

**15. Full Application – Proposed First Floor Extension to Existing Double Garage, Proposed Porch and Internal Alterations at Bakestonedale Farm, Pott Shrigley, (NP/CEC/0814/0869), P597, 396223 / 379517/SC**

**APPLICANT: MRS JUDITH WHITTAKER**

This application is brought to the Committee because the views of the Parish Council are contrary to the Officer recommendation.

**Site and Surroundings**

Bakestonedale Farm is part of a traditional group of buildings now separated into two dwellings; the other dwelling is now known as Manor Farm. The properties are sited in open countryside approx. 1.8km east of Pott Shrigley on the minor road to Kettlethulme (Bakestonedale Road). The application building is a detached outbuilding lying within the curtilage approximately 8m east of the farmhouse. The outbuilding comprises of a two storey traditional stone roofed former barn with later 1970s double garage attached to the east having a pitched blue slate roof at right angles to the old barn.

The two storey barn element of the outbuilding is in use as additional living accommodation to the house with a dining/kitchen, living room and toilet on the ground floor with spiral stair up to a bedroom and office. The outbuilding is cut into rising ground such that the land at the rear is at first floor level and is held back by a retaining wall a short distance off the back of the building. Halfway up the rear gable of the barn a stainless steel flue exits the building and runs up the outside wall to discharge above the roofline.

**Proposal**

A first floor extension over the garage to provide extended living space on the first floor level for the ancillary living accommodation in the outbuilding. The extension would provide a single large room which would accommodate a combined living room, kitchen and dining space and be accessed through a new internal door opening from the original outbuilding. The additional accommodation would enable the provision of a self-contained dependant relative unit over the first floor on one level. It is intended this would be occupied by the applicant's elderly mother who would move out of the main farmhouse to live semi-independently with close support from her family.

Whilst the form of the extension would match that of the existing garage, with a conventional pitched roof slope at the front running at right angles to the taller barn roof, a gable form has been introduced across the full width of the rear roof slope. The new room would be lit by 2 windows and two rooflights in the front, road facing elevation, and a single window in the gable end. At the rear, patio doors in the new gable would give access onto a small decked area that would span the gap to the retaining wall whilst allowing light underneath to the existing rear garage windows. The submitted plans also show the internal layout of the existing outbuilding changed with the existing first floor office omitted to create a first floor bathroom alongside the existing bedroom. Downstairs the existing living room, WC and kitchen/dining areas would remain. The spiral staircase would be replaced by a conventional stairway (although not shown on the plans, the supporting information states this will allow the fitting of a chair lift).

Outside, a pitched roof porch extension is proposed on the roadside facing gable elevation of the outbuilding.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**That the application be REFUSED for the following reason:**

- 1. The proposed garage extension, by virtue of its overall size, massing and design, would unacceptably dominate the existing traditional outbuilding which, along with the inappropriate porch, would cause harm to its valued character, appearance and its setting to the detriment of the National Park thereby conflicting with Core Strategy Policy GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L3, Saved Local Plan Policies LC4 and LH4.**

### **Key Issues**

Scale, design and external appearance of the proposal on the existing outbuilding and its setting.

### **History**

1978 – Approval for double garage attached to the existing traditional outbuilding.

2004 - Application to convert the whole of the traditional outbuilding to an ancillary dwelling with further accommodation in the form of a first floor extension over the garage building and the addition to a large porch extension to the gable (road facing) elevation. Officers raised objections to the scale of the extension and the principle of the porch, considering that the accommodation exceeded that which was considered reasonably necessary to provide basic ancillary accommodation for a family member. Revised plans were subsequently submitted omitting both extensions and approval was given to convert the traditional outbuilding to additional living accommodation, restricted by condition to be ancillary to the main dwelling.

### **Consultations**

Highway Authority – No response to date

Parish Council – Recommends approval provided the main building and garage remain as one planning unit.

### **Representations**

Supporting information from agent.

This explains that the accommodation is the applicant's elderly mother who resides with the applicant at Bakestonedale Farm. The applicant's mother is in her 80's and requires the assistance of her daughter for general day to day living. She is also quite unsteady on her feet and needs to live on one level. Recently she has become increasingly less able to cope with living in the main property due to the number of internal level changes.

The extension of the garage would allow the mother to live across the first floor of the barn and first floor of the garage with all accommodation on one level (bedroom, shower room, living room and kitchen). A stair lift would be included to allow for access from ground to first floor.

### **Main Policies**

#### **National Planning Policy Framework**

It is considered that in this case, there is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and Government guidance in the NPPF.

Section 7 of the NPPF requires good design, whilst paragraph 17 states that planning should always seek to secure high quality design.

Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L3

Relevant Local Plan policies: LC4, LC8, LH4, LH6

The Authority's Design Guide, which is adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance along with the 'Building Design Guide', advises that all extensions should harmonise with the parent building and respect the dominance of the original building and be subordinate in its size and massing.

## **Assessment**

### **Principle of extending the outbuilding**

The application building is a domestic outbuilding forming additional living accommodation and garaging to a house that is situated in open countryside well outside of any designated/recognised settlement. For sites in the open countryside, Core Strategy Policy DS1 (C) provides the strategic policy basis allowing for extensions to existing buildings with Local Plan policy LH4 setting out the detailed policy allowing extensions to existing dwellings. Policy LH4 is caveated with the proviso that such extensions should not detract from the character, appearance or amenity of the original building, its setting or neighbouring buildings, dominate the original dwelling where it is of architectural, historic or vernacular merit, or amount to the creation of a separate dwelling or an annexe that could be used as a separate dwelling. Where a proposal involves conversion of a building of vernacular or historic merit to a use other than that for which it was designed, Local Plan LC8 states that this will be permitted provided that it can accommodate the new use without changes that would adversely affect its character (such changes include significant enlargement or other alteration to form and mass, inappropriate new window spacing's or doorways, and major rebuilding).

Local Plan Policy LC4 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 it enhances the landscape, built environment and other valued characteristics of the area, and the degree to which design details, materials and finishes reflect or complement the style and traditions of local buildings.

In this case the existing ancillary accommodation was approved as an acceptable scale and forms of residential annexe in connection the main house. It accorded with Local Plan Policy LH6 which allows for the conversion of outbuildings within the curtilage of existing dwellings to ancillary residential uses provided that they do not harm the character of the building or the surrounding area, would not result in an over intensive use of the property, an inadequate standard of amenity space or accommodation, or the need to replace outbuildings at a later date, that appropriate parking and access arrangements can be met and finally that the new accommodation would remain under the control of the occupier of the main dwelling.

The outbuilding is still in use as ancillary accommodation and, as there is no change of use involved in the use of that accommodation as a dependant relative unit ancillary to the main house, the principle of the use is not at issue in this application. The above policies also accept the principle of extending such accommodation subject to the site specific scale and design considerations. Furthermore, whilst the proposed accommodation would have all the internal facilities of a dwelling that would be necessary for independent living, it would still rely upon the main dwelling for access and amenity space.

The proposed plans show an increased scale of accommodation that would still be subservient to that of the main house. Therefore, subject to appropriate safeguards (e.g. planning conditions or a legal agreement) to prevent the creation of a separate dwelling, the accommodation would still comply with Policy LH6 and LH4 provided the scheme did not harm the character of the building or its setting.

The main issue in this case is therefore whether the scale and detailed design of the proposed extension is acceptable in terms of its impact upon the character and appearance of the existing building, the relationship to the main dwelling and their setting in the open countryside.

### **Scale, massing and design**

The existing outbuilding comprises a former traditional two story barn which has a simple form

and detailing reflecting the local vernacular. It is a low two story building and although converted to additional living accommodation, the scheme has resulted in little change and, apart from the unsightly external flue at the rear, has conserved the building's simple valued character and appearance. The later 1970s garage extension on the west elevation is a significant addition to the building which, as a result of its scale, over-wide gable and low roof pitch in non-matching materials, dominates the older vernacular building, resulting in some harm to its character, appearance and setting.

The proposal to enlarge the garage extension by adding a first floor would unacceptably increase the dominating effect of the garage extension upon the valued character and appearance of traditional outbuilding and cover more of its fabric. Furthermore, in addition to the form of the extension having the same undesirable attributes as the existing garage (an over-wide gable and uncharacteristically shallow roof pitch), the plans now propose an over-complicated roof form with an additional shallow pitched gable form at the rear. In this respect the proposal would fail to reflect the character and appearance of traditional buildings in the area and fail to respect the valued characteristics of the original outbuilding.

The increased scale of the extended building would also make the proposal more prominent from public vantage points along Bakestonedale road, where the inappropriate form would be seen as a more incongruous and harmful addition to the original building. The proposal would therefore fail to accord with adopted design guidance in the Building Design Guide and policies LC4 and LH4.

With regard to the porch proposed for the road facing gable of the old barn, this would be an overtly domestic feature that would be wholly inappropriate to the design and former use of this old agricultural building. The ground floor of this main road facing gable end is currently blank and part of the key character of the building. Consequently, the addition of a porch or a new doorway would be harmful to the character and appearance of the barn and thus contrary to policies LH4 and LC4.

The existing entrance door into the ancillary accommodation is located on the side elevation facing the house. With some modest adjustment to outside levels, there is no overriding reason why this doorway could not be retained for use by the elderly relative (with an internal lobby should this be necessary) and thus avoid the need for the inappropriate new entrance and porch.

In recognition of the need and the acceptance of the principle of improved accommodation for the applicant's elderly relative, officers have suggested to the applicant that one of the garage spaces could have been incorporated into the residential accommodation with a new internal access door. This would have provided additional living accommodation at ground floor level, without the need to extend (or alter) the building any further, thus overcoming the above objections. In response, the agent, whilst minded to remove the porch element from the scheme, confirmed that his client wished to retain all the garaging space, leaving the only option to extend above. He has therefore asked for the application to be determined as submitted.

### **Conclusion**

The form and scale of the proposed extensions do not adequately reflect the scale, form and massing of the existing building, neither do the design details entirely reflect or complement the style or tradition of the building or the local vernacular building tradition. As a result, it is considered the development would dominate and detract from the character and appearance of the original outbuilding and its setting, particularly when viewed from the nearby public highway.

Consequently, the proposal is considered contrary to adopted policy Core Strategy L3 and GSP3, and Local Plan, LC4 and LH4, The proposal is also considered contrary to the Authority's Supplementary Design Guidance, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly Section 7 'Requiring good design'.

### **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