

**7. FULL APPLICATION – SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION, AND THE REPLACEMENT OF THE FRONT PORCH AT STUBLEY, CREAMERY LANE, PARWICH, ASHBOURNE, DE6 1QB (NP/DDD/0320/0220 TM)**

**APPLICANT: MRS PATTI BEASLEY**

**Summary**

1. The application seeks permission to erect a single storey wrap around extension to the side and rear of an existing property. The key considerations are, the principle, the potential impact on the character and appearance of the host property and the privacy and amenity of neighbouring dwellings and the wider locality. In this case, the impacts are considered unacceptable and the application is recommended for refusal on scale, form, massing and design grounds.

**Site and Surroundings**

2. Stublely, also known as Lower Monsdale House, is a 1980's two storey detached four bedroom house. It is built from limestone davy blocks with gritstone window surrounds, lintels and quoins, under a clay tiled roof. It has been built in a traditional style which is similar to the neighbouring property constructed at the same time. There are two side by side garages to the front of the property, one is for a neighbouring property.
3. The site is situated on the eastern side of the Village of Parwich on Creamery Lane and is across the road from the designated Parwich Conservation Area. The rear of the property faces open fields.
4. The nearest neighbouring properties are Inglefield located 6m to the north, Retlenden House located approximately 50m to the west and 3 Parson Croft located 26m to the south.
5. There are several listed buildings within Parwich and the nearest is Orchard View House (Grade II) which is located approximately 30m south west. There is a public footpath that runs west to east, 12m north of the site.

**Proposal**

6. The applicant seeks full planning permission the erection of a single storey side and rear extension, and the replacement of the front porch. The proposed extension to the side would be constructed from limestone ashlar to the side and rear, and limestone ashlar detailing with limestone Davy blocks to the front elevation. The roof would be flat with two large rooflights.
7. The rear extension would have a fin at the side extending beyond the extension and a canopy joining it to the onto the side extension. The roof appears as one piece with a sandstone fascia across the rear and down the side return and on to the front extension elevation.
8. There would be two lots of triple doors and an addition set of three windows of almost full height at ground floor level. In addition a first floor window is proposed to be enlarged.
9. During the application, discussions with the agent have taken place regarding the flat roof design of the side and rear extension, and the amount of glazing to the rear. We are concerned that these elements of the scheme do not harmonise with the traditional style of the host dwelling and are contrary to the design guide.

10. We recommended:

- That the amount of glazing to the ground floor and first floor to the rear of the property be reduced to give a better solid to glazing ratio.
- To alter the contemporary fins/walls with the flat roof to the rear of the property.
- To provide an alternative roof arrangement to the side extension that is more traditional in style.
- To keep the existing traditional style porch rather than changing to a flat roof option.

11. A supplemental statement and amended plans were submitted showing a reduction in size of the window to the first floor, removal of some of the fin walls, pulling back the canopy to the rear, keeping the existing porch and the removal a window in the side extension. The style of the side and rear extension flat roof remained the same.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

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

13. **The proposed side and rear extension by virtue of the scale, form, massing and design, fails to harmonise with or adequately respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. The proposal would also have an unduly harmful visual impact on the character of this part of the National Park. As such, the proposed development is contrary to guidance and to the requirements of Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP3 and L3, and Development Management policies DMC3, DMC8 and DMH7.**

### **Key Issues**

14. The design, scale and the impact on the appearance of the host property, the character of the nearby Conservation Area and the special qualities of the National Park.

### **Relevant Planning History**

15. No relevant planning history.

### **Consultations**

16. Derbyshire County Council (Highways): No highway objections

17. Derbyshire Dales District Council: No response to date

18. Parwich Parish Council: Support - No objections

### **Representations**

19. A total of 20 letters of support have been received from local people. In summary they raise the following points:

- Parwich has a variety of traditional and newer buildings.
- Several buildings within Parwich have flat roofs.
- Limited visibility from the footpath at the rear.

- Extension would not be visible from the road,
- There are numerous glass extensions/conservatories around the village.
- The design will enhance an ‘ordinary’ property.
- The house does not fall in the Conservation Area.
- The house has no architectural merit.

### Main Policies

20. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L1, L3

21. Relevant Development Management Plan policies: DMC3, DMC8, DMH7

### National Planning Policy Framework

22. 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.
23. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) replaced a significant proportion of central government planning policy with immediate effect when first published in 2012. The latest version of the NPPF was published on 19 February 2019. 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 policies of the Development Management Policies document 2019. 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.
24. Paragraph 172 of the NPPF states that ‘*Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing 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 these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.*’

### Main Development Plan policies

25. 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). GSP1 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.
26. 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.

27. DS1 - Development Strategy. Supports extension / alterations in principle subject to satisfactory scale and design.
28. Policy L1 identifies that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character as identified in the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan and other valued characteristics, and other than in exceptional circumstances, proposals in the Natural Zone.
29. Policy L3 – Development Strategy for Cultural Heritage Assets. States that development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal the significance of architectural or historic assets and their settings.

#### Development Management Policies

30. DMC3 sets out that where development is acceptable in principle, it will be permitted provided that its detailed treatment is of a high standard that respects, protects and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape, including the wildlife and cultural heritage assets. Particular attention will be paid to siting, scale, form, mass, landscape setting and the valued character and appearance of the area.
31. DMC8 states that applications for development in a Conservation Area, or for development that affects its setting or important views into or out, or 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.
32. 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.

#### Supplementary Planning Guidance

33. The Authority's Design Guide and Detailed Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Documents give advice that is relevant to the consideration of this application.
34. Chapter 3 of the Alterations and Extensions Detailed Design Guide states that there are three main factors to consider, massing, materials and detailing and style. It states that all extensions should harmonise with the parent building, respecting the dominance of the original building and being subordinate to it. The original character of the property should not be destroyed when providing additional development.
35. Chapter 7 of the Design Guide discussed extensions to existing buildings and states "*All extensions should harmonise with the parent building*".

#### Assessment

##### Design and Landscape Impacts

36. The key issues are whether the proposal would conserve the character and appearance of the building, the setting of the nearby Conservation Area and the special qualities of the National Park or would harm the amenities of nearby neighbouring properties.
37. The amended scheme proposes both a side and rear extension. The side extension would incorporate a bedroom, bathroom and dressing room. The flat roofed extension to the side would protrude 3.2m by 9.2m in length and would be constructed from limestone ashlar to

the side and rear, and limestone Davy Blocks to the front elevation. The flat roof would be green with sandstone fascia and there would be two large aluminium framed rooflights. To the rear elevation there would be a triple dark grey aluminium framed window almost at full height.

38. The rear extension would protrude 0.85m by 8.5m in length. There would be two lots of dark grey aluminium triple doors with a canopy over which joins the side extension. There would be a contemporary fin wall (1.2m depth) constructed from limestone ashlar with holes to allow light through. The additional depth of floorspace projecting from the rear of the host property is small and in this amended scheme the canopy has been pulled back, however, the extension still appears as a solid and dominant form due to the flat roof and the contemporary features, in particular the sandstone fascia.
39. The two extensions are effectively joined creating a wrap around extension feature from the front of the property down the side and across the back, with the side part extending beyond the rear extension line.
40. One of the first floor windows to the rear has been increased in size.
41. The existing building although built in the 1980s has been built with the traditional style and massing of the National Park building tradition and was no doubt in line with the design guide at that time. It has kept the three main characteristics of a traditional elevation as set out in Chapter 3 of the Alterations and Extensions Detailed Design Guide, which are “*A balance of proportions between the overall shape of the walls and the opening they contain, a high solid to void ratio in which the wall dominates and a simple arrangement of openings (symmetrical)*”. Although the building is of no particular note, it is a good example of a well-executed traditional style addition to the village, which does not detract from the nearby conservation area and sits modestly within its curtilage.
42. The Authority’s adopted Design Guide does say that it is sometimes possible to add modern extensions, but emphasises that it must be in harmony with the original building and does not diminish its quality or integrity. Chapter 7 also states the extension would respect the dominance of the original building in terms of size and massing. This is considered to be of utmost importance if contemporary additions are to be successfully integrated as extensions to existing property.
43. The proposed contemporary styled flat roof extension to the side is very long and narrow. The fin wall and the canopy to the rear of the property make the extension create a wrap-around style extension. Although the projection across the rear has been reduced in depth, the form and design with very strong horizontal emphasis of the flat roof and the sandstone fascia retains a dominant character and has not helped to reduce the massing of the proposal.
44. The wrap-around design is particularly problematic. Our Building Design Guide at chapter 2 discusses the importance of appropriate massing and plan form. Massing should be as simple and plan-form should be well resolved and harmoniously balanced. Extensions that wrap around the side and rear of the house do not achieve this and are highlighted explicitly as an example of unsatisfactory plan form and massing in the Design Guide. The wrap around that is created by the side and rear extensions together is unacceptable and creates a poor plan form that is over large at the side elevation and dominant in design on the side and rear elevations and is harmful to the simple character of the building.
45. The flat roof to the side extension is also harmful. Flat roofs do not form part of the local building tradition and how no reference point in the traditional architecture of the Peak District as a whole or Parwich in particular. Flat roofs generally are visually unsatisfactory and can make the building look unfinished. The overall contemporary style of the side and rear extensions do not harmonise with the existing building. Even though only a small part of the side extension roof may be seen from the front elevation, a flat roof can be looked

down upon from the surrounding landscape and the footpath to the side of the property then crosses the rear of the property as the ground rises.

46. Chapter 3.29 of the Design Guide states “*Modern buildings with National Park often have a high degree of visual solidity*”. This high degree of solidity (as opposed to openings) is part of the local building tradition, and it is important that modern buildings including contemporary designs take these local traditional reference points to create designs that are relevant to the Peak District, rather than design that is contemporary but without reference to the place in which they are located. The amount of glazing to the rear of the property has reversed the solid to void ratio which weakens the relationship of the design to the local building tradition and by extension, the existing building. In addition, the window to the first floor elevation alters the symmetrical manner of the existing arrangement which is also at odds to the traditional style of the existing building.
47. The agent has provided correspondence during the course of the application giving examples of similar contemporary extensions within the National Park. There are properties of styles both traditional and contemporary style in the National Park. However, it is vital that extensions are appropriate for the particular building to which they are proposed to be added, and that particularly where additions are contemporary, that they have appropriate scale and massing. The presence of contemporary extensions elsewhere in the National Park does not justify the inappropriate design of the extensions proposed in this case.
48. There have been 20 letters of support and several have given examples of flat roofed extensions and glazing to properties within Parwich. We have taken these examples into consideration. However, none are directly comparable with this scheme and each case must be assessed on its own merits.
49. The site is located in a residential area made up of traditional and non-traditional buildings. It is located just over the road from Parwich Conservation Area. There are several listed buildings within Parwich and the nearest is Orchard View House (Grade II) which is located approximately 30m south west.
50. Although the property lies just outside the Conservation Area the Authority still are required to consider the impact of the extension on the host property and the wider area including the setting of the nearby Conservation Area and listed buildings. The extension would only be slightly visible from the road, however the extension would be viewed from the public footpath which is located to the north of the site. The scheme would detract from the setting of the conservation area.
51. The host dwelling reflects the local building tradition and does not require remodelling to enhance its appearance. The proposed scheme would dominate the existing building without reference to the local building tradition reflected in the host property creating a clash of styles and features. It would be an incongruous and unsympathetic addition and have a harmful impact on upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling. As the proposal would be harmful to the character of the host building with its references to the local building tradition, it follows that there would be harm to the character of the immediate locality of this part of the National Park. Therefore, the current proposal is contrary to Development Management policies DMC3, DMC8, DMH7 and contrary to policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3 and L1 of the Core Strategy.

#### Amenity Impacts

52. The nearest neighbouring properties are Inglefield located 6m to the north, Retlenden House located approximately 50m to the west and 3 Parson Croft located 26m to the south.
53. Whilst it is considered that the proposal would be harmful to the visual amenity of the immediate area, it is acknowledged that its position would not result in harm to the residential

amenity of any neighbouring dwelling by way of overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing impact.

### Climate Change Mitigation

54. Policy CC1 requires that new development makes the most efficient and sustainable use of land, building and natural resources and achieves the highest possible standards of carbon reductions and water efficiency.
55. The scheme proposes to increase the thermal efficiency of the property by installation of high performance glazing with thermally broken frames and insulation of the walls and roofs.
56. Air leakage will be minimised by high quality detailing of all new junctions. The scheme aims to use sustainable materials where possible and reduce / recycle waste during the construction process.
57. All new sanitary fittings and toilets will take water saving into consideration with dual flush toilet to be used in the new WC. For artificial lighting it is proposed to use low energy or LED technology.
58. Given the scale of development proposed if members are inclined to approve the development it is considered that it should be deferred to secure additional commitment to measures set out below to ensure the development goes beyond building regulations to comply with CC1 which could include:
  - the use of locally quarried building materials which have travelled shorter distances
  - recycled/reclaimed building materials
  - and use of low carbon cement
  - gas filled double glazing, where appropriate
  - sustainably sourced timber in woodwork and joinery
  - grey water recycling

### Conclusion

59. The proposed single storey extension to side and rear by virtue of its scale, form, massing and detailing would fail to respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and insufficiently references and takes into account the local building tradition, resulting in negative impacts on the buildings setting and surrounding area.
60. As such, the proposed development is contrary to guidance and to the requirements of Core Strategy policies GSP1 and GSP3, and saved Development Management policies DMC3, DMH7 and DMC8. It also conflicts with advice contained in the Authority's Adopted Design Guidance and the guidance within the NPPF.

### Human Rights

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

### List of Background Papers (not previously published)

None

**Report Author:** Teresa MacMillan, Planning Assistant