

8. HOUSEHOLD APPLICATION - PROPOSED DWELLING EXTENSION AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT 1, HORSEDALE, BONSCALL, DE4 2AY (NP/DDD/0320/0275, LB)

APPLICANT: MR ANDREW CLARKE

Summary

1. The application seeks planning permission for a rear extension to number 1, Horsedale at Bonsall for additional living accommodation. The proposed extension would result in the dwelling having a complicated mass and plan form that would fail to preserve the historic character of the host building and that would result in harm to the character of the Bonsall Conservation Area. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Site and surroundings

2. Number 1 Horsedale is located to the west of Bonsall within its Conservation Area. Set at the bottom of 'The Bank', and overlooking 'Horsedale Lane' to the south, the large detached dwelling sits in an open and prominent garden, clearly visible from the highway which leads into Bonsall and Slaley. Under a pitched roof the dwelling has a formal frontage; 4 sliding slash windows with gritstone surrounds which sit alongside a small porch. A large two storey element projects off the rear elevation and the whole dwelling is rendered with a white painted finish. A detached pitched roof garage is also located at the rear of the site. Footpaths run into Bonsall Dale from the north, south and west. The nearest neighbouring property is Dale House, approximately 20 metres to the north, and Pear Tree Cottage, 30 metres to the east.

Proposal

3. The application seeks planning permission for an extension and associated works.
4. The submitted amended plans show a two storey extension will project off the east elevation of the existing rear projection. The proposed extension will project past the eastern gable of the host dwelling, causing the addition to come past and be visible from the front elevation. A single storey lean-to is also proposed to project off the eastern gable of the proposed extension.
5. The extension will be constructed from random limestone rubble laid to course under a blue tiled roof alongside casement windows with gritstone heads.
6. Amended plans also show landscaping works will take place to the front of the dwelling alongside various alterations to the property that comprise of replacing hardrow tiles with Staffordshire blue tiles, rebuilding of the chimney stacks, and stripping the window surrounds of paint.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reason:

1. **The proposed development, by virtue of the scale, form, massing and design fails to harmonise with or adequately respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. As such the development proposals are not sensitive to the locally distinctive building traditions or the valued characteristic of the National Park. The development would therefore also result in harm to the historic character of the Bonsall conservation area. The proposal is contrary to the National Planning**

Policy Framework, the Core Strategy Policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1 and L1 and the Development Management Policies DMC3 and DMC8.

Key Issues

- Design and scale, location, landscape impact and amenity issues.

History

7. WED/0177/006, planning permission for the erection of a garage, approved.

Consultations

8. **Bonsall Parish Council** – *‘Support the application on the basis that the proposals would constitute an improvement to the aspect of the dwelling and would be sympathetic to the conservation area’.*
9. **Derbyshire County Council Highways Authority** – *‘No highway objections in principle providing the office is for private domestic purposes only i.e. not for commercial use’.*
10. **Derbyshire Dales District Council** – No response to date.

Representations

11. The Authority has not received any letters of representation.

Main policies

12. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L1
13. Relevant Development Management Plan policies: DMC3, DMC8

National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance

14. In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority’s Core Strategy 2011 and the Development Management Policies 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 government guidance in the NPPF with regard to the issues that are raised.
15. 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.’*
16. Section 16 of the NPPG discusses the conservation of the historic environment. It sets out that great weight must be given to the conservation of heritage assets.

Development plan

17. Core Strategy polices GSP1, GSP2 and GSP3 together say that all development in the National Park must be consistent with the National Park's legal purposes and duty and that the Sandford Principle will be applied where there is conflict. Opportunities for enhancing the valued characteristics of the National Park will be identified and acted upon and development which would enhance the valued characteristics of the National Park will be permitted. Particular attention will be paid to impact on the character and setting of buildings, siting, landscaping and building materials, design in accordance with the Design Guide and the impact upon living conditions of local communities.
18. Core Strategy policy DS1 outlines the Authority's Development Strategy.
19. 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.
20. DMC3 of the Development Management Plan 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.
21. DMC8 of the Development Management Plan 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, 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. The Authority's Detailed Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document gives advice on alterations and extensions. Chapter 3 states that there are three main factors to consider, massing, materials, 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. Side extensions should take their cue from the front elevation alongside, converted loft space can be lit by the addition of roof lights.

Assessment

Principle

23. As noted in the Authorities policies, in principle, extensions to dwellings in the National Park are supported by the Authority provided that they are of a suitable design, scale, form and massing and would not harm the character, appearance or amenities of the host property or the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Design and Impact on the Conservation Area

24. The host dwelling occupies a very prominent position in the conservation area and the front and eastern side elevations are clearly visible from public vantage points.
25. The host dwelling is a traditional building that is a good example of the local, historic, vernacular. Its single-room-depth plan form and narrow gables are entirely in keeping with the Peak District local building tradition. The building has previously been extended with

quite a large two storey addition to the rear elevation, but this has a very simple plan form that does not detract from the historic character of the original building. Because the existing rearward projecting element is set against the bankside, meaning that it does not have a particularly prominent appearance.

26. In its current form, the host dwelling makes a positive contribution to the historic character of the Bonsall Conservation Area.
27. Originally the submitted plans proposed a two storey extension that projected from the east elevation of the existing rear projection, passing and almost wrapping round the side gable of the front section of the dwelling. A further single storey extension with a porch projected off the eastern gable of the extension, increasing the bulk and massing at the rear of the dwelling and completely altering the original, simple form of the dwelling, contrary to adopted design guidance. Amended plans were submitted during the course of the application.
28. The amended plans still propose a two storey projection off the eastern elevation of the existing rear projection but with a single storey lean to attached to the gable of the extension.
29. The extension would project significantly beyond the eastern elevation of the principle part of the host dwelling. This raises two significant conflicts with our adopted design guidance: massing and plan form.
30. In terms of massing, the substantial footprint of the extension, with an internal area very similar to that of the principle original part of the dwelling, along with the proposed extensions' eaves and ridge height, creates a form and massing that is not subsidiary to the host dwelling. The scale is further increased by the additional single storey element. Clearly dominating the property, the extension would be larger than the existing rear projection and would result in significant erosion of the original, simple character and appearance of the building.
31. The adopted design guide requires that extensions are set down and/or set back from principle elements of the host dwelling in order to ensure a subservient visual relationship. However, the extension as proposed would do exactly the opposite; it would result in the original eastern side elevation of the historic host property being set back several metres from the side elevation of the proposed extension. This is an unacceptable arrangement that would significantly detract from the character of the host building.
32. In terms of plan form, the proposed extension projects off both the back of the original part of the host dwelling and the side of the existing two storey addition. It then continues to project significantly beyond the original eastern elevation as set out above.
33. This completely alters the original shape of the dwelling, creating a building of very complicated plan form with a total of six different roof elements. Simplicity of plan and roof form is identified in our adopted Design Guides as one of the key characteristics of the local building tradition. A complicated, unresolved plan form should be avoided. The extension as proposed would completely erode the existing simple and traditional historic form of the host dwelling, resulting in a dwelling with an unresolved form that would dominate the original building rather than harmonise with it or compliment it.
34. The extension dose not sit comfortably or balance with the dwelling, instead one overall mass of bulk is created when taken together with the original part. The original simplicity of the building is lost. The extension creates a double pitch and valley roof with the original dwelling when viewed from the east and forms a complicated massing of roof pitches together, contrary to examples in the Authority's Design Guide. This would create a building that is no longer a good example of the local vernacular.

35. As the dwelling can also be viewed from the adjacent highway, the extension from the east and west will be seen in its wider setting resulting in visual impact upon the dwelling itself, its wider setting and the surrounding Conservation Area. Rather than making a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area as is the case now, the dwelling as proposed to be extended would harm the character of the Conservation Area.
36. The scale, massing, design and location of the extension harms the character and appearance of the dwelling and creates unnecessary harm to the visual impact of the dwellings' imitate setting and the wider area resulting in impact upon the public view points and the Conservation Area. Therefore, the proposals are contrary to Development Management Policies DMC3 and DMC8 and the guidance within section 16 of the NPPF.
37. During the course of the application, we have invited the applicant to consider an alternative scheme that involves a simple extension off the side elevation of the host dwelling. This would allow the building to retain its simple and traditional form and massing and would be likely to overcome the concerns with the scheme as proposed. However, the applicant has declined to amend the scheme in this way and has requested that the application is determined in its current form.

Amenity

38. Due to the distance to the nearest neighbouring properties and as there are no opening proposed in the eastern gable of the extension, the proposal will not result in any amenity issues.

Highways Impacts

39. The Highways Authority has no objection to the proposal provided the extension is not for commercial use. The proposal is for residential use only, therefore there are no highways concerns.

Conclusion

40. The proposed extension to number 1 Horsedale would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and would be harmful to the Bonsall Conservation Area and to the special qualities of this part of the National Park. The application is contrary to policies GSP1, GSP1, GSP3, DS1 L1, and DMC3 and DMC8 and the guidance within the NPPF. The application is recommended for refusal.

Human Rights

41. 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: Laura Buckley, Planning Assistant, South Area.