

6. FULL APPLICATION - REAR TWO STOREY EXTENSION AND REPLACEMENT GARAGE. KEYS HOUSE, LIME KILN ROAD, BUTTERTON (NP/SM/0218/0137 407306 / 356658 P4435 MN 14/3/2018)

APPLICANT: P AND M BROWN

1. Site and Surroundings

Keys House is a detached two storey dwellinghouse positioned to the western end of Butterson village, to the north of Kiln Lane.

The property is of stone built construction under a clay tiled roof, with barge boards and fascias to the roof eaves and verges.

A small porch is centred on the front elevation, whilst to the rear half of the elevation is covered by a projecting two storey gable. The other half of the rear elevation is covered with a single storey lean-to that projects the same distance from the rear elevation as the two storey gable does.

A single timber garage has been constructed to the eastern side of the house.

The property is set in a sizeable plot, with garden to all four sides.

The nearest neighbouring house is the immediate neighbour to the east, whose property is approximately 15 metres from Keys House. To the west, the neighbouring property is approximately 40m away due to their large garden being positioned between the two houses. There are further nearby properties to the southern side of Kiln Lane.

The site is within the Butterson Conservation Area.

2. Proposal

- 2.1. To replace the existing rear lean-to extension with a two storey gable extension that would project approximately 4.9 metres from the rear wall of the house. It is also proposed to replace the existing timber garage with a new stone built garage.

3. RECOMMENDATION

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. **By virtue of its massing and design the proposed two storey rear extension would detract from the appearance of the dwellinghouse and would fail to preserve the character of the Butterson Conservation Area, contrary to policies LC4, LH4, and LC5.**

4. Key Issues

- The impact of the development on the character and appearance of the parent building and wider built environment.

5. Relevant Planning History

- 5.1. No relevant history

6. Consultations

- 6.1. Butterton Parish Council – The Parish Council support the application, advising that they have no concerns. They note that they are pleased to see the property being restored as it has appeared unmaintained for some time.
- 6.2. Staffordshire Moorlands District Council – No response at time of writing.

7. Representations

- 7.1. None received at time of writing.

8. Policies

- 8.1. 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

- 8.2. 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.
- 8.3. 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

- 8.4. 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.

- 8.5. 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.
- 8.6. 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.
- 8.7. Policy LC4 states, amongst other things, that any development must, at least, respect and conserve the landscape of the area.
- 8.8. Policy LC5 states that development in conservation areas should assess and clearly demonstrate how the existing appearance of the conservation area will be preserved and, where possible, enhanced.
- 8.9. Policy LH4 allows for extensions and alterations to existing dwellings (which includes domestic outbuildings such as garages) provided that the development does not detract from the character or appearance of the original building, dominate the original dwelling, or amount to the creation of a separate dwelling.
- 8.10. Policy LT11 states that the design and number of parking spaces associated with residential development must respect the value characteristics of the area, particularly in conservation areas.

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

Relevant Local Plan (LP) policies: LC4, LC5, LH4 LT11

9. Assessment

Design and appearance of the proposed rear extension

- 9.1. Based on the design of the existing house (roof detailing and size and proportion of openings in particular) it is considered that the building most likely dates from the mid twentieth century.
- 9.2. It is not a historic property, although retains a traditional form and is constructed of traditional materials and makes a positive contribution to the appearance of the conservation area.
- 9.3. The existing two storey gable projects approximately 2.7 metres from the rear wall of the house and shares the same ridge line as the main part of the house, making it a dominant feature of the elevation. The existing rear gable may have been constructed at the same time as the 'main' part of the house. If the building was constructed with the rear gable and lean-to, they read as the kind of additions commonly found on houses of traditional style in the locality. The simple form and dominance of the 'main' part of the house remains legible though, due to the matching projection of this gable and the adjacent lean-to, because part of the rear elevation of this part of the building remains exposed, and because of the limited projection of both of these elements.

- 9.4. The proposed extension would alter this relationship. The Authority's design guidance advises that extensions should respect the dominance of the parent building, be subordinate to it in terms of size and massing, and that having a lower eaves height than that of the main building can help achieve this (Design Guide – paragraph 7.8). The extension would project approximately 5m from the rear wall of the 'main' part of the house, which is the same length as the property's gable width. It would also share the same eaves height. These two factors mean that when viewed from the west the extension would be overly dominant, having a greater apparent mass than the 'main' part of the house, contrary to adopted design guidance and policy LH4.
- 9.5. The addition of a two storey gable alongside the existing one would also serve to entirely obscure the rear elevation of the principle part of the building, reducing its legibility. Further, it would result in the two rear gables being staggered – the new one projecting past the existing by approximately a further 2.2 metres. This would lead to an awkward relationship between the existing and proposed development and would significantly unbalance the rear elevation, the impact being exacerbated by the mismatching gable widths and ridge lines. This would result in a complicated arrangement that detracts from the relatively simple form of the building and is contrary to the advice of adopted design guidance stating that extensions should be simple bold shapes (Alterations and Extensions SPD - section 3.4)
- 9.6. For these reasons the extension would detract from the appearance of the building, contrary to policies LC4 and LH4.

Design and appearance of the proposed replacement garage

- 9.7. It would be preferable for the proposed garage to be orientated so that the gable faces the house rather than the road, in order that the garage door could be positioned beneath the eaves as is traditional and advocated by the Authority's adopted design guidance.
- 9.8. However, due to the limited space to this side of the house this would not be possible without adjoining the garage to the house or building it very close to it. This would prevent access to the rear garden down this side of the house and would obstruct access to the property through an existing side door. It is therefore accepted that providing the main door in the gable of the building is the only practical solution.
- 9.9. Given that the proposed building is modest in size and that the property is not of historic significance, the position of the garage door in the gable can be supported in principle.
- 9.10. The proposed door opening is overly wide however; it dominates the elevation and provides a very large opening that is contrary to the generally solid character of the house and appearance of most buildings in the conservation area. Where there are examples of garages with wide openings in the gable in the vicinity, these detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 9.11. It is therefore recommended that the garage door be reduced in width by condition if permission is granted.

Impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area

- 9.12. The rear extension would be partially visible in public views when approaching along Kiln Lane from the west. It would not be especially prominent in these views, and intervening mature planting would further reduce its impact in some views, especially in the months that the trees are in leaf.

- 9.13. However, the proposed extension would be harmful to the overall character of the host dwelling for the reasons set out above. The renovation works undertaken recently are a positive occurrence after the dwelling had apparently previously fell into disrepair. The building's position, traditional appearance and general form are considered to make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area but the proposed extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, reducing the benefit that has recently arisen from the renovation works. It follows that the proposal would fail to preserve the character of the Conservation Area, contrary to policy LC5.
- 9.14. Notwithstanding the concerns about the impact of the garage on the Conservation Area, it is acknowledged that the garage would be a modest addition to the site and, subject to a reduction in the proposed door opening width as discussed above, would not have an unacceptable impact on the conservation area.
- 9.15. Overall, the development would fail to conserve the character and appearance of the conservation area as required by planning policy.

Amenity

- 9.16. The two storey extension would be a prominent addition to the property when viewed from the neighbouring garden to the west. It would be set only approximately 6 metres from their boundary, but their garden is large with otherwise open aspects. For these reasons it is considered that it would not be overbearing or oppressive on the neighbouring property, and nor would it result in any significant overshadowing.
- 9.17. The garage would be only single storey and the adjacent neighbouring property to the east is set on higher ground. As a result it would not be overbearing or oppressive, and nor would it otherwise detract from the neighbours amenity.
- 9.18. Overall, the development is considered to conserve the amenity of nearby properties.

Highway Considerations

- 9.19. The property would retain space for the parking of at least two vehicles. This accords with local parking standards provision for a 3 bed house (which this would be).
- 9.20. Site access would remain unchanged, and the development would not result in a significant intensification of use on the site that would result in any highways impacts.

10. Conclusion

- 10.1. The proposed two storey rear extension would dominate and unbalance the property, detracting from its appearance, contrary to policy LC4. It would also fail to preserve the character of the Butterton Conservation Area, contrary to policy LC5.
- 10.2. The development otherwise provides no significant material planning benefits to weigh against this harm.
- 10.3. Therefore, and having given full consideration to all relevant planning policy and other material considerations, the application is recommended for refusal.

11. Human Rights

11.1. None

12. List of Background Papers (not previously published)

None

Report Author and Job Title

Mark Nuttall, Senior Planner,