

**7. FULL APPLICATION - FULL APPLICATION – SINGLE STOREY AND TWO STOREY EXTENSION TO EXISTING CARE HOME AND POLYTUNNELS AND STORAGE SHED AT THE LODGE, MANCHESTER ROAD, HOLLOW MEADOWS (NP/S/0518/0432, P.7130, 425648 / 387941, 07/06/2018/ AM)**

This application was deferred at the August meeting to allow time for Officers to discuss the proposed polytunnels and storage shed with the applicant. The agent has submitted revised drawings which show the polytunnels and storage shed omitted from the scheme.

**APPLICANT: MOORVILLE RESIDENTIAL**

**1. Proposal**

- 1.11 The erection of a two storey and single storey extension to the existing care home.
- 1.12 The two storey extension would project from the rear of the original building between two existing elements on this elevation. The extension would have a pitched roof and would be built from materials and windows to match the main building. This extension would provide space for a hydro spa at ground floor and a larger bedroom at first floor.
- 1.13 The single storey extension would extend to the west from the recently approved extension. This extension would have a pitched roof and would be built from materials to match the main building and extension. This extension would provide for a bedroom with part of the approved extension being re-configured to provide space for a sensory room.

**2. Site and Surroundings**

- 2.1 The Lodge is located to the north of the A57 at Hollow Meadows. The property is a former dwelling now converted to a residential care home which was granted planning permission last year and more recently granted planning permission for extensions (see planning history section of the report). The property was originally associated with the old Hollow Meadows hospital located immediately to the east (now converted to housing).
- 2.2 The building is two storey and constructed in natural gritstone under a blue slate roof. The Lodge is set well back from the A57 and is accessed by a private driveway. The nearest neighbouring properties are the dwellings located in the former hospital to the east.

**3. RECOMMENDATION:**

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

1. **It is considered that by virtue of its form, design and siting that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the existing building contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP2, GS3, DS1, L1, HC4 and E2, saved Local Plan policies LC4 and LE4 the Authority's adopted design guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework.**

**4. Key Issues**

The design and scale of the proposed extension and the impact upon the character, appearance and amenity of the existing building, its setting and that of neighbouring properties.

**5. History**

1987: Planning permission granted for extension.

2007: Planning permission refused for two storey rear extension.

2011: Planning permission granted for conversion of garage to gym and granny flat.

2015: Planning permission granted for first floor extension over existing kitchen.

2017: Planning permission granted for change of use to care home for adults with autism and learning difficulties and retention of access.

2018: Planning permission granted for extension to care home.

## **6. Consultations**

Highway Authority – No response to date.

District Council – No response to date.

Parish Council – No objections.

## **7. Representations**

7.1 A total of nine representations have been received to date. Six representations support the proposed development and three representations object to the development. Four of the representations in support of the application are in the form of a questionnaire completed by residents at the site and state support for the building of the proposed facilities.

7.2 The material planning reasons given for support or objection are summarised below. The letters can be read in full on the website.

### Support

- The proposals will enhance facilities and opportunities for enabling meaningful experience for individuals on site in a safe and manageable environment.

### Object

- Proposed two storey extension will potentially increase activity in the courtyard area which is in close proximity to neighbouring gardens.
- Concern over potential future uses of proposed garden store.
- Proposed polytunnels will have an adverse visual impact.
- Proposed polytunnels will increase green waste from the site and harm the amenity of neighbouring properties.

## **8. Main Policies**

Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, E2, L1 and T2

Relevant Local Plan policies: LC4, LE4, LT10 and LT18

### National Planning Policy Framework

8.1 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. A revised NPPF was published on 24 July 2018. 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.

- 8.2 Paragraph 172 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.'
- 8.3 Paragraph 172 includes footnote 54, which notes that further guidance on how National Parks should be managed is provided in the English National Parks and Broads: UK Government Vision and Circular 2010 (the Vision and Circular).
- 8.4 Paragraph 83 states that planning decisions should enable the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of businesses in rural areas.
- 8.5 Chapter 12 of the revised NPPF, "Achieving well-designed places", sets out the Government's policy on design: "*The creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities*". Paragraph 130 states: "*Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents*".

#### Development Plan policies

- 8.7 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.
- 8.8 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.
- 8.9 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.

8.10 There is no specific relevant policy within the Authority's Development Plan covering care homes generally or for adults with autism and learning difficulties. Policy HC4 enables the provision of community services but these are encouraged within sustainable locations within settlements, elsewhere proposals to provide community facilities or services involving change of use of traditional buildings or replacement buildings achieving enhancement will be encouraged.

## **9. Assessment**

### Principle

9.1 The use of the site as a care home was granted by the Authority last year and planning permission was granted earlier this year for substantial extensions with the approved scheme allowing for a maximum occupancy of 10 persons in care within the main building and in the detached annex at the rear.

9.2 This application proposes further extensions to the existing care home and the Authority's development plan does allow for extensions to existing buildings in principle. Policy HC4 does not refer specifically to extensions to existing community facilities in the open countryside but HC4. B indicates that community facilities should involve the change of use of traditional buildings or a replacement of an existing building where there is enhancement. Policy E2 and LE4 together say that the expansion of existing businesses will be carefully considered in terms of landscape impact and should be a modest scale in relation to existing activity and/or buildings.

9.3 Therefore it is considered that relevant policies do offer support in principle an extension to the existing care home provided that the design, scale and landscape impact was acceptable and that the development was acceptable in all other respects.

### Design and Landscape Impact

9.4 This application proposes further extensions to the care home over and above those approved by the Authority earlier this year. The design of the approved extension is unchanged by this proposal.

9.5 Officers do have concerns about the design and location of the proposed single storey side extension.

9.6 The proposed single storey side extension would extend off the recently approved extension and further westwards away from the original building. When read as a whole with the approved extension would have a comparable footprint to the original building and visually from the front elevation would be wider than the original building and therefore a more dominant element. Furthermore the gable width of the extension would be wider than the main gable of the original building and approved extension and consequently would have a taller roof.

9.7 The single storey side extension would result in the approved extension becoming more dominant than the original building and the width of the gable and consequent taller roof of the extension would not harmonise with the original building or the extension. The design and siting of the single storey extension is therefore considered to be contrary to the Authority's adopted design guide.

9.8 The proposed two storey extension would be located to the rear of the original building between two existing extensions and would be sub-ordinate to it in scale and height and therefore would not be a dominant addition. The design and form of this element would also reflect the existing rear gables. Officers therefore have no objections in principle to this

element of the design and welcome the amended plans which show the rear wall of the extension is inset from the adjacent extension which is in accordance with Officer advice.

- 9.9 The polytunnels and storage shed originally proposed in the application have been omitted from the scheme. These would be sited on part of the field to the west of the care home rather than within its curtilage. Officers had strong concerns that siting these buildings within the field would result in an adverse visual and landscape impact by their use of non-traditional materials and because the buildings would encroaching into the open field where the structures would be visible from the highway and the surrounding landscape.
- 9.10 Officers consider that the proposed single storey extension would not be in accordance with the Authority's adopted design guidance and would result in the extensions as a whole having a greater and more dominant impact upon the original building. The proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the building contrary to policies GSP3, HC4, E2, LC4 and LE4.
- 9.11 If permission is granted then Officers would recommend conditions to secure the amended plans which show the polytunnels and storage shed omitted as these elements would encroach into the countryside contrary to policies GSP3, L1 and LC4. Conditions to secure matching materials for the extensions would also be recommended.

#### Amenity and Highway Safety

- 9.11 The proposed extensions would not result in any increase in the permitted number of residents at the property. There is ample parking space to accommodate the proposed development and it is considered that the proposal would not result in any substantial increase in activity, traffic or other issues such as waste over and above the existing.
- 9.12 Given the position of the proposed extensions to the north and west of the lodge and away from neighbouring properties which lie to the east and the intervening distances, there are no concerns that the extension would lead to any loss of privacy or amenity to neighbouring properties. Officers note the concerns raised about the potential future intentions of the applicant in regard to the polytunnels and storage shed, however the application must be determined on its own merits.
- 9.13 Therefore it is considered that the proposed development would not harm the amenity, privacy or security of neighbouring properties or harm highway safety.

#### Other Considerations

- 9.14 A number of representations have been received which emphasise that the proposed facilities will improve opportunities and experiences for individuals on site. Officers are sensitive to these points and recognise the importance of the accommodation provided by the applicant for residents and for people with autism who would benefit from the opportunity to live independently with care. Therefore approving the application would provide a public benefit of enhancing the existing accommodation at the site.
- 9.15 The Authority's policies do allow in principle for extensions to the existing building and in principle Officers welcome proposals to improve the accommodation provided at the lodge. However, significant concerns in regard to the design and impact of the proposal remain.
- 9.17 Therefore, while the potential benefits of allowing the scheme are understood and recognised it is considered that these benefits can be provided in a different way which is in accordance with the Authority's design and conservation policies. The National Park has the highest level of landscape protection, and the Authority's policies in relation to design and conservation cannot be put aside because the use has benefits in other respects,

particularly where these benefits could be realised in a scheme which would not be detrimental to the National Park.

## **10. Conclusion**

- 10.1 It is therefore concluded that the proposed extensions by virtue of its form and design would harm the character and appearance of the existing building contrary to relevant development plan policies and adopted design guidance.
- 10.2 Officers recognise the benefits of the accommodation and care provided on site to occupants and the wider community and in principle welcome development to enhance this accommodation and the National Park.
- 10.3 However these benefits are not considered to outweigh or override the conflict identified with the Authority's conservation policies and in the absence of further material considerations it is therefore concluded that the proposed development is contrary to the development plan. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

## **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

## **Report Author**

Adam Maxwell, Senior Planner