

## **12. FULL APPLICATION: SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AT 2 NEW EDGE VIEW, SMALLDALE, BRADWELL. NP/DDD/1219/1286 – JK**

**APPLICANT: MR ANDREW SMITH**

### **Summary**

1. Proposed is a small single storey extension in matching materials to the rear of an affordable house. There are no design or amenity concerns and the scale of the extension will not take the dwelling beyond affordable size guidelines.
2. The approved external landscape works on this small development have never been completed, but unusually required a parking space cut into the rear sloping garden and accessed only through the back of the existing garage. This rear space was never constructed and is to be replaced by a small private patio in the current scheme along with a new pedestrian door and window in place of the rear garage door.
3. Although the loss of the approved (and very impractical) parking space technically makes the proposal contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan, and thus generates the Parish Council objection, two replacement parking spaces are proposed on the frontage. The existing garage space would also be retained. We therefore consider the proposal addresses any parking concerns and meets the overall aim of the local plan to maintain off-street parking. The application is therefore recommended for approval subject to appropriate conditions.

### **Site and Surroundings**

4. The application site, 2 New Edge View, is the middle house of a set of three affordable terraced properties located off Michlow Lane in Bradwell, immediately to the east of the Bowling Green Public House (on land previously associated with the neighbouring Bowling Green public house). The application property is a two bedroom dwelling constructed of limestone walling under a blue slate roof. Vehicular access to the houses is via a drive from the existing public house car park. The site is located within the Bradwell Conservation Area.
5. The application property, and its two neighbours, sits lower than the neighbouring public house and car park at the bottom of a grassed bank. The rear of the houses are therefore relatively hidden from view within the Conservation Area. The front of the properties are however highly visible from Michlow Lane and currently has some negative impact upon the conservation area for reasons outlined below.
6. The existing permission for the three units was originally supposed to provide a parking space to the rear of the existing garages. These spaces have not been created and the grass embankment, which was to be terraced behind a retaining wall to provide usable amenity space to the rear of the properties, remains. As a result it appears that the landscape plans relating to the development as a whole have not been implemented despite the dwellings having been occupied for some time. The site as a whole is unsightly, and has an unfinished appearance and the existing properties have no useable amenity space or external defined parking spaces.

### **Proposal**

7. The proposed development is for a small (6.75m<sup>2</sup> internal) single storey rear extension to enlarge the existing kitchen. The plans also show replacement of the rear garage door with a standard pedestrian door and small window which would become the new rear

entrance as the extension would be over the current rear door. The applicant has stated that the existing garage will remain in use. The application also includes works to the rear to establish a retaining wall and create a small rear amenity yard space at the foot of the embankment. To the front of the dwelling across the current limestone gravelled yard the plans also show the marking out of two parking spaces for the house.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

- 1. Commence development within 3 years.**
- 2. Development to be in complete accordance with specified plans, received by the Authority 3rd February 2020, with the following references; Proposed site plan (showing 2 parking spaces and 1 garage space) 03-02-2020, Proposed back and south elevations - drawing 2, Proposed front elevations – drawing 1 and Proposed layout/floorplan - drawing 4;**
- 3. Specify materials - Natural limestone walling laid to match along with natural blue slate roof and timber windows and doors.**
- 4. Provision of the external parking spaces, as shown on ‘Proposed site plan 03-02-2020’ prior to occupation of the extension;**
- 5. The retention of the garage for the parking of vehicles throughout the lifetime of the development.**
- 6. The submission of a detailed scheme /carry out agreed scheme, of measures to reduce the carbon footprint of the proposed development and its lifetime use to meet the requirements of Policy CC1.**

### **Key Issues**

- Impact on design and character.
- Neighbour amenity.
- Parking provision

### **History**

8. As the application site is part of a wider relatively new development of three units, the planning history of the site is complex. A summary is provided below:
9. 1996 - Refusal for Erection of 3 dwellings DDD0496184 - (outline) – 1997 - The above application was subsequently allowed at appeal (273733). This permission was then renewed in 2000 (NP/DDD/0700/257).
10. 2002 – Approval of reserved matters for the three dwellings (NP/DDD/0302/159). The subsequent file records shows some discussion was held about the practicality of the rear parking spaces cut out of the bank and whilst an amended plan omitting this was submitted post decision, there are no records of this obtaining any consent as a formal amendment to the approved plan.
11. Pre-application advice was sought in 2018 (PE/2018/ENQ/34227) for a proposal which, in addition to the single storey rear extension, included an extension over the existing

garage to provide an additional bedroom and en-suite at the first floor. The advice from the Authority stated that the extensions would be acceptable in principle however, with some amendments. These amendments sought to ensure the first floor extension remained subservient to the host dwelling and replace the two proposed rooflights in the single storey rear extension with a single centrally located rooflight.

### **Consultations**

12. Highways Authority: No objection subject to suitable parking provision being provided and maintained within the site curtilage.
13. Bradwell Parish Council: Concerns have been raised that the intention of the applicant is to convert the existing garage into additional living accommodation. The council have also objected to the loss of parking in line with policy T2 of the Bradwell Neighbourhood Plan.

*Officer Comment: We note the concern over a possible intention to convert the garage but this does not form part of the application proposal and therefore no weight can be attached to this concern. In any case the garaging is protected by condition on the original consent for the houses. In respect of the Neighbourhood Plan policy T2, this is a legitimate concern and the reason why the application is brought to committee. However, whilst an approved and impractical space is lost, two further defined spaces are to be provided.*

### **Representations**

14. There have been four representations received on this application. The following is a summary of the representations received:
  - Concern that the rear extension will block light to an existing kitchen window at 1 New Edge View.
  - No need for additional living accommodation.
  - General untidiness of the site as a whole.
  - Already inadequate parking provision.

### **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

15. 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.
16. 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. 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.
17. In the National Park, the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and the 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**

18. GSP1, GSP2 - *Securing National Park Purposes and sustainable development & Enhancing the National Park*. 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.
19. GSP3 - *Development Management Principles*. 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.
20. DS1 - *Development Strategy*. Sets out that most new development will be directed into named settlements. Bradwell is a named settlement.
21. L1 - *Landscape character and valued characteristics*. Seeks to ensure that all development conserves and enhances valued landscape character and sites, features and species of biodiversity importance.
22. L3 – *Cultural heritage assets*. Seeks to ensure all development conserves and where appropriate enhances the significance of any heritage assets. In this case the Bradwell Conservation area is the relevant heritage asset.
23. Policy CC1 states that development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources.

#### **Development Management Policies**

24. DMC3 - *Siting, design, layout and landscaping* - outlines that development which is acceptable in principle will only be permitted if it is of a high standard of design which respects, protects and where possible enhances a distinctive sense of place.
25. DMH7 - *Extensions and alterations* - outlines that extensions and alterations to dwellings must not:
  - detract from the character, appearance or amenity of the original building, its setting or neighbouring buildings;
  - dominate the original dwelling;
  - amount to the creation of a separate independent dwelling;
  - create an adverse effect on, or lead to undesirable changes to, the landscape or any other valued characteristic.
  - In the case of houses permitted under policy DHH1, exceed 10% of the floorspace or take the floorspace above 97m<sup>2</sup>.

#### **Bradwell Neighbourhood Plan**

26. The Bradwell Neighbourhood Plan was 'made' in 2015. Of relevance to this application is policy T2 – Retention of car parking which opposes the loss of parking facilities and provision stating '*The removal of any current car parking facilities, both public and private, will be strongly opposed.*' This policy is cited in the response from the Parish Council.

### Supplementary Planning Documents

27. The Alterations and Extensions Guide (2015) states that extensions to existing dwellings are usually acceptable. The design guide also places great emphasis on ensuring that the extension is of an appropriate scale, with the size, shape and massing of the new development being required to be subservient to the existing dwelling.

### Assessment

#### Principle of Development

28. Extensions to existing residential properties are considered acceptable in principle as set out by policy DS1 of the core strategy subject to them having a satisfactory scale, mass and design. This reflects requirements for new development as outlined in policy GSP3. The proposal is for a single storey rear extension of modest proportions and so can be considered to be acceptable in principle. It is therefore considered that the proposal complies with the requirements of development plan policies DS1, GSP3 and national planning policy.

#### Impact upon affordability of the dwelling

29. The house in this case is an affordable dwelling restricted to occupation by persons with qualifying local residency and secured by the Authority's standard legal agreement under S106 of the Planning Act. The agreement contains a further restriction over any extensions without the Authority's prior consent and which also states that no alterations will be permitted which takes the floorspace of the dwelling beyond the affordable floorspace guidelines. This reflects the intent and wording of Policy DMH7 however DMH7 also has a maximum extension limit of 10% for these restricted dwellings.
30. The existing property is a modest two-bedroomed house with single ground floor reception room and a small kitchen. The extension will provide a larger kitchen / diner for the property. It would have a floorspace of only 6.75m<sup>2</sup> which is less than 10% of the original house and would still keep the dwelling below the maximum floorspace guidelines.
31. The extension would maintain the affordability of the property in accordance with DMH1 and DMH7.

#### Scale and Design considerations

32. The scale of the extension is very modest and its form would reflect that of the host dwelling. It would not detract from, or dominate the original dwelling. The proposed materials will match the existing property and are appropriate. Further specific details of these materials would need to be conditioned to ensure that they are acceptable within the Conservation Area.
33. The proposed extension is located to the rear of the property and sits much lower than the neighbouring public house and car park, with most views of it screened from public vantages. Therefore the visual impact within the conservation area is limited and where seen the matching materials will ensure the Conservation Area is conserved.
34. The proposed extension will not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling nor the Bradwell Conservation Area.

35. The proposal complies with the requirements of development plan policies DMC3, DMH7 and national planning policy.

### **Amenity Impact**

36. Concerns have been raised regarding the impact of the proposed rear extension on the adjacent house, 1 New Edge View. The proposed extension would be located 2.8m away from rear projecting extension at No 1 which sits on the boundary with No 2 and which contains a secondary, side window to the kitchen of 1 New Edge View. This window directly overlooks the rear amenity space to No 2 and whilst the view from it would change, the proposed extension would not appear overbearing or otherwise harm the amenity of the neighbouring property given its small scale, single storey form and projection only 2.8m off from the rear wall. There are no side windows within the proposed extension facing the neighbour and there is no impact on privacy. The proposal is acceptable in this regard.
37. The proposal will have some impact on a rear window of the application property however, again this is secondary window to the living room and thus the proposal complies with policy.
38. There is no harm to amenity and the proposal complies with the requirements of development plan policies DMC3 and DMH7 and national planning policy.

### **Parking Considerations**

39. The creation of a small amenity yard should have been undertaken as part of the original development of the three units in addition to the creation of a parking space behind the existing garage (and one next door). This is why the existing garage has a door at the front and rear of the property to enable access to a space behind the property. Implementing this proposal would remove any possibility of providing a space to the rear as permitted in the original permission and therefore is technically a loss of a single parking space which is to be replaced to the front of the dwelling.
40. The provision of parking has been highlighted by both the Highway response and the Parish Council (against their neighbourhood plan policy T2). As the property has two bedrooms, 2 parking spaces should be provided. Currently there is a garage space and no other defined parking on the site due to unfinished external landscape works, although residents currently park on the large gravelled area to the frontage.
41. The applicant has provided a proposed site plan to demonstrate that two parking spaces (in addition to the garage) will be provided and laid out in line with adopted parking standards. Therefore the proposal is in compliance with the guidance. It is recommended that a condition be attached to any approval to secure the use of the garage in perpetuity to ensure that this remains the case as well as the laying out of the formal parking spaces to the front before the extension is brought into use. Given the approved layout was somewhat impractical, the ability to rationalise the car parking situation on this site is considered beneficial and welcomed.
42. The proposal complies with the requirements of development plan policies GSP3, Derbyshire County Council parking standards, Bradwell Neighbourhood Plan policy T2 and national planning policy.

### **Environmental Impacts / Management**

43. Although the proposal is small in scale, meaningful reductions in carbon use can nevertheless still be made. Confirmation is therefore being sought for the expected use

of low energy lighting internally, to complement the low energy, movement activated lighting already specified for the external areas alongside confirmation of the use of locally obtained limestone/possibly reclaimed coupled with the use of low carbon cement in the mortar and foundations. The applicant has been requested to submit his confirmed package of measures to meet policy CC1 in time for the meeting where officers will provide a verbal update and confirm the condition wording accordingly.

### **Conclusion**

44. This application is acceptable both in principle and also in terms of its design and layout. We note and have assessed the concerns that have been raised surrounding the loss of parking and impact on neighbouring amenity. However, the applicant has provided information to demonstrate how the proposal meets the relevant standards in terms of parking provision. It is recommended that a condition is attached to secure the long term use of the garage for the parking of vehicles and to ensure that the proposed parking provision is provided prior to occupation of the extension.

### **Human Rights**

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

46. Nil