently high standard of design, would not detract from the character, appearance or amenity of the original building, its setting, nearby Conservation Area or that of neighbouring buildings, in particular No. 12 Park Road, Bakewell or No. 16 Park Road, Bakewell. The proposed development would not create any highway safety issues. There are no further material conditions which indicate that planning should be refused. Therefore the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the development plan, (Core Strategy Policies GSP1, GSP2 GSP3, & DS1, and Local Plan Policies LH4, LC4, LC5).

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