

**9. FULL APPLICATION – PART TWO STOREY, PART SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION FOLLOWING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE AT PLANTATION VIEW, RAKE LANE, MIDDLETON BY YOULGRAVE (NP/DDD/0419/0408 SC)**

**APPLICANT: MS B MALLABAND**

**Summary**

1. The application seeks permission for extensions to the main house for domestic residential use. The key considerations are the impact on the character of the host dwelling and its setting, the impact on the character of the conservation area and neighbour amenity. The extensions are not subservient in scale, massing and design, and would therefore detract from the simple character and appearance of the main dwelling. This would fail to preserve the character of the conservation area. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

**Site and Surroundings**

2. Plantation View is a detached cottage, sited within a reasonable sized plot on the northern side of Rakes Lane, Middleton by Youlgrave. The cottage is traditionally constructed of limestone walls under a stone slate roof. The closest residential dwellings are Oak Stone House to the north and Kings Croft Farm to the east (both grade II listed), with open fields to the west of the property. The house and its associated land lie within the conservation area of the village.

**Proposal**

3. Planning consent is being sought, to erect a two-storey extension and a single storey extension on the east gable elevation of the dwelling. The property itself comprises of a main central two-storey element with a single storey part attached to the west gable and a single storey garage attached to the east gable. The proposal is to demolish the existing single-storey garage and replace it with a part-two storey and part-single storey extension, providing additional living accommodation in the form of a larger kitchen/utility room at ground floor, with an additional bedroom at first floor level.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

1. **The proposed extensions by virtue of their scale, massing and design fail to respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and its setting. The development would also fail to preserve the character and visual amenity of the Conservation Area. As such, the development is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, Core Strategy Policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L3 and Development Management Policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC8 & DMH7 and the guidance contained within section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

**Key Issues**

4. The potential impact on the character and appearance of the host property, the Conservation Area, the privacy and amenity of neighbouring dwellings and highway safety.

### **History**

5. 2017 - Pre-application advice was sought for a two storey extension. Advising that, *'In this case, the property has been substantially extended in the past from what appears a small traditional dwelling, so consideration has to be given that further extensions may be harmful to the building and subsequently impact on the dwelling and the valued character and appearance of the wider conservation area...In my view, the thrust of this enquiry is clearly the addition of a further bedroom, which in essence could be accommodated within the existing garage building'*.
6. 1989 - WED0589269 - Extension to dwelling - Granted Conditionally.
7. 1987 - WED1187467 - Alterations and extensions to dwelling - Granted Conditionally.

### **Consultations**

8. Highway Authority - No objections, subject to applicant maintaining 2 no off street parking spaces.
9. Parish Council - *'... supports this application as the materials proposed are in keeping with the existing house, sympathetic to its surroundings and the extension provides a local family with the essential space to remain in the community. Being such a small community Council is keen to support the retention of families and local residency and the proposals appear to fully meet design and material requirements in our conservation area'*.

### **Third Party Representations**

10. There has been one representation which supports the application as the property would better meet the needs of the applicant if extended and they consider it would look better.

### **National Planning Policy Framework**

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 (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.

13. In particular, paragraph 172 states 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. Whilst 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.
14. In the National Park, the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and the new Development Management Policies (DMP), adopted May 2019. 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**

15. GSP1, GSP2 - These policies 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.
16. 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.
17. DS1 supports extensions and alterations in principle, subject to a satisfactory scale, design and external appearance.
18. L3 explains that development must conserve and where appropriately enhance or reveal the significance of historic assets and their setting. Other than in exceptional circumstances, development will not be permitted where it is likely to cause harm to the significance of any cultural heritage asset or its setting.

#### **Development Management Policies**

19. DMC3 – reiterates that where developments are acceptable in principle, policy requires that design is to high standards and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape. The siting, mass, scale, height, design, building materials should all be appropriate to the context. Accessibility of the development should also be a key consideration.
20. DMC5 provides detailed advice relating to proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, requiring new development to demonstrate how valued features will be conserved, as well as detailing the types and levels of information required to support such proposals. It also requires development to avoid harm to the significance, character, and appearance of heritage assets and details the exceptional circumstances in which development resulting in such harm may be supported.

21. DMC8 sets out that applications for development in a conservation area, or for development that affects its setting or important views into or out of the area, across or through the area should assess and clearly demonstrate how the existing character and appearance of the conservation area will be preserved and, where possible, enhanced. Applications should also be determined in accordance with policy DMC5 taking into account amongst other things, form and layout, street pattern scale, height, form and massing, local distinctive design details and the nature and quality of materials.
22. DMH7 sets out 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. DMT8 sets out that off-street parking for residential development should be provided unless it can be demonstrated that on-street parking meets highway standards and does not negatively affect the visual and other amenity of local communities. In addition, the design and numbers of parking spaces associated with residential development must respect the valued characteristics of the area, particularly in Conservation Areas.
24. The Authority has also adopted three separate supplementary planning documents (SPD) that offers design guidance on householder development namely the Design Guide, the Building Design Guide and the Detailed Design Guide on Alterations and Extensions. This guidance offers specific criteria for assessing the impacts of householder development on neighbouring properties.

## **Assessment**

### **Principle of development**

25. There are no objections in principle to extending a dwelling, subject to satisfactory scale, design and external appearance and where development pays particular attention to the amenity, privacy and security of nearby properties, in accordance with policies DS1 & DMC3 in particular.

### **Design and materials**

26. There are matters of scale and design that are not considered acceptable in the current proposal. 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
27. In this case, the proposed two-storey extension is not considered sufficiently subservient in relation to the existing dwelling. While there is a reasonable setback of the two-storey extension, there is only a nominal break between the ridge heights of the original and the proposed two-storey extension, failing to allow the original dwelling to dominate. In addition, the eaves height of the two-storey extension appears higher than the eaves of the original dwelling, resulting in a poor design feature. Furthermore, the construction of the two-storey extension would result in two traditional windows being removed from the existing gable. The new gable would have a window at first floor, which on plan does not appear to sit comfortably between the roof verge of the two-storey extension and the roof pitch of the single storey extension. In this case, the sill of the window appears to cut into the roofslope of the single storey extension and the top corner of the header is positioned very close to the edge of the roof verge of the two-storey extension.

28. The Authority's Extensions and Alterations SPD advises that if the house front has a horizontal proportion (i.e. longer than it is high) then the extension should be proportioned to match. It goes on to note that too many houses have a tall, one bay addition to the side with a proportion that is a vertical rectangle rather than the horizontal rectangle of the parent building. The two-storey element of the extension proposed here is a vertical rectangle, therefore, the proportion and massing of this does not fit well with the host dwelling.
29. It is considered the overall volume of the proposed scheme, combined with past extensions (to what was originally a small traditional cottage), would make the overall scheme too large in massing terms, dominating the original cottage and causing the scheme to be overly extended. It would be very difficult to identify the original core building and the character and readability of the building would be lost. Therefore, the extensions would fail to remain subsidiary in relation to the host property. Consequently, the scheme, by virtue of its scale, massing and design fails to respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the Conservation Area, resulting in harm to the visual amenity of the locality, conflicting with policies DMC3, DMC5 & DMC8 and the guidance contained within section 16 of the NPPF.

#### **Amenity impact on neighbouring properties**

30. 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.
31. The nearest neighbouring dwellings are Oak Stone House approximately 12m to the north and Kings Croft Farm around 13m to the east (both grade II listed). In this case, it is considered due to the orientation and separation, the proposed extensions would have no adverse impact or significantly harm the setting or residential amenity of these neighbouring properties or any other residential dwellings in the locality. Consequently, it is considered the amenity of neighbouring dwellings or any other dwellings in the locality would not be unduly compromised by the development; according with policies GSP3 & DMC3 in these respects.

#### **Highway Impact**

32. The Local Highway Authority has raised no objections, subject to the applicants maintaining two off street parking spaces. In this case, whilst there would be a loss of one garage space, there appears enough room within the curtilage of the dwelling to provide the highways recommendation to maintain two parking spaces. Subject to an appropriate condition to protect this, the proposal would be considered acceptable in highway terms, according with policy DMT8 in these respects.

#### **Environmental Management**

33. No measures in relation to carbon reduction or climate change mitigation have been proposed.

#### **Conclusion**

34. The proposed extensions by virtue of scale, massing and design, fails to respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and its setting within the village Conservation Area. We have assessed the proposal against National Planning Policy

Framework, Development Plan policies, and any other material considerations and concluded that it represents a form of development that is not capable of being amended in a way, which would make the proposal acceptable in its current form, therefore the scheme is recommended for refusal.

### **Human Rights**

- 35. Any human rights issues have been considered and addressed in the preparation of this report.
- 36. List of Background Papers (not previously published)
- 37. Nil

Report Author: Steve Coombes, Planner