

**11. FULL APPLICATION - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING FLAT ROOF EXTENSION TO BE REPLACED WITH TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, BRAMBLEGATE, TIDESWELL LANE, EYAM, (NP/DDD/0118/0055)**

**APPLICANT: MR AND MRS S ROWLAND**

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1. The proposal is for a two storey side extension of a large detached house located on Tideswell Lane in Eyam. The dwelling is situated at a raised level above the main centre of Eyam village, within a Conservation Area.

**2. Site and Surroundings**

- 2.1. The property located on Tideswell Lane which is situated to the North of the site, open fields and residential properties are situated to the East of the site, and other neighbouring properties are situated to the South and West of the site. A sizeable front garden and driveway leads up to the property, to the North of the site. Further extensive areas of garden surround the property to the South, East and West of the site. The boundaries to the site comprise stone walls, timber fences and areas of foliage. The property itself is set over two floors, with further accommodation within the roof. The principle East elevation of the house is of a natural stone construction, the North and South side elevations are part stone and part rendered, and the Western rear elevation is rendered. The property has a pitched slate roof, with timber windows and doors and stone detailing. The property has two ground floor bay windows to the East elevation, two chimney stacks, and four rooflights. A series of single storey extensions are attached to the Northern side of the house. These comprise a flat roofed porch, a flat roofed extension and a lean-to hybrid conservatory. The extensions are clustered together as a group and project beyond the building lines to the front and rear of the property. An L-shaped stable block is situated to the North East of the house and a detached double garage is situated to the North West of the house.

**3. Proposal**

- 3.1. The application proposes the demolition of the existing flat roof extension to be replaced with a two storey side extension. The two storey extension would be attached to the Northern side of the house and would be constructed using materials to match. The extension would follow the form of the existing property, with a lean-to glazed aspect to the East elevation. The extension would largely appear as a continuation of the main dwelling, however it would be set in slightly from the front and rear building lines and would be set down slightly from the roofline. The main extension would measure approximately 8.7M in height to the ridge, 5.3M in height to the eaves, 9.8M in width and 8.8M in depth, with a further single storey lean-to section measuring approximately 1.2M in depth. To the Northern side elevation, the plans are for three French doors and a pair of casement windows at ground floor level with a pair of casement windows at first floor level. To the Western rear elevation, the plans are for a set of three casement windows, a door and a single casement window at ground floor level with a two pairs of casement windows at first floor level. To the Eastern rear elevation, the plans are for a glazed lean-to structure at ground floor level with two sets of triple casement windows and a set of double casement windows at first floor level. Internally it is proposed to create a kitchen, utility and garden room at ground floor level, with a master suite, dresser, boiler and two en-suite bathrooms at first floor level. There are concerns that an extension of this nature would have a harmful visual impact upon the existing building, its setting, that of neighbouring properties, or the surrounding Conservation Area.

#### **4. RECOMMENDATION**

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

- 1. The excessive scale, poor design and dominant massing of the proposed plans would result in an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the property, its setting and the wider Conservation Area. The proposed plans would not be sympathetic, subservient to the original building or limited in size, would not respect, conserve and enhance the valued characteristics of the site or the surrounding landscape, and would harm the character and appearance of the existing building and its setting. As such, this application is contrary to the Extensions and Alterations SPD, and Policies GSP3, L1, LC4 and LH4 of the Peak District National Park Core Strategy and is therefore recommended for refusal.**

#### **5. Key Issues**

- Whether the development would conserve the character, appearance and amenity of the existing building.
- Whether the development would conserve the setting of the existing building.
- Whether the development would conserve the amenity of neighbouring properties.
- Whether the development would conserve the character of the surrounding Conservation Area.

#### **6. Relevant Planning History**

- 6.1. Application WED1079499 was approved in 1979 for the erection of a garage.
- 6.2. Application WED0381105 was approved in 1981 for a proposed conservatory.
- 6.3. Application NP/DDD/0810/0881 was approved in 2010 for the erection of equestrian stables.

#### **7. Consultations**

- 7.1. Highway Authority: No objection.
- 7.2. Borough Council: No response received to date.
- 7.3. Parish Council: Supports the application.

#### **8. Representations**

- 8.1. No representations have been received to date.

## 9. Policies

9.1. National Park designation is the highest level of landscape designation in the UK. The Environment Act 1995 sets out two statutory purposes for national parks in England and Wales:

- Conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage
- Promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of national parks by the public

When national parks carry out these purposes they also have the duty to seek to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities within the national parks.

### National Planning Policy Framework

9.2. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012 and replaced a significant proportion of central government planning policy with immediate effect. The Government's intention is that the document should be considered as a material consideration and carry particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date. In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and saved policies in the Peak District National Park Local Plan 2001. 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 Government guidance in the NPPF.

9.3. Para 115 of the NPPF states that *'great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.'*

### Development Plan policies

9.4. Policy GSP1 sets out the broad strategy for achieving the National Park's objectives having regard to the Sandford Principle, (that is, where there are conflicting desired outcomes in achieving national park purposes, greater priority must be given to the conservation of the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area, even at the cost of socio-economic benefits). GSP1 also sets out the need for sustainable development and to avoid major development unless it is essential, and the need to mitigate localised harm where essential major development is allowed.

9.5. Policy GSP3 sets out development management principles and states that all development must respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings, paying particular attention to, amongst other elements, impact on the character and setting of buildings, scale of the development appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park, design in accordance with the National Park Authority Design Guide and impact on living conditions of communities.

9.6. Policy L1 identifies that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character and valued characteristics, and other than in exceptional circumstances, proposals in the Natural Zone will not be permitted.

- 9.7. Policy DS1 indicates that extensions to existing buildings in all settlements will be acceptable in principle.
- 9.8. Policy L3 states that development must conserve and enhance any asset of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance or its setting that has statutory designation or registration or is of other international, national, regional or local significance.
- 9.9. Policies LC4 and LH4 state that all domestic development must not harm the character, appearance and amenity of the existing building, its setting or that of neighbouring properties. GSP3 also requires a high standard of design in accordance with adopted design guidance.
- 9.10. Policies LT11 and LT18 require safe access provision and adequate parking arrangements.

Relevant Core Strategy (CS) policies: GSP1, GSP3, DS1, L1, L3

Relevant Local Plan (LP) policies: LC4, LH4, LT11, LT18

## 10. **Assessment**

### Design/Use of the Buildings

- 10.1. The proposed scale and design do not reflect adopted design guidance. The Extensions and Alterations SPD states that extensions should be sympathetic, subservient to the original building, and limited in size. The existing house measures approximately 12.7M in width and the extension would measure approximately 9.8M in width. As such, the plans would result in a two storey side extension that would measure more than three quarters of the width of the original dwelling. The current proposal is considered to be excessive in scale in relation to the host property. The single storey lean-to extension would not remain subservient to the main dwelling as it would project beyond the building line to the front of the property, on the primary elevation.
- 10.2. It is also excessively glazed, poorly detailed and too wide, resulting in an unacceptable quality design. The proposed fenestration relates poorly to the existing dwelling, comprising a mix of glazing styles with little consistency. The majority of the windows in the original dwelling to the West elevation are of an equal sized sash design, however the application proposes an extension with casement windows and little attention to symmetry to the primary elevation. The triple French doors to the North elevation are considered to relate poorly to the main dwelling, and the glazed lean-to would dominate the primary East elevation and have an adverse impact on the character of the property. It is acknowledged that the existing extensions to the house are not of a high quality, however they remain largely subservient to the main dwelling and do not dominate the property in the manner of the extension that is now proposed.
- 10.3. It is considered that a smaller two storey side extension of an alternative design could be appropriate at this property. Officers have worked with the applicants agent to try to secure an alternative scheme, but this has not been forthcoming.

### Character/Landscape

- 10.4. The proposed extension by virtue of its scale and massing would dominate the property within the wider landscape. The site is situated within a Conservation Area, and it is considered that the proposed plans would result in an adverse impact on this sensitive

location. Policy L3 of the Core Strategy relates to cultural heritage assets including Conservation Areas and states that development must conserve and enhance any asset of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance or its setting that has statutory designation or registration or is of other international, national, regional or local significance. It is considered that these plans would fail to do so, due to the excessive scale, poor design and dominant massing.

#### Amenity

- 10.5. It is not considered that the proposed location, scale or form of the extension would result in any adverse impact on neighbouring properties. Neighbouring properties are situated a significant distance away, and as such there would be no issues in terms of overlooking, overshadowing or an overbearing impact.

#### Highway Considerations

- 10.6. Given the location of the proposed extension and its relationship to the existing property and neighbouring properties there are no concerns that the proposed development would result in any significant impact in terms of highway matters. There have been no objections from the Highway Authority.

### **11. Conclusion**

- 11.1. The scale, design and massing of the proposed would result in an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the property, its setting and the wider Conservation Area.
- 11.2. This application is contrary to the Extensions and Alterations SPD, which states that extensions should be sympathetic, subservient to the original building, and limited in size. It is contrary to Policy GSP3, which states that development must respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings, paying particular attention to, amongst other elements, impact on the character and setting of buildings, scale of the development appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park, and design in accordance with the National Park Authority Design Guide. It is contrary to Policy L1 which states that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character and valued characteristics, and Policies LC4 and LH4 which state that all domestic development must not harm the character, appearance and amenity of the existing building or its setting.

### **12. Human Rights**

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

### **13. List of Background Papers (not previously published)**

None

#### **Report Author**

Joe Freegard, Planner