

16. FULL APPLICATION - ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AT 12 MAWSTONE LANE, YOULGRAVE DE45 1WJ (NP/DDD/1118/1110 TM)

APPLICANT: MR SAMUEL WILSON

Summary

1. The proposed two storey extension is too large, would significantly increase the width of the dwelling and would unbalance the appearance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings. The proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, and its setting. The application is recommended for refusal.

Site and Surroundings

2. 12 Mawstone Lane is a semi-detached property situated within a small estate on the very edge of the settlement limits of Youlgrave. The site does not lie within Youlgrave's designated Conservation Area.
3. The form of the house is typical of a mid-twentieth century semi-detached house. It has smooth rendered external walls under a hipped natural blue slate roof. All windows and doors are white Upvc. Its design is suburban and does not reflect the local building tradition.
4. The rear of the property is open to fields and there is a footpath on the opposite side of the boundary walling.
5. The nearest neighbouring properties are the adjoining property at 11 Mawstone Lane to the east, numbers 17 and 18 Mawstone Lane located opposite the site and approximately 25m to the south and a block of four terraced properties at numbers 13 to 16 Mawstone Lane which are located about 12 to the west at the nearest point.

Proposal

6. This application seeks full planning permission for a two storey side extension.
7. The proposed two storey side extension would protrude 4m from the western elevation of the host dwelling and would be 4.3m in width. The extension would be constructed from stone and rendered, with a blue slate tiled hipped roof. It would have Upvc windows and doors to match the host dwelling. French doors are proposed to the rear (north) elevation.
8. The extension would provide additional living accommodation in the form of office/utility room and toilet at ground level and a new bedroom and bathroom at the first floor.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

The proposed two storey extension by virtue of its scale, form and massing fails to harmonise with the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and its setting. Overall the extension would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposed development is

contrary to guidance and to the requirements of Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP3 and L3 and saved Development Management policies DMC3 and DMH7.

Key Issues

9. The principle of development
10. The impact on the appearance of the property
11. The impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties

History

12. No relevant planning history.

Consultations

13. Youlgrave Parish Council: Support and made the following comment: *“Supports this extension which is in keeping with the main structure and surrounding houses with similar extensions. It fulfils a local need for its resident family”*
14. Derbyshire County Council (Highways): *“No highway objections subject to applicant demonstrating 3no off street parking spaces, minimum 5.5m depth.”*
15. Derbyshire Dales County Surveyor: No response to date.

Representations

16. During the consultation period, the Authority has not received any representations regarding the proposals.

National Policy

17. 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.
18. 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, 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.
19. In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and the Adopted Development Management Policies. 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 government guidance in the NPPF with regard to the issues that are raised.

Main Development Plan Policies

- 20. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, GSP4, DS1, L1
- 21. Relevant Development Management policies: DMC3, DMH7, DMT8
- 22. 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.
- 23. 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.
- 24. DS1 supports extensions to existing buildings in principle, subject to satisfactory scale, design and external appearance.
- 25. 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.

Development Management Policies

- 26. DMC3 states that development will be permitted provided that its detailed treatment is of a high standard that respects, protects and where possible enhances the natural quality and visual amenity of the landscape, including the wildlife and cultural heritage that contribute to the distinctive sense of place.
- 27. With particular attention to (i) siting scale, form, mass, levels, height and orientation in relation to existing building, settlement form and character, including impact on open spaces, landscape features and the wider landscape setting which contribute to the valued character and appearance of the area; and (vi) the detailed design of existing buildings, where ancillary building, extensions or alteration are proposed; and (vii) amenity, privacy and security of the development and other properties that the development affects.
- 28. DMH7 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.
- 29. DMT8 States off-street parking spaces provided as part of a development will be protected where there is evidence that loss of such space would exacerbate local traffic circulation problems.

Relevant Guidance

- 30. Supplementary Planning Guidance is provided in the 1987, 2007 and 2014 Design Guides.

Assessment

Principle of Development

31. In principle, 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 extensions supported within the Authority's Detailed Design Guidance SPD.
32. The Development Management policy DCM3 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.
33. The Development Management policy DMH7 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.

Design

34. The application site sits towards the head of a cul-de-sac of similar properties. Whilst the dwellings aren't necessarily typical of the Peak District vernacular, they form a well-laid out 20th century housing development with a uniformity to the scale and massing of the houses and generous spacing between the plots. It is therefore important that any extensions preserve these characteristics of the area.
35. With a projection of 4 metres from the side elevation, the extension is of a substantial size. The size, form and massing of the proposed extension are too large and would unbalance the appearance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings to the detriment of the character of the area.
36. As initially submitted the extension would have protruded from the west elevation by 4.8m and it would have been 5m deep. The design was too large and was not subservient to the host building and would have been harmful to character of the host building. While this has now been reduced, the resulting proposal is still too large in terms of scale and massing.
37. In terms of preserving the character of the area the best alternative solution here would be to build a two storey extension to the rear. The site has a large rear garden and the host property is of sufficient width to allow a two storey extension to be constructed on the back without harming the amenity of the adjoining house at number 11 Mawstone Lane. Other similar properties on Mawstone Lane have extended both to the rear and front in ways that are less inappropriate than is proposed in this case. The applicant has been advised that a rear extension could provide the living space they require and meet our policy requirements.
38. A side extension could also be supported if it was a reduced width, a maximum of 3m, pulled back in line with the rear elevation of the existing host dwelling would be acceptable. While a rear extension is the best solution, a side extension of this scale would reduce the visual impact of the extension and the extent to which the pair of semi-detached houses would be unbalanced and therefore could be supported.
39. Amended plans were submitted. However, the width of the extension has only been reduced by 0.8 metres, to 4 metres. This makes very little difference to the

appearance of the proposed extension and does not overcome the concerns. The extension as now proposed is still overly-large, would result in the host dwelling appearing over-extended and would significantly unbalance the appearance of the pair of semi-detached houses. This would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would create an incongruous feature in the street scene that would be harmful to the character of the area. The application is therefore contrary to policies GSP1, GSP3, L3, DMC3 and DMH7.

Impact upon amenity

40. The proposed two storey side extension would be to the west elevation of the host property. The nearest neighbouring properties are the adjoining property at 11 Mawstone Lane to the east, 17 and 18 Mawstone Lane located opposite the site approximately 25m to the south and terrace properties at 13 to 16 Mawstone Lane that are located on slightly higher level approximately 12 to the west.
41. The extension would be visible to 13 to 16 Mawstone Lane also 17 and 18 Mawstone Lane. 13 Mawstone Lane is the closest neighbour to the west of the proposed site. There are no windows proposed to the west elevation, so there would be no overlooking between the host building and 13 Mawstone Lane.
42. We consider that the proposed extension would not be oppressive when viewed from the windows of 13 Mawstone Lane given the change in land levels. The proposed extension would not cause any overshadowing to 13 Mawstone Lane or 14 to 16 Mawstone Lane. We consider it would not harm the amenity of occupiers of these dwellings or any other nearby dwelling by way of overshadowing or oppressive impacts.
43. Overall we consider 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 DMC3 in these respects.

Highway Impacts

44. The Highway Authority has raised no objections subject to applicant demonstrating three off street parking spaces, minimum 5.5m depth. The applicant has submitted a plan on 29/12/18 for the proposed parking arrangements. The details submitted show adequate parking space for three vehicles. The proposal accords with policy DMT8.

Environmental Impacts

45. By virtue of the proposed scale, location and nature of the proposed development, it is considered that an environmental impact assessment is not required.

Conclusion

46. The proposed development, by virtue of the scale, form and massing fail to respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, and its setting. As such, the proposed development is contrary to guidance and to the requirements of Core Strategy policies GSP1 and GSP3, and Development Management policies DMC3 and DMH8. It also conflicts with advice contained in the Authority's Adopted Design Guidance.

Human Rights

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

48. Nil

Report Author: Teresa MacMillan – Planning Assistant South Area