

12. FULL APPLICATION - PROPOSED EXTENSION AND ALTERATIONS TO DWELLING AT 6 ALDERN WAY, BAKEWELL (NP/DDD/0418/0314, P1354B 12/04/18 TM)

APPLICANT: FIONA NEWBOULD

1. Site and Surroundings

- 1.1. 6 Aldern Way is a detached modern two storey, 2 bedroomed property that is constructed from limestone Davy blocks, the roof is clad with Hardrow concrete tiles and Upvc windows/doors.
- 1.2. The applicant has purchased extra scrubland to the rear of the property with the intention of extending the garden.
- 1.3. The site is on Aldern Way which is situated off Baslow Road and is a residential area of Bakewell which consists of modern style houses/bungalows of similar age but varying scale and appearance. The site is not within the designated Conservation Area.
- 1.4. The nearest neighbouring properties are Greystones (4 Aldern Way) approximately 5.5m to the west, Highfields (8 Aldern Way) is 2.15m to the east, 7 Aldern Way 25m to the north and 5 Aldern Way 25m to the north west.

2. Proposal

- 2.1. The application seeks full planning permission to extend and alter the existing dwelling.
- 2.2. The proposal is to extend over the existing garage to provide two additional bedrooms, to extend the single storey lean-to extension to the front elevation and extend the roof-line the full length of the front elevation. Also, to extend the rear of the property with a part two storey and part single storey in line with the existing garage.
- 2.3. The applicant submitted an application (NP/DDD/0416/0298) in 2016 for a ground floor extension to front porch, garage, rear window bay and dining room. First floor gable extension over existing garage to form two bedrooms and single bathroom. Plus rear window bay extension of ground floor window bay.
- 2.4. The design to the rear of the dwelling was very complicated and looked cluttered. The glazing was very mixed with several different designs, folding doors, Juliet style balcony and French doors. This has been simplified so that the glazing to the single storey extension matches the two storey extension. There are two sets of folding patio doors which match and all the windows are of a similar style and size. The extensions to the rear of the property have been moved in line with the rear of the garage which makes the design less complicated.
- 2.5. It was also considered that the previous scheme would have had an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties at Greystones (4 Aldern Way). The design of the extension over the garage has been reduced in height and now has a hipped roof design in order to address the amenity issues.

3. RECOMMENDATION

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. The proposed size, form and massing of the extensions and alterations, particularly in relation to the form of the roofline and windows on the northern elevation, would be

unacceptable and would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the property and its setting contrary to policies GSP3, LC4, LH4 and guidance in the SPD.

4. Key Issues

- The principle of development
- The impact on the appearance of the property
- The impact on residential amenity of neighbouring properties

5. Relevant Planning History

- 5.1. NP/DDD/0416/0298: Ground floor extension to front porch, garage, rear window bay and dining room. First floor gable extension over existing garage to form 2 bedrooms and single bathroom. Plus rear window bay extension of ground floor window bay. This design was considered to be unacceptable and was considered to cause amenity/light issues to number 4 Aldern Way.
- 5.2. After consultation with the applicant and their agents, the application was withdrawn. Pre-application was given to address the issues of amenity and design issues and current proposal submitted.
- 5.3. NP/DDD/1000/408: A simple single storey lean-to extension to the front of the dwelling. Granted Conditionally in December 2000.
- 5.4. A simple single storey lean-to extension to the rear of the dwelling has been constructed through permitted development.
- 5.5. Garage extended to rear prior to 1992 has been constructed through permitted development.

6. Consultations

- 6.1. Derbyshire County Council (Highways): No objection subject to applicant demonstrating 1 additional off street parking space.
- 6.2. Derbyshire Dales District Council: No response to date.
- 6.3. Bakewell Town Council object to the application for the following reasons:
 - The proposal does not appear to be in compliance with national and local policies; in particular the large increase in the size of the property gives concerns about overdevelopment of the site.
 - Design and appearance of the development.
 - Layout and density of buildings.
 - It is felt that the development would result in overshadowing and an overbearing presence near a common boundary that is to the detriment of neighbours
 - Overlooking/loss of privacy; the topography of the site should be taken into consideration.
 - Loss of light to neighbouring properties.
 - Car parking provision. The existing garage is believed to be used only as a store. Currently overflow parking from the property uses the road. It is felt that if the application were to be approved the problem is likely to be exacerbated.

7. Representations

- 7.1. There have been 3 letters of objections and 2 general comments to this proposal. The letters of objections raise the following concerns:

- House being used as a holiday let
- Lack of provision for off road parking
- Distance between neighbouring properties
- Disproportionate massing, overbearing effect
- Overdevelopment
- Loss of light, amenity and privacy
- Structural issues

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). GPS1 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. DS1 supports extensions to existing buildings in principle, subject to satisfactory scale, design.

Local Plan

- 8.8. Local Plan policy LC4 states that where development is acceptable in principle it will be permitted provided it is of a high standard of design that respects and conserves the landscape, built environment and characteristics of the area.
- 8.9. Local Plan policy LH4 states that extensions and alterations to dwellings will be permitted provided that they do not detract from the appearance or amenity of the original building, its setting or neighbouring buildings.

Relevant Core Strategy (CS) policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1

Relevant Local Plan (LP) policies: LC4, LH4

9. Assessment

Design/Use of the Buildings

- 9.1. Saved Local Plan policy LH4 states that extensions and alterations to dwellings will be permitted provided that the proposal does not detract from the character, appearance or amenity of the original building, its setting or neighbours buildings, does not dominate the original dwelling where it is of architectural historic or vernacular merit and does not amount to the creation of a separate dwelling or annexe.
- 9.2. LC4 sets out criteria to ensure that detailed design is to a high standard. Amongst other things it refers to scale, form mass and orientation in relation to existing buildings and the degree to which design details, material and finishes reflect or complement the style and tradition of local buildings.
- 9.3. The 1960s property is typical of properties of that time and is not of any particular vernacular style. It is set within other properties on Aldern Way that share similar design characteristics but with variety in terms of size and form of the dwellings.
- 9.4. The dwelling has previously been extended to front with a small single storey lean-to extension NP/DDD/1000/408 and there is a small single storey lean-to extension and garage extension to the rear of the building which were carried out using permitted development rights.
- 9.5. The proposed extensions would be constructed from reclaimed Davy blocks, Hardrow concrete tiles and Upvc windows, the front Upvc door and steel framed garage door would be re-used. New patio doors to the rear would be either steel or aluminium framed and powder coated. The rear of the dwelling will be rendered and outlined with Davy stone quoins. The dimensions of the proposed extension are as follows:
- Porch extension size 1.5m x 3.3m
 - Rear single storey extension size 2.7m x 3.7m (existing single storey 1.5m x 3.2m)

- Rear two storey extension size 2.7m x 4.2m
- Extension over garage size 9.7m x 3.5m

- 9.6. It is acknowledged that the design of the rear extension with the double gables with single storey link in between are not typical of the local vernacular. However, the extensions to the rear would not be very visible from outside of the application site and the estate is made up of relatively modern houses with a mix of appearances. As such, it is considered that the appearance of the rear extension would not result in any harm to the character of the locality or be detrimental to visual amenity in this instance.
- 9.7. The proposed extension to the side would have a hipped roof. The hipped roof design has been chosen to address the impact of amenity to the neighbouring property to the west side of the dwelling as discussed further below. However, the majority of the dwellings in the locality have traditional pitched roofs. Hipped roof elements appear on rear extensions and smaller front additions (such as porches) on the road, but there are no examples of hipped roof's on the primary roof. In this case it is proposed that the extended roof would extend contiguously from the existing roof, and that the extension part of the roof would be hipped, while the original part of the roof would retain an end wall gable and a dual pitch roof arrangement. This creates a roofline which lacks symmetry and is an dominant and unbalanced appearance. As such, it is considered that the proposed hipped roof, and the unbalanced roofline created be an alien feature into the street scene in this instance.
- 9.8. The proposed eastern gable would be 10.1m wide and the western gable would be 9.6m wide. Both of these are wider than design guidance. The eastern gable would not be prominent as this would only be visible from the rear. However the western gable is prominent from the front elevation and the width of the gable creates another unbalanced roofline on the primary elevation. The use of the hipped gable at the west means that the internal space upstairs would be lower than the existing upstairs, and the windows in the gable are lower in height on the primary elevation to accommodate the ceiling height. This means that the windows on the gable and the existing building are unbalanced on the primary elevation and appear incongruous. Overall, it is considered that the extensions and alternations to the front would result in a dwelling that would appear incongruous or discordant in the street scene.
- 9.9. Bakewell Town Council and Neighbours are concerned that the proposal does not appear to be in compliance with national and local policies; in particular the large increase in the size of the property gives concerns about overdevelopment of the site.
- 9.10. The design guide states that extensions of up to 25% are more likely to be acceptable, but this is not an absolute limit and each case must be assessed on its own merits. In this case the extensions amount to almost a 75% increase and the desire to increase the volume to such an extent, results in the unacceptable design details. It is considered that the proposed extensions of this volume cannot be achieved without causing visual harm.
- 9.11. There are other properties within this location that are constructed with a mixture of Davy blocks and rendering and the proposed materials would therefore be in keeping in this regard.
- 9.12. Overall, it is considered that the proposed size, form and massing of the extensions and alterations would be unacceptable and would have detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the property and its setting contrary to policies GSP3, LC4, LH4 and guidance in the SPD.

Landscape

- 9.13. 6 Aldern Way is located within a built-up area of Bakewell which is outside the Conservation Area. The property is a non-traditional dwelling set within the context of other non-traditional dwelling. The gardens have no major trees, but do have hedging, bushes and fencing that enclose the rear garden. There is fencing to each side of the property and a stone wall to the front.
- 9.14. The extension and alterations would be visible to the road (Aldern Way). However, the site is in a built-up residential area which is made up of dwelling of various forms and sizes that are of a similar character. As such, it is considered that the proposed development would not have a significant impact on the wider landscape character. Therefore it is considered that the proposal complies with the requirements of GSP3, L1, LC4 and LH4.

Amenity

- 9.15. Core Strategy Policy GSP2 and Saved Local Plan policies LC4 require that the amenity, privacy and security of the development and of nearby properties be given due consideration. The nearest neighbouring properties are Greystones (4 Aldern Way) approximately 5.5m to the west, Highfields (8 Aldern Way) is 2.15m to the east, 7 Aldern Way 25m to the north and 5 Aldern Way 25m to the north west.
- 9.16. The occupiers of Greystones (4 Aldern Way) approximately 5.5m to the west of 6 Aldern Way have raised concern about the loss of light, amenity and privacy. Bakewell Town Council are also concerned *“that this development would result in overshadowing and an overbearing presence near a common boundary that is to the detriment of neighbours.”*
- 9.17. In the initial application (NP/DDD/0416/0298) the pitched roof height was within a 45 degree angle take from the study window to the east elevation of Greystones. The scale and position of the previously proposed extension would potentially have resulted in unacceptable overshadowing and oppressive impacts to this neighbouring dwelling.
- 9.18. In respect of the loss of light and view the Authority has now adopted a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on alterations and extensions. This SPD includes a section on Neighbourliness/Privacy and Daylight (pages 26-28) and gives advice on the parameters in which extension over the garage would be acceptable and where the provision of a rear extension would have an adverse impact on a neighbouring property.
- 9.19. These parameters and guidelines have been applied to the proposed extension over the garage, the height of the roof has been reduced from the first design so that it will not encroach within the 45° zones of light protection given in the SPD guidance, particularly within the vertical encroachment in the westerly direction. Given that the sole window affected is a study window and the light to this window will remain unaffected for the majority of the day until the evening, it is now considered that the resultant loss of light would be much reduced from the previous scheme and would not result in any significant harm to amenity. Whilst there will be some loss of view, this does not amount to a sufficient planning justification for the rejection of the proposal, and views from this window will be improved through the significant reduction in the height of the extension as now proposed. The design of the extension with a roof that hips away from the neighbouring property would now not be oppressive or overbearing.
- 9.20. The scheme proposes a new first floor window on the western elevation serving a new bathroom which would have obscure glazing. This window would overlook the garage to east elevation of Greystones. Part of the casement window opens, however it is felt this will not cause any loss of privacy to the neighbouring property. The position of the other windows

within the proposed extensions and the separation distances to neighbouring dwellings would prevent unacceptable overlooking to any neighbouring dwelling.

- 9.21. The distance between Highfields (8 Aldern Way) is 2.6m to the east. The extensions to the rear would not be situated any closer to Highfields, it would protrude 2.7m which is in line with the neighbouring property, so should not cause any loss of light or privacy issues. The garden is screened with mature hedges, bushes and fencing.
- 9.22. The proposed works would increase the scale and massing of the host dwelling. However, it is considered that the position of the dwelling in relation to neighbouring properties can accommodate the proposed enlargement without resulting in any significantly harmful overshadowing or overbearing impact to any neighbouring dwelling.
- 9.23. Overall it is considered that the scale of the works proposed and the separation distances between the site and neighbouring properties would not result in any harm to the amenity of occupiers and users of any nearby property. The proposals therefore accord within policies GSP3 and LC4 in these respects.

Highway Considerations

- 9.24. Derbyshire County Council (Highways) have raised no objection subject to applicant demonstrating 1 additional off street parking space. An amended ground floor plan was submitted on 15/5/18 for an additional off road parking space (size is 2.4m x 5.5m). This option has minimal loss of stone walling to front of the property. The provision of the additional parking space can be secured by condition.
- 9.25. Bakewell Town Council are concerned about the lack of provision for off road parking. The existing garage is believed to be used only as a store. Currently overflow parking from the property uses the road. It is felt that if the application were to be approved the problem is likely to be exacerbated.
- 9.26. Neighbours have raised concerns about the lack of provision for off road parking. They are concerned if the extension is approved this would increase the number of cars to the property.
- 9.27. Whilst these concerns are acknowledged, the Highway Authority have raised no objections and sufficient parking would be provided. As such, it is considered that the proposal would not lead to any harm to highways safety or amenity.

10. Conclusion

- 10.1. It is recognised that the applicants have made changes to their proposals to address amenity concerns. The development would also not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the locality or the nearest neighbouring properties. However, it is considered that the proposed size, form and massing of the extensions and alterations would be unacceptable, particularly in relation to the northern front elevation, and would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the property and its setting contrary to policies GSP3, LC4, LH4 and guidance in the SPD.
- 10.2. The proposal is in accordance with the relevant planning policies and guidance, and therefore the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions securing compliance with the plans and design details.

11. Human Rights

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

12. List of Background Papers (not previously published)

None

Report Author and Job Title

Teresa MacMillan, Planning Assistant