

11. HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION – CONVERSION OF BUNGALOW TO ONE-AND-A-HALF STOREY DWELLINGHOUSE – GLENHAVEN, 12 WHITE EDGE DRIVE, BASLOW (NP/DDD/ 0217/0171, P.5726/55, 22/2/2017, 425164 / 372164, MN)

APPLICANT: MR AND MRS HILLMAN

Site and Surroundings

Glenhaven is a detached bungalow located on White Edge Drive in the north of Baslow village, where it is part of a residential estate.

The house is constructed of gritstone walls under a hardrow tiled roof. A porch projects from the front of the building, and a single garage is attached to the northern side. To the rear two gables project from the back of the house. These are of differing lengths, and one is a heavily glazed sunroom extension.

The property faces the road, set back behind a driveway and garden, with a further garden to the rear. There are neighbouring properties to both sides of Glenhaven (Old Hall Croft to the north and 6 Gorse Ridge Drive to the south), and to the rear the property of Rocher End – which is located on the parallel road of Over Lane – backs on to the site. Other properties also face the application site from the other side of White Edge Drive.

The property is outside of the Baslow Conservation Area.

Proposal

To add an additional floor to the property, creating a one-and-a-half storey dwelling with dormer windows to the front and rear.

To the rear, the existing sunroom extension would be replaced by a new one. This would be larger than the existing, projecting from the house so far as to align with the adjacent single storey rear extension.

The front porch would be remodelled to move the door to the front, all windows to the front elevation would be replaced, and a total of four rooflights would be introduced to the roofslopes.

To the front of the house a second vehicular access would be created to the southern edge of the site, and an additional hardstanding for further parking would be constructed.

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 verge and eaves detailing, window and door details, rooflights, and rainwater goods**
- 4. Highway conditions to ensure space for plant and materials is provided, and that the parking spaces remain free from obstruction throughout the life of the development**

Key Issues

1. Whether the development conserves the character and appearance of the dwellinghouse and its setting.
2. Whether the development has an acceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties

History

2016 – Pre-application advice provided by the Authority relating to the current proposal. Officers made some design recommendations which the current proposal, as revised, takes account of.

2005 – Planning permission granted for solar panels to front roof slope.

1997 – Planning permission granted for conservatory extension.

Consultation

Derbyshire County Council – Highways – No objection subject to space being provided for storage of plant and materials during works, and for parking being maintained free from obstruction throughout the life of the development.

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

Baslow Parish Council – Concerned that this alters the mix of housing and bungalows and may set a precedent for further conversions.

Representations

Ten letters of representation have been received. Six of these explicitly object to the proposal, whilst others raise concerns and recommend conditions. Two letters – from the two occupiers of the property to the immediate south – are more supportive of the proposal, principally on the basis of assurances that they have received from the applicant regarding his commitment to minimise disruption to them during works. The material grounds of representation are summarised as:

- Objection to the loss of a bungalow property in the area, and concern that this would set a precedent for the loss of further bungalows;
- The property would overshadow neighbouring properties;
- The extension would result in a loss of light to neighbouring properties;
- The extension would harm the privacy of neighbouring properties;
- The size of the property would be out of keeping with surrounding development and would also be too large for its plot;
- Raising the eaves and ridge height is contrary to the Authority's adopted design guidance;
- Removing the rear dormer window would improve the privacy of neighbouring properties and better resolve the appearance of the building;
- If approved, hours of construction and routes of site access should be restricted;
- If approved, future extension should be restricted to protect neighbouring amenity;
- The applicant has taken steps to mitigate impact on neighbours by using dormer windows and rooflights to keep the overall height of the building down.

Main Policies

Development Plan

Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP3, DS1

Relevant Local Plan policies: LH4, LC4

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.

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.

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.

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.

Assessment

Revised plans have been submitted during the course of the application that adjusts the design of the extension. These have been submitted in an effort to address concerns raised by Officers.

Design assessment

Additional floor and associated works

The form and design of the existing bungalow property does not follow the building traditions of the National park, being a single storey dwelling with wide picture windows and wider gables than traditional houses.

It is not out of keeping in its immediate setting however, which is a relatively modern housing estate. The 'island' of properties formed between Over Lane and White Edge Drive, of which

Glenhaven is part, largely comprises bungalows, with a two-storey dwelling to the immediate north of the application site. However, there are a variety of property types adjacent to and surrounding the application site; White Edge Drive comprises a mix of single storey, one-and-a-half storey and two storey dwellings. The same is true of the adjoining Gorse Ridge Drive and Over Lane. In this context, the bungalow does not appear out of keeping.

For the same reasons, Officers consider that the principle of extending the dwelling up to one-and-a-half storey building would be similarly in keeping, i.e. it would remain reflective of the mix of housing types in this area.

Whilst the gables of the house are wider than those found on many traditional properties (approximately 7 metres), they are not so wide that they would result in a building of unusual proportions in this area if they were to be extended upwards. Similarly, the length of the property (approximately 12 metres, plus garage) does not result in an overly long or imposing frontage in the context of the surrounding non-traditional development.

In terms of height, the Authority's design guidance states that raising the eaves or ridge height to increase head height is generally unacceptable. In this case, however, weight is given to the fact that the building is of non-traditional appearance, is in a setting of similarly non-traditional buildings, and that many of the surrounding buildings vary in design, size, and height. In addition, given the existing width and length of the building, it is not considered that the height increase would result in a massing that harms the buildings character or appearance. Further, the ridgeline of the property would remain lower than the neighbour to the north, following the existing reduction in ridgelines that occurs from north to south down the hill along White Edge Drive.

The neighbouring property also provides some justification and context for the proposed form. This dwelling is one-and-a-half storey with two dormer windows to the front, as is currently proposed. Originally a single storey dwelling, part of this neighbouring building was increased in height in 1999 following the grant of planning permission. Subsequently, in 2005, an application was made to raise the building to one-and-a-half storey throughout, with dormer windows at first floor level. This was refused by the Authority, but was granted on appeal.

Whilst the situation differed in some regards in that the existing building had an unresolved form that the extension then proposed would improve, the Inspector still concluded that the proposal would result in an acceptable appearance given that there is a mixture of house types and designs in the wider area, and that the scale would not be out-of-keeping with the dwellings on the opposite side of White Edge Drive.

Given the proximity of this site to that of the current application, and the similarities between the design and form of the two proposals, this decision is given some weight in assessing the current proposal.

Dormer windows do not generally form part of the local building tradition, and the Building Design Guide notes that they will not normally be acceptable. However, this is a site specific assessment, and two of the properties opposite Glenhaven and the neighbouring property to the north all have dormer windows. In addition, the surrounding development more broadly does not follow the design traditions of the area. In this context it is accepted that dormer windows could be accommodated in principle.

In terms of number, the application has been revised since submission to reduce the number of front facing dormers from three to two. In addition they have been reduced in width to two light windows.

The Building Design Guide states that where acceptable such windows should be as small as possible and should be a continuation of the wall with a gabled roof. The proposed windows largely comply with this advice, although the precise detailed design of the windows is not clear; these details could be controlled by planning condition if permission was to be granted however.

The rooflights are modest in size and number and subject to being fitted flush with the roofslope so as to minimise their prominence are considered to conserve the appearance of the building.

The proposed flue would project through the rear of the roof, minimising its wider prominence and subject to having a black painted finish would conserve the appearance of the building.

For the reasons outlined above, the design of the extension and dormer windows are considered to comply with planning policy and the Authority's adopted design guidance subject to conditions. These would secure details of materials, dormer window design, roof verge and eaves detailing, rainwater goods, and window and door recessing, rooflights, and colouring for the proposed flue.

Sunroom extension

The replacement sunroom to the rear of the house would follow a similar form and massing to the adjacent extension. Its overall size is such that it remains subordinate to the main house as required by planning policy and would conserve its overall appearance.

On a more traditional building the solid roof over the heavily glazed walls could conflict with the buildings solid appearance, but given the buildings character this is not considered to be a significant issue in this case. On this basis the proposed replacement sunroom is considered to be acceptable in design terms.

Other alterations

At ground floor, the windows to the front of the property would be replaced with ones of more traditional proportions that would improve their appearance. The changes to the porch are minor, but moving the door from the side to the front would provide a stronger focal point to the front of the house, which is welcomed.

The change in layout to the front of the property would have a less than significant impact on the appearance of the site in the street scene; enclosure of the street is not a strong feature in this location, with very low walling and many driveway accesses along both sides of the road. Materials for the surfacing are not detailed, but could be controlled by condition if permission was to be granted.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

Due to the proximity of surrounding residential development and the topography of the surrounding area – the property is built on higher ground than some neighbours – amenity is an important consideration when assessing at this application.

Those properties most affected are considered to be the immediate neighbours of Old Hall Croft (to the north), Rocher End (to the north east) and 6 Gorse Ridge Drive (to the south).

Old Hall Croft is set slightly higher than Glenhaven, and following completion of the development would remain taller than it and the footprint would be largely unaltered. Given this, the fact that the two buildings share the same building line, and because Old hall Croft has no principle windows facing the application site it is not considered that the proposal would have an oppressive or overbearing impact on this neighbour.

In terms of impact on privacy, the rear facing dormer window would increase visibility towards the neighbour's garden. However, most overlooking would be outside of a 45 degree field of view taken from the centre of the window, and would therefore only be possible when stood directly next to the window. This would significantly reduce the frequency of any overlooking – especially given that this is to be a bedroom rather than, for example, a living room.

It is also of note that in approving the Appeal to allow Old Hall Croft to be extended to one-and-a-half storeys in 2005 the Inspector approved two rear-facing dormer windows, which have a similar impact on Glenhaven as the now proposed dormer window would have on Old Hall Croft, and raised no concerns in relation to amenity.

Overall, and having considered all of the points above, the amenity impacts of the extension and dormer windows on Old Hall Croft are considered to be less than significant and acceptable.

Rocher End is a bungalow property on Over Lane, which backs on to the east of the application site. Due to the land rising to the west, the property is set at a slightly lower level than Glenhaven.

The distance between the main shells of the two properties (i.e. excluding the single storey extensions to the rear of Glenhaven, which could not be increased in height) is between approximately 21 metres and 28 metres, the difference due to the staggered rear facing elevation of Rocher End.

Whilst the building lines are already established, the Authority's design guidance states a preferred minimum separation distance of 22 metres between rear facing elevations. The proposed development would be very close to achieving this even at its closest point.

In addition, there is only one rear facing dormer window proposed to this side of the building, which serves a bedroom, as well as 3 rooflights, which provide less potential for overlooking due to their size and position within the roof. It is also noted that in approving the appeal for extension to one-and-a-half storeys at Old Hall Croft in 2005 the Inspector raised no concerns regarding amenity impacts in relation to Rocher End, despite the proposal including two rear-facing dormers and having more direct views towards the closest part of Rocher End. Having considered the above points, it is not considered that the proposal would result in significant levels of overlooking of Rocher End.

The dwellinghouse of Glenhaven is also approximately 17 metres from the garden boundary of Rocher End. On the basis of this and having considered the proposed increase in height and massing of Glenhaven it is not considered that the property would become overbearing or oppressive on the occupiers of Rocher End.

The other immediate neighbour is 6 Gorse Ridge Drive ('no.6' hereafter), which is a bungalow property occupying the corner plot where White Edge Drive meets Gorse Ridge Drive. This property is built approximately 10 metres to the south of Glenhaven's southern gable at its closest point, and is at a lower level. The two properties have a similar building line in part, but no.6 is L-shaped, with the returned elevation facing back towards Glenhaven. The back garden is infills behind the L-shape.

The proposed extensions introduce no windows that would overlook no.6 and so there is considered to be no impact on their privacy.

The key issue here is whether the proposed extension would be overbearing or oppressive on the occupiers of this property. The closest window of this neighbour that faces towards the application site is approximately 20 metres from the building of Glenhaven. In addition, the part of the building that would be raised is offset in views from this window, rather than being directly in

front of it, which could otherwise result in it dominating the neighbour's outlook. Similarly, whilst the extension would be close to the boundary of this neighbour's garden it would also be offset to the west of the garden. Whilst it would become more apparent in views from both the house and the garden this offset is considered to prevent the extension from appearing overbearing or oppressive.

Due to the shared building lines of the property with its neighbours to each side, the distance from the neighbour to the west, and having taken account of the sunpath, it is not considered that the development would significantly reduce light to or overshadow any neighbour.

Other neighbours are further from the application building and on this basis are considered to be less than significantly affected in terms of any loss of privacy or light, and at these distances the property would not be overbearing nor would it cause significant overshadowing.

Given the residential scale of development proposed, it is not considered reasonable or necessary to control hours of construction works through the planning system; this is not a material planning consideration, being addressed by other legislation.

Highways

The proposal would increase the amount of available parking on site to three spaces. This meets the requirements set out in the Development Plan for dwellings of this size and the Highway Authority has raised no objections. This is therefore considered to be sufficient.

The Highway Authority has advised that they have no objections subject to the parking remaining available for such use throughout the lifetime of the development, and subject to space being provided within the site for plant and materials during works. These matters could be controlled by planning conditions if permission was granted.

Other matters

It is proposed to install solar panels to the south facing roof slope of the single storey rear extension, removing those from the front roof slope. In this position the panels would not be conspicuous or detract from the appearance of the property, and they are therefore welcomed as appropriate renewable energy provision, as advocated by policy CC2. Given the scale of development proposed this measure is also considered sufficient for the application to comply with the terms of CC1 in regard to the provision of environmental management measures.

Conclusion

The form, design and size of the extensions are all considered to conserve the character and appearance of the built environment as required by the policies of the Development Plan.

Officers have made an assessment of the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties and consider that the impact on their amenity would be less than significant. Officers also consider that, having considered the advice of the Highway Authority, the proposal would not result in a detrimental effect to highway safety or amenity.

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