

**12. FULL APPLICATION - TWO STOREY EXTENSION TO THE REAR ELEVATION, WITH GROUND FLOOR PORCH TO THE FRONT ELEVATION, AT 1 WOODLAND VIEW, BUTTS ROAD, BAKEWELL (NP/DDD/1118/1123) P4826)**

**APPLICANT: MR HENRY KAY**

**Site and Surroundings**

1. Number 1 Woodland View is the end terrace of a group of four houses situated on the west side of Butts Road, directly opposite the Bakewell Cottage Nursing Home and the Medical Centre. The property, like all other properties in the row is constructed of coursed natural limestone under a blue slate roof. The terrace and its associated front gardens are elevated from the roadside and bordered by a traditional drystone wall. To the rear of the dwelling is a small-enclosed yard with access to a single storey outbuilding and the rear entrance/exit gate. A garden area is sited beyond a rear pedestrian access path and this path is shared with other terraced houses. Access is also shared with Beech Cottage; a detached two-storey property sited around 15 metres to the west/rear of the development site. The dwelling and its associated land are located within the Bakewell Conservation Area.

**Proposal**

2. Permission is being sought to construct a two-storey extension on the rear elevation of the property and a porch to the front entrance of the dwelling. The two-storey extension would provide additional living accommodation in the form of a kitchen area at ground floor level, with a new bedroom and bathroom at first floor. The new porch would provide a covered entrance to the front doorway.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:**

1. **Statutory Time Limit.**
2. **Build in accordance with the submitted plans, subject to the following conditions;**
3. **All new stonework shall be faced, laid and pointed to match the existing dwelling.**
4. **The roofs of the two-storey extension and the porch shall be clad with slates to match the existing dwelling.**
5. **All new external doors & windows shall be of timber construction.**
6. **All new door and window frames shall be recessed from the external face of the wall the same depth as existing frames.**
7. **All window openings shall be provided with natural gritstone lintels and sills and all door openings provided with natural gritstone lintels.**
8. **All rainwater goods shall match the existing in terms of size, texture and colour.**

### **Key Issues**

3. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property, its setting within the Conservation Area, neighbour amenity and highway safety.

### **Relevant Planning History**

All relevant history relates to neighbouring houses in the terrace.

4. 2008 - (NP/DDD/1207/1117) - Construction of 2 storey rear extension and new front porch at 2 Woodland View - Granted.
5. 2007 - (NP/DDD/0807/0799) - Two-storey extension to rear of dwelling at 3 Woodland View - Granted.
6. 1998 - (NP/DDD/0798/341) - Extension to dwelling at 4 Woodland View - Granted.

### **Consultations**

7. Highway Authority - *No highway objections subject to no loss of parking.*
8. Parish Council - *'...object on design and appearance grounds; the proposal is felt to be an overshadowing/overbearing presence near a common boundary that would be to the detriment of neighbours. Should approval be considered it is recommended that the door to the extension be relocated in order to provide better visibility of other users of the shared side path when exiting the building'.*

### **Representations**

- There have been five letters of objection to the proposed scheme, the general reasons are summarised as follows.
- Part of the extension appears to be built on subservient land.
- Amenity concerns about overshadowing and overlooking.
- Negative impact on light.
- Not enough room for the storage of waste bins.
- Any side entrance would be a health and safety issue due to walking directly out onto the right of way
- Emergency services would be hindered or potentially unable to get equipment to the houses in case of emergency, due to scaffolding and skips required in the construction.
- Line of sight and sound would be diminished for the other three terraces.

### **Main Policies**

9. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L3
10. Relevant Local Plan policies: LC4, LC5, LH4, LT11

## **National Policy**

11. 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: Which are; to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage and 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.
12. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been revised (Published 19 February 2019). This replaces the previous document (2012) 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 particular,
13. Paragraph 172 asserts that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.
14. Paragraph 193 states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
15. 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. These Development Plan Policies provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. In this case, it is considered there are no significant conflicts between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and government guidance in the NPPF.

## **Main Development Plan Policies**

### **Core Strategy**

16. GSP1, GSP2, jointly seek to secure national park legal purposes and duties through the conversion and enhancement of the National Park's landscape and its natural and heritage assets.
17. GSP3 requires that particular attention is paid to the impact on the character and setting of buildings and that the design is in accord with the Authority's Design Guide and development is appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park.
18. DS1 supports extensions to existing buildings in principle, subject to satisfactory scale, design and external appearance.
19. L3 deals with Cultural Heritage Assets. Explaining that development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal the significance of historic assets and their setting.

### Saved Local Plan

20. LC4 states, that development will not normally be permitted where it would not respect, would adversely affect, or would lead to undesirable changes in the landscape or any other valued characteristic of the area. Further stating, that an appropriate scale, siting, landscaping, use of materials and a high standard of design will be required if consent is to be granted.
21. LC5, states that applications for development in a Conservation Area, or for development that affects its setting or important views into or out of the area, should assess and clearly demonstrate how the existing character and appearance of the Conservation Area will be preserved and, where possible, enhanced.
22. 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 neighbouring buildings.
23. Supplementary Planning Guidance is provided in the 1987, 2007 & 2014 Design Guides.

### Assessment

#### Principle of Development

24. Generally, there are no objections in principle to extending a dwelling, subject to satisfactory scale, design and external appearance, with reference to appropriate design options for rear extensions supported within the Authority's Detailed Design Guidance SPD. In this case, it is considered the principle is acceptable, therefore considered to accord with policy DS1 in this respect.

#### Design & Materials

25. The Authority's Design guidance states that all extensions should harmonise with the parent building and that it may be possible to add a well-designed extension provided it is in harmony with the original building and does not diminish its quality or integrity.

#### Proposed Two Storey Extension

26. To construct the new extension an existing single storey lean-to, a small outbuilding and a section of walling would all be removed. The extension would measure 3.8m wide x 5m deep x 6.8m to the ridge. The footprint of the extension would take up most of the rear yard area, with a small gap between the extension and the neighbouring dwelling. The ridge of the proposed extension would be lower than the existing, therefore appearing subordinate in scale and massing to the host dwelling. The use of natural stone and slate would reflect the appearance of the host property, and would both complement and help conserve the character of the dwelling and its setting within the wider Conservation Area.

#### Proposed Front Porch

27. To construct the proposed new entrance porch, an existing flat roofed timber and glazed porch would be removed. It is considered that the existing porch is a detracting feature. The new porch would be constructed in timber, with the framework supported on stone plinths, under a pitched roof covered in slate to match the existing dwelling. A timber framed porch would not be suitable for some property types within the national park and a more traditional solid porch would be required. However, in this case, the removal of the flat roofed 'box' would offer some enhancement and there is an existing timber sided porch at the neighbouring dwelling, which justifies the use of a timber porch in this

circumstance. It is therefore considered that the design and materials of the proposed porch is acceptable in this instance and would improve the existing appearance of the front elevation of the dwelling. Consequently this element of the scheme would preserve the character of the Conservation Area within which it is sited.

28. As such, both the two-storey rear extension and the new porch are considered acceptable in scale, form and design terms, therefore according with policies LC4, LC5 & LH4 and the guidance contained within the NPPF.

#### **Potential impact on residential amenity**

29. It is considered that outlook, amenity, privacy and daylight are fundamental considerations when altering or extending a property. This is to ensure that habitable rooms achieve a satisfactory level of outlook and natural daylight, there is adequate privacy and outdoor private amenity space and that no overbearing or harmful overshadowing of neighbouring property results.
30. Two storey-extensions on terraced properties can sometimes be difficult to achieve successfully, without causing undue harm to the residential amenity of neighbours. However, the other three properties in the terrace row have all built two storey extensions to the rear. In this case, it is considered the proposed two-storey extension to No 1 would not be unduly overbearing to residents of the adjoining properties, as it would match the neighbouring extensions in terms of height and rear projection.
31. The other property most affected by the development would be Beech Cottage; a detached building sited around 15m to the west of No.1 and at a slightly higher level. The principal windows of Beech Cottage have a southerly aspect, whereas the extension would be sited to the west. It is therefore considered that the extension would not adversely affect the principal outlook of from this neighbouring property. It is acknowledged though that there are further windows to the west facing side elevation of Beech Cottage and there would be some intervisibility with the proposed extension from these windows. The windows most affected in Beech Cottage would be a ground floor window into a sitting area and a first floor bedroom window on the west elevation of the property. There is also a garden area to the west of Beech Cottage, which shares a solid boundary with the rear gardens of both 1 & 2 Woodland View. The proposed extension would result in some degree of additional overlooking to the side elevation windows and garden area of Beech Cottage by virtue of bringing the rear elevation of the application dwelling closer to the shared boundary. However, there is already a sense of properties being in close proximity to each other here due to the historic layout of the area. The degree of overlooking arising from the proposed development would not be significantly different to the outlook from the adjoining extended dwellings.
32. The Authority's design guide states amongst other things, that in achieving a basic level of privacy between dwellings and in particular the relationship to principal windows, there has to be some flexibility in historic areas. In this case, with the intervening distance, differing levels and a slightly angled orientation between the two properties, it is considered that the development would not have an oppressive or overbearing impact on Beech Cottage, and would not result in unacceptable overshadowing or overlooking to the side elevation or the garden area of this neighbouring property. Furthermore, the development would not result in any such impacts to any other neighbouring property in the locality. Consequently, it is considered there are no significant amenity issues arising from the scheme that would adversely affect the occupants of the nearest neighbouring dwellings, or any other residential properties close by. The scheme is therefore considered to comply with GSP3 & LC4 in these respects.

### **Highway safety and access**

33. The Highway Authority have raised no objections, subject to no loss of parking. In this case, there is a parking area to the side of the dwelling, which is owned and used by the occupiers of No.1. This driveway area is part of the shared pedestrian access to the rear of the terrace properties and Beech Cottage and therefore the owner has a legal obligation to keep this clear at all times. Consequently, and subject to the access being maintained for pedestrian use to the other properties, the scheme is considered acceptable in highway terms in accordance with policies LT11 & LT18.

### **Other Issues raised**

34. Issues have been raised by objectors relating to the impact on light, potential discrepancies to correct boundary lines in the property's deeds and concerns over the impact of the development on the shared rights of way. Whilst noted, these issues are considered to be private legal matters and are not material planning considerations.

### **Conclusion**

35. The proposed two-storey rear extension and porch extension are of an appropriate scale, design and appearance in relation to the existing property, uses natural materials in keeping with the immediate surroundings and would have no adverse impact on any nearby residential amenity, whilst preserving the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. In addition, there are considered no highway concerns. Consequently, the scheme is in accordance with Development Plan Policies, adopted Design Guidance, and recommended for approval, subject to appropriate conditions.

### **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** – Steve Coombes, Planner