

7. FULL APPLICATION – EXTENSION AND ALTERATIONS TO THE HOUSE, RE-ORGANISATION OF DRIVE AND GARDEN AREAS AND NEW DOUBLE GARAGE, GATEHOUSE FARM COTTAGE GATEHOUSE LANE HATHERSAGE (NP/DDD/1018/0912, JEN)

APPLICANT: MR JOHN MORFFIT

Site and Surroundings

1. Gatehouse Farm Cottage (the cottage) is located in open countryside, approximately 2km to the north of Hathersage. The property is located on Gatehouse Lane and forms part of a cluster of four dwellings.
2. The existing building is a detached two bedroom dwelling constructed from natural gritstone under a pitched roof clad with concrete tiles. Windows and doors are white and a mixture of timber and uPVC. There is a projecting bay window at first floor on the west facing elevation.
3. The property was formerly a barn or outbuilding and part of Gatehouse Farm, historically altered and converted to form a dwelling which is now in separate ownership to the farmhouse. Access to the property is via driveway shared with the farm house.
4. The cottage lies forward of the facade of the farmhouse. The northern and eastern gable walls of the cottage form two boundaries with the farm house. The two plots share a driveway but are separated by gates and a wall. The garage is an extension to the stone outbuilding which lies to the south of the farmhouse but is built of block work.
5. Little Gate House is located on lower ground to the south and Gatehouse is located further south east beyond.

Proposal

6. The application proposes extensions and alterations to the existing dwelling, re-organisation of drive and garden, demolition of the blockwork garage and erection of a new double garage.
7. A two storey extension is proposed to the western elevation of the existing building, with a double height glass opening at the division between the existing building and the extension. A single storey ground floor extension behind the two storey extension will return along the corner of the site along the boundary, resulting in an L shaped floor plan with the front elevation of the extension two storeys high and the rear part one storey. The one storey extension is proposed to have a green roof and has been designed to sit below a line 1800mm above the boundary wall.
8. There are windows on the boundary at the rear which overlook the neighbouring farmhouse in the building as it currently is arranged. It is proposed that these openings be blocked up and replaced with roof lights.
9. As part of the scheme the fenestration of the existing building would also be altered. New timber windows and doors would be installed along with roof lights on the front and rear elevation. The existing windows to the rear elevation would be blocked with matching stonework.

10. It is proposed to construct the extension using natural stone and slate with timber windows and powder coated folding sliding doors.
11. Amended plans have been submitted following discussions between Officers the agent and applicant. The amended plans show a reduced scale extension and narrowing of the double height glass opening proposed to the front elevation.
12. The existing outbuilding would be demolished and a new double garage erected. The garage would be built from gritstone with concrete tile roof. Two timber garage doors would be positioned in the west elevation with roof lights in the east elevation.
13. It is proposed that the existing block work garage is demolished. A reorganisation of the parking arrangements to create a turning area and a new double garage be of traditional form and design is proposed.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. **Standard time limit.**
2. **Prior to the commencement of the development a construction management plan shall be submitted showing areas of the site to be used for storing building materials and placement of skips.**
3. **Development in complete accordance with the submitted plans including 101RevQ, 102RevK, 103RevK, 104RevJ and 106RevE, and specifications, subject to the following conditions or modifications.**
4. **Stone panel and roof materials to be submitted for approval.**
5. **Detailed specification of windows and doors to be submitted for approval.**
6. **Rooflights in the garage to be no larger than 78cm long 55cm wide.**
7. **The rear single storey extension to measure no higher than 1800mm from existing ground levels immediately adjacent at Gatehouse Farm.**
8. **Details of surface water drainage to be submitted for approval**
9. **Submission of a scheme for maintenance of the green roof.**
10. **Remove permitted development rights for extensions and alterations and for ancillary buildings in the curtilage.**
11. **All new door and window frames within the extension shall be recessed from the external face of the wall to the same depth as the existing frames on the host dwelling.**
12. **All rooflights shall be fitted flush with the roofslope.**

13. The glass divide to the south facing elevation of the two storey extension shall be no wider than 900mm and shall be recessed from the external face of the wall by at least 100mm.

14. No fascia or barge boards.

Key Issues

14. Impact of the proposed development upon the character, appearance and amenity of the existing building, its setting and that of neighbouring properties.

Relevant Planning History

15. 2017 – Pre-application enquiry in regard to proposed extensions. Officers gave the following advice.

16. *“The property is a modest two bedroom dwelling. It appears that there have been a number of unfortunate alterations to the property over the years and I agree that the bay window and unresolved fenestration generally does not reflect the local vernacular. I do think there is scope in principle for extensions / alterations geared around providing additional living space and enhancing the character and appearance of the building.*

17. *The proposed two storey side extension would not be read as subordinate instead the proposal is essentially to change the fenestration of the building so that it reads as a cottage with shippon. Normally my view would be that this extension is too large and that this was falsifying the history of the building and harming character (as it was formerly a barn) - however it appears that there is little left of the original character of the building which neither reads as a vernacular barn or cottage at the moment.*

18. *In this circumstance I do think that a two storey side extension along the lines you are proposing would be acceptable in principle, however the key would be that the development results in enhancement.*

19. *However I do have concerns about the single storey rear element and the detailing proposed in the extension. My view is that the rear element should be reduced to a single storey ‘cat-slide’ element reflecting the shippon design. I also feel that the balcony and large glazed opening on the west facing gable are inappropriate and act to counter the overall aim of enhancement. Note, Officers provided a sketch plan to the agent with suggested amendments.*

20. *No details of garage or ancillary accommodation provided and therefore not possible to give detailed comments on these at the pre-application stage.”*

21. December 2017 & January 2018 - An application proposing extending the property in a 2 storey L shaped arrangement was considered by Planning Committee in December 2017 and January 2018 and was refused on the basis that the design would harm the character and appearance of the existing building and its setting and that by virtue of its position and proximity to Gatehouse Farm, it is considered that the proposed extension would be overbearing and oppressive and create additional over-shadowing which cumulatively would harm the residential amenity of occupants of that property.

22. 2018 - Following that refusal, pre-application discussions have been held with the applicants and with the residents of Gatehouse Farm. Discussions with the nearest neighbours have been concerned with identifying a scheme which addresses amenity

and reduces overbearing impacts. Other discussions with the applicants have been concerned with scale, massing and design to secure a scheme which conserves and enhances the National Park.

Consultations

23. Highway Authority – No objections.
24. District Council – No response to date.
25. Parish Council – Support the application for the following reasons.
26. ‘The single storey extension to the rear is being lowered to reduce visibility to the neighbours; the green living roof covering is welcome; the layout is improved and the removal of the UPVC ‘prow’. The Parish Council do ask that the maintenance of the living roof is ensured by future owners of the property and that due to the closeness of Sycamore trees any seedlings are removed.’
27. Further comments were received that reiterate support and add that:
‘The height of the garage needs to be kept as low as possible so as not to impact the view and may reduce the natural light into Gate House Farm. The Parish Council are concerned about the size and proximity of the garage to the neighbours at Little Gate House. The position of the garage will be very close to the boundary wall where the ground level of Little Gatehouse is 2.5m below the boundary wall and the kitchen wall of the house is only 1m away from this wall, therefore the garage could have an overbearing effect and reduce natural light.

There is some confusion as to the planning history of the site which may need investigation.’

Representations

28. Three representations have been received to date.
29. The first of these is from residents of The Gatehouse who own the drive which accesses the cottage and Gatehouse Farm. The representation raises concerns that the increased scale of the property proposed would lead to increased vehicle movements and the construction traffic which may both risk harm to a wall adjacent to the access. This is not a material planning consideration and is a private matter between the property owners.
30. The second of these is from the residents of Gatehouse Farm. They welcome the reduction in height of the rear extension and the maximum height of 1800mm which is proposed and the increase in height of the dry stone garden wall dividing the two properties which will retain residential amenity in that respect.
31. The representation states that they are grateful for the reduction in the garage height but do have some concerns that it is close to the retaining wall as set out above.
32. They go on to express that despite the improvements to the scheme they have concerns over increase in size of the property and the potential increase in the volume of pedestrian and vehicular access, along the shared access and in front of their front garden. They would prefer an alternative access be provided from Gatehouse Lane.

33. An alternative access was discussed with the neighbours at a pre-application meeting. It is not considered that the impacts of use of the access have a detrimental effect on residential amenity, it is not unusual for vehicles to pass in front of other properties front gardens. This would not be sufficient grounds to sustain a refusal of planning permission. In addition, residential use arising from the proposal would not be intensified sufficiently that an alternative access could be reasonably required by condition.
34. The third representation is from residents of Little Gate House, located to the south of the application site, closest to the garage part of the proposal.
35. They are concerned that the development may impact the stability of the boundary dry stone wall which defines the southern boundary of Gatehouse Farm Cottage. While this is largely not a planning issue and is a private property issue between the landowners, they raise concerns about movement of delivery vehicles and placement of skips during construction, which could be reasonably controlled by condition.
36. The representation also asks that the surface rainwater from the new garage roof be controlled to drain towards the large pond in the garden and not directly towards their property.
37. Finally they raise concerns that the south elevation and the height of the ridge of the new garage would restrict light to their property. Further discussion of this is covered under 'Amenity' below.

38. Main Policies

39. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L1
40. Relevant Local Plan policies: LC4, LC20, LH4, LT11 and LT18
41. National Planning Policy Framework
42. 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.
43. 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.'
44. 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).

45. 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”*.
46. Development Plan policies
47. 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.
48. 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.
49. 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.
50. Saved Local Plan Policy Local Plan Policy LH4 deals specifically with extensions and alterations to dwellings which includes outbuildings. An extension of this type would not be permitted if it detracted from the character, appearance or amenity of the original building its setting or neighbouring buildings or if it dominates a building of historic or vernacular merit.
51. The above policies are supported by LC4, which requires a high standard of design which respects and conserves the landscape, built environment and other valued characteristics of the local area. It goes on to state that consideration will be paid to the scale, form and massing of the proposal in relation to the existing building and its setting; design details and materials reflecting traditions of local buildings. The policy also pays particular attention to the amenity, privacy and security of the development and nearby properties.
52. LT11 and LT18 require development to be served by a safe access and have adequate parking and turning space.

53. The Authority's adopted design guide and alterations and extensions detailed design guide are material considerations in the determination of this application.

Design

54. The application building is a former barn previously associated with Gatehouse Farm but now in separate ownership. The building has some time ago been converted to a dwelling and a number of unfortunate alterations have taken place including the introduction of a projecting bay window at first floor, unresolved window fenestration and a prominent flue. Due to the changes made to the building in its conversion in the 1960's, it neither appears as a converted barn or as a cottage. The building is confused in design terms. Officers have advised at the pre-application stage that there is an opportunity for a development to enhance the character of the building (see planning history section). This was reflected in the debate that planning committee had when considering the previous application.
55. The proposed two storey side element would match the eaves and ridge height of the existing building and be fenestrated with a double height glass dividing, with a width of 900mm - the width of a domestic internal door. The glass would be set between the existing building and the new extension to the front elevation as a dividing feature which helps to address the lack of setting back or reduced ridge height for the extension which cannot be achieved in this case due to the roof pitch of the existing building. The proposed double height extension is detailed in a simple manner, while it is dominant in terms of scale which would not normally be acceptable (and runs contrary to the Alterations and Extensions SPD), it avoids creation of the pastiche of agricultural barn detailing, which would not be relevant to the building which has evolved beyond its agricultural roots. The SPD states that the reason that extensions with a common ridge height and eaves with the original building are not acceptable is that the extension 'dominates the original building, spoiling its character and appearance.' In this case little original character remains and improvement to the unsympathetic alterations provide an opportunity for enhancement with an extension which is appropriate in its own right. While it would usually be desirable to secure enhancement with a smaller scale side extension it is difficult to achieve enough additional accommodation in this case due to the roof pitch and gable size, and a two storey rear extension providing more accommodation would be unacceptable in terms of amenity due to the overbearing nature of that for the neighbouring property.
56. The existing window openings would be altered and provided with more traditional openings. The resultant building would appear as a result, superficially as a traditional cottage with a double height extension to the front elevation. This would fundamentally change the character of the building, but in principle this approach is considered to be beneficial given that any character that the former barn possessed has been lost through unsympathetic alterations over the years.
57. On the rear elevation (which is the boundary between the properties) it is proposed that the two rear windows which overlook the garden of neighbouring property Gatehouse Farm, are infilled with stonework. This is considered a benefit of the proposal as it will resolve an existing issue of overlooking. It is proposed that five conservation rooflights (550mmx990mm) are inserted into the roof to provide additional light which will in part compensate for the loss of the rear windows. Four of these would be located on the rear elevation and one on the front. While in other more traditional buildings rooflights of this size may not be considered acceptable, due to the benefit of the blocking of the

rear windows, the primarily rear placement and the non-traditional qualities of the building, the rooflights are considered acceptable in this case.

58. The proposed rear extension would be dug into the ground ensuring its height is not greater than 1800mm from the higher ground levels in Gatehouse Farm's garden. This single story element of the scheme is proposed to have a less traditional appearance with a flat green roof, and the elevation to the west largely glazed. The design addresses concerns about neighbour amenity, loss of light and overbearing. While this extension would change the plan form to an L shape, again, so little of the character of the building as a barn is retained, that this is not considered a significant loss in this case. The use of traditional materials and the green roof are considered to ensure that the impact of the rear extension in the landscape is acceptable and that the rear extension will appear congruent with the design of the existing and proposed 2 storey elements of the scheme in accordance with policies GSP3 and LH4.
59. Officers consider that the benefits of improvements to the existing fenestration would be welcomed and would improve the existing parts of the building. The use of local stone, wooden windows and powder coated door frames in the glazed doors is considered to make a positive contribution to the National Park. The Authority's policies and design guide seek enhancements to re-inforce local distinctiveness.
60. Although the proposal exceeds the scale and dominance of extension that would normally be considered acceptable, the improvements to the existing building, the simple design of the two storey extension with the glass divide and the reduction of amenity impacts on the neighbouring property arising from the design and position of the single story extension in this case creates an opportunity to secure enhancement with an extension which is acceptable in its own right in design terms.
61. The design of the proposed garage reflects a traditional building with the openings beneath the eaves in accordance with adopted design guidance. The garage incorporates two roof lights which while located on the most appropriate roof slope, are considered to be unacceptable as proposed in terms of their size and the volume of glazing within the roof. A condition can be applied to address this and it is considered that roof lights of no greater size than 780mmx550mm would address this issue.

Amenity and Other Issues

62. The rear wall of the cottage effectively forms part of the southern boundary to Gatehouse Farm and the curtilage of the cottage follows northwards along the western boundary where there is a Yew tree within the boundary of Gatehouse Farm. There is an existing conservatory extension on the west side of Gatehouse Farm located approximately 4m from the rear wall of the cottage subject to the proposal (and there is currently a planning application under consideration which would replace that conservatory with a garden room). The small distance between the properties is unusual and potentially reflective of the fact that until recently the properties were within a single ownership.
63. Gatehouse Farm Cottage was converted in the 1960's and the issue of the historic relationship of the cottage with Gatehouse farm has been raised by a number of representations and the Parish Council. When the cottage was granted planning permission it was subject to a planning condition restricting occupancy to "service accommodation associated with Gatehouse Farm". The application proposes extensions to the property and therefore would not change this planning condition, and the proposal can be considered without the matter of the condition being addressed.

The applicants have been advised of the condition and will consider how they wish to proceed.

64. Due to the close distance of the two buildings and the orientation of the cottage which is on the southern boundary, the cottage does currently result in over-shadowing to the conservatory and has an overbearing and oppressive impact. The conservatory is also currently overlooked by the two existing windows to the rear of the cottage which serve the staircase and bathroom. The existing windows currently represent a clear overlooking issue and potential loss of privacy to occupants of both properties.
65. The application proposes to block the rear windows of the cottage which would resolve the existing overlooking situation and this is welcomed. The applicants have worked with officers and the neighbours to identify the best way to achieve additional accommodation without compounding the existing over-bearing relationship between the properties.
66. The proposed rear extension would effectively wrap around the south western corner of the boundary to Gatehouse Farm. But at the rear of Gatehouse Farm Cottage (the application site), the proposed extension is single storey and is proposed to take advantage of falling ground levels and some excavation to ensure it is no more than 1800mm above the current ground levels of the neighbours garden. The boundary wall which extends to the north is proposed to be extended in height to 1.8m to provide further privacy for both properties.
67. It is therefore considered that the proposed extension addresses previous concerns regarding over-shadowing and does not exacerbate the existing overbearing relationship between the properties in accordance with Core Strategy policy DS1, Local Plan policy LC4 and the Authority's adopted detailed design guide.
68. The proposed garage would be positioned close to the southern boundary of the site which is shared with Little Gate House to the south. The residents of Little Gate House have made a representation and are concerned that the construction of the development may have an impact on the stability of the wall between the properties. The wall is close to the elevation of Little Gate House, around 1m away, and they are concerned that if the wall collapsed this could impact their property. This is to some extent a private property issue between the residents and should be resolved between the parties, however, it would be possible to add a condition to require a construction management plan to ensure that the placement of spoil and skips etc. are appropriately placed to reduce unnecessary impacts close to the boundary.
69. Little Gate House sits at a lower level to the site of the proposed garage and has a predominately blank facing elevation but a kitchen window is on this elevation 3m below the top of the boundary wall level and 1m from the boundary wall. The residents of Little Gate House are concerned that the proposed replacement garage may further restrict light to the property. However, due to the location of the window on a north facing elevation, below the wall height the proposed garage would not be any further overbearing than the existing boundary wall or result any significant loss of light to that property.
70. Residents of Little Gate House are also concerned that run off from the garage roof be directed away from their property and this can be secured by a condition requiring drainage details to be provided.
71. Representations made by residents of The Gatehouse who own the drive which accesses the cottage and Gatehouse Farm raises concerns that the increased volume

of traffic due to the increased size of the property and from the construction traffic may risk harm to a wall adjacent to the access. This is not a material planning consideration and is a private matter between the property owners.

72. It is considered that the development is not unneighbourly in principle and has been designed to minimise the impacts of the development on neighbouring properties. Conditions can be added to the development to control construction and drainage impacts. The proposal is therefore in accordance with policy GSP3.
73. In accordance with policies LT11 and LT18 the proposed development would not impact upon existing access arrangements and would retain sufficient parking for the proposed four bedroom dwelling. Therefore Officers agree with the Highway Authority that in principle there is no objection to the proposals on highway safety grounds.

Conclusion

74. It is therefore concluded that the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of design and would enhance the character and appearance of the property and its setting and would not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity.

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

Author of report: Jane Newman, Head of Development Management