

6. FULL APPLICATION - FOR THE DEMOLITION OF HILLCROFT AND A GARAGE. REPLACEMENT WITH A NEW DWELLING AND DOUBLE GARAGE AT HILLCROFT, SHERWOOD ROAD, TIDESWELL, BUXTON (NP/DDD/1021/1064 SPW)

APPLICANTS: NEIL FOSTER AND CLARE READING

Summary

1. The application is a revised scheme following a refusal in December 2020. It is considered that the proposed replacement dwelling now provides an enhancement to the site and its setting, replacing a non-traditional dwelling on a site adjacent to Tideswell Conservation Area. The scheme has been informed by a detailed Heritage Assessment. The design is a contemporary interpretation of the local building tradition, reflecting the local vernacular in terms of massing, scale and materials. The proposal is therefore in accordance with the policies of the Development Plan, in particular DMH9 which deals with the principle of replacement dwellings.

Site and Surroundings

2. Hillcroft is a detached dwelling located on Sherwood Road, Tideswell. Adjacent to the site, to the north and south, there are untraditional prefabricated garages. To the north there is Bockerly Lane which leads to Bockerly Lodge and through to Gordon Road. Bockerly Lane has a number of garages before it reaches Bockerly Lodge. The Conservation Area runs along Bockerly Lane but excludes the garages. To the south of the site there are garages on the road frontage (these have a mono pitch roof with corrugated sheet roof) in the same ownership as Hillcroft, and Lochiel Villa, a three-storey house on Sherwood Road which is also in the same ownership. There are a number of mature trees in the curtilage of Hillcroft and a large mature sycamore tree close to the boundary but associated with Lochiel Villa. This tree overhangs the boundary to Hillcroft and is shown on the submitted plans.
3. Hillcroft benefits from a very long garden. Its eastern, western and part of its northern boundary adjoin the Conservation Area.
4. Hillcroft appears as a single storey bungalow on Sherwood Road. The site slopes eastwards, with the dwelling set into the hillside so that it is entered at first floor level from the west (Sherwood Road), with a two-storey elevation facing east. It is constructed of gritstone with hipped roof clad in artificial slates and red ridge tiles and has bay window to the front and overhanging eaves. There are no listed buildings on the site. There is a ruin on the wider site (to the east). The submitted Heritage Statement suggests that the site was part of a farm and that the earlier agricultural buildings were demolished, and the site developed with a dwelling and detached garage between 1955 and 1972. It adds that the dwelling, with its bay windows and hipped roof, is broadly similar to a number of bungalows to the southwest of Sherwood Road, although there are sufficient differences to suggest they were not built to the same overarching design and likely constituted separate building projects.
5. This part of Sherwood Road is characterised by a mixture of building types, but they are mainly two storey and faced with limestone. Most of the dwellings on the street are set close to the edge the road, but Hillcroft has a small front garden.

Proposal

6. The proposal is to demolish the existing dwelling and a garage and replace it with a dwelling and double garage. The walls would be constructed of split faced limestone. The materials for the roofs which are indicated on the plans are natural blue slate and standing

seam zinc roofs. The dwelling would provide accommodation over two floors including 3 bedrooms, 3 bath/shower rooms, studio/flexible living space/, Open plan living and dining area, kitchen, study and very large basement storage area lit by roof lanterns.

7. The existing derelict garage would be replaced with a double garage, in the same location to the north of the house, set slightly closer to Sherwood Road.
8. The application is accompanied by a Planning Statement, a Design and Access Statement, a Heritage Statement, and a landscape plan

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. **The development hereby permitted shall be begun within 3 years from the date of this permission.**
2. **In accordance with submitted plans, as amended in respect of siting of garage.**
3. **Withdraw permitted development rights for extensions, alterations and outbuildings.**
4. **Detailed design conditions, including submission and approval of samples of materials.**
5. **Implement landscape scheme within the first planting seasons following completion or occupation of the development.**
6. **Implement tree protection scheme before development commences.**
7. **Ecology conditions.**
8. **Highway conditions as recommended by Highway Authority.**

Key Issues

- Whether the development is acceptable in principle.
- The design of the proposed development and specifically would the proposal achieve an enhancement as required by DMH9
- Impact on the amenity of other dwellings.
- Highway considerations

History

December 2020: Full planning application for the demolition of Hillcroft and a garage. replacement with a new dwelling and double garage NP/DDD/0720/0609, refused on the following grounds:

1. *The proposal would not achieve an enhancement of the site or the wider National Park and it is therefore contrary to the replacement dwelling policy Development Management Policy DMH9, this is because its design is not in accordance with the 'Design Guide' and is contrary to core Strategy policy GSP3 and Development management policy DMC3.*
2. *The proposal would harm the setting of the Conservation Area including views into and out of the Conservation Area so it is contrary to Core Strategy Policy L3 and*

Development Management Policy DMC8 and would harm the valued characteristics of the National Park so also contrary to Core Strategy policy GSP1 and L1.

Consultations

9. Tideswell Parish Council:

“It was RESOLVED that whilst the Councillors agree with a redevelopment of the site, the Parish Council share the same concerns as the Highways Department”.

10. Highway Authority:

Initial response:

“The application site has been the subject to a similar proposal (NP/DDD/0720/0609) which received no objections from the Highway Authority, however, the proposal demonstrated a double vehicular garage accessed via a forecourt whereas this proposal demonstrates a double vehicular garage accessed directly off Sherwood Road with the garage doors being directly to the rear of the adjacent footway. Whilst there are no objections to the proposal in principle, it is recommended that the proposed double garage is setback from Sherwood Road similar to the existing garages in the vicinity of the site, the existing garages to the South of the proposed garage appear to be setback around 2m from Sherwood Road, therefore, its recommended the applicant submits a revised plan demonstrating the proposed double garage setback similarly to the existing garages to the South of the Site. Slightly reducing the size of the proposed double garage to the minimum recommended dimensions (6.0m x 6.0m) would result in more space for the garage to be setback from the adjacent footway/highway. Additionally, the Highway Authority would recommend against the sliding garage doors as demonstrated on the Lower Ground Floor Plan, it is considered that roller shutter type doors would be more appropriate. Therefore, it’s recommended that the applicant is given opportunity to submit revised details demonstrating measures to satisfactorily address the above issues. However, if you are minded to determine the application in its submitted form, I would be grateful if you could revert back to the Highway Authority for any further comments”.

Response to revised siting of garage:

“The submitted plan (Garage option B – 110) demonstrates the proposed double garage set-back 2m from the nearside carriageway edge similar to the existing garages to the South of the site, which is in line with the Highway Authorities previous comments. Accordingly, it is recommended the modified/existing vehicular access off Sherwood Road is provided with 25m emerging visibility sightlines in both directions, as measured from a point located centrally and 2m back into the access. The area within the sightlines shall thereafter be kept clear of any object greater than 1m in height (0.6m in the case of vegetation) above the nearside carriageway channel level.

“The Highway Authority has no objections to the proposal, and it is recommended that the following conditions are included in any consent:

- 1. At the commencement of operations on site (excluding demolition/ site clearance), space shall be provided within the site curtilage for storage of plant and materials, site accommodation, loading and unloading of goods vehicles, parking and manoeuvring of site operatives and visitors vehicles, laid out and constructed in accordance with detailed designs to be submitted in advance to the Local Planning Authority for written approval and maintained throughout the contract period in accordance with the approved designs free from any impediment to its designated use.*
- 2. The existing vehicular access to Sherwood Road shall be modified in accordance with the revised application drawings, laid out, constructed and provided with 2m x 25m visibility splays in both directions, the area in advance of the sightlines being maintained clear of any object greater than 1m in height (0.6m in the case of vegetation) relative to the adjoining nearside carriageway channel level.*

3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, or any statutory instrument amending, revoking and/or replacing that Order, the garage to be provided in connection with the development shall not be used other than for the parking of vehicles except with the prior grant of planning permission pursuant to an application made to the Local Planning Authority in that regard.

4. Any gates or other barriers shall open inwards only.

5. No part of the development shall be occupied until details of arrangements for storage of bins and collection of waste have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details and the facilities retained for the designated purposes at all times thereafter”.

11. District Council: No response.

12. Natural England: No objection. Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on statutorily protected nature conservation sites.

13. PDNPA Archaeology:

Archaeological interest and significance: The development site is within the historic core of the village of Tideswell, and within a medieval component of the village as defined by the Tideswell Extensive Urban Survey assessment of 2001. This is an area of long narrow plots with the main frontage at the east end of the plots along the main road (now Fountain Square, Cheery Square etc.), with boundaries running back up the slope to the former back lane (Sherwood Road). The development of this part of medieval Tideswell is not fully understood. It is believed that the back lane did not start to develop buildings along its frontage until the 18th century, but this has not been fully established. It is also thought that the long narrow town plots on the west side of the main street, laid out with their back lane, may have a different origin to the settlement on the east side of the main street, perhaps resulting from deliberate and planned reorganisation of the settlement and expansion over earlier fields. However, again this theory has not been fully established. Certainly from the 18th origins, the development of the ‘frontages’ along the back lane (now Sherwood Road) continued in the 19th and 20th century. In the medieval period this area is likely to have formed the rear of the plots that fronted the main road, and as such in the medieval and early early-modern period formed part of a ‘burgage’ plot or ‘croft’ are associated with the buildings along the main road frontage, and would have been used for activities associated with the main house, such as growing vegetables, ancillary structures, workshops, outbuildings, areas of rubbish disposal (cess pits) etc. Such plots therefore have the potential to contain below ground archaeological remains relating the development of Tideswell through the medieval and into the post-medieval period, particularly the establishment and use of the narrow medieval ‘crofts’ or ‘burgage’ plots in a period of re-organisation, the possible earlier use of the area for more agricultural purposes; and then the development of the back lane as a frontage its own right in the post medieval period.

Impact of the proposed development: However, the proposed development is along the already developed frontage along Sherwood Road, with the proposed new house and garage largely situated over the footprint of existing buildings and development. This significant reduces the archaeological interest and potential of the development site, and makes the likelihood of this particular development encountering undisturbed archaeological remains that would help in the understanding of the development of Tideswell in the medieval and post-medieval period very unlikely. **Therefore, there are no archaeological concerns, further comments or need for archaeological conditions.**

14. PDNPA Landscape Architect:

Initial Response: *“As my comments on the previous scheme, “While I don’t have significant concerns over this application as a whole, I think the removal of the locally-important streetscape trees on the Sherwood Road frontage is a significant loss”, this proposal also fails to take this into account in its design. No landscape plan is included with the application and issues of landscape impact and mitigation are not included within the Design & Access Statement. I therefore object to the scheme on the grounds of lack of sufficient information. To withdraw my application, a landscape scheme (which demonstrates mitigation for the loss of trees, enhancements to the garden spaces and a landscape scheme for the street frontage) would be required”*

Revised response: A landscape scheme has been submitted in response to this and the revised comments of the Landscape Architect are that the scheme is now acceptable subject to the landscape plan being part of any conditional approval.

15. PDNPA Ecology: Summary of recommendations:

- Use the precautionary method of works as suggested in Hillcroft, Sherwood Road, Tideswell Bat Survey Report in full.
- Erect on or incorporated into the fabric of the new building at least 2 new bat boxes
- Carry out a check for nesting birds before the existing building is demolished.

Representations

16. We have received 7 representations, with 6 objecting to the application and one supporting it. The representations can be seen in full on the Authority’s website.

17. The objections can be summarised as follows:

- The overpowering height, bulk and greatly increased footprint and volume of the proposed development.
- It is totally against the traditional design of the village and in particular the other properties in the conservation area that surround this plot. There are far too many windows which are very large and out of keeping. The exterior design is also completely different and would look out of place and therefore have a negative effect on the conservation area which surrounds it.
- The design would transform a predominantly open, green site to built frontage facing the conservation area on both Sherwood Road and Brockley Lane. By having a long high side elevation facing Brockley Lane and by raising the roofline across the whole plot width to the height which is above that of the chimney of Ollerset House, results in a significant decrease in the openness of the site.
- Superimposing the existing structure on the proposed elevations suggests at least two times increase in the built elevation areas from both perspectives.
- The proposal lacks a key element of all dwellings in the vicinity including the existing dwelling in that all are set back behind front gardens
- The impact of the increased level of vehicle parking on Sherwood Road.
- The existing property should be renovated or redeveloped in a way which enhances the Conservation Area and compliments the established properties in that area. Hillcroft has been empty and neglected by its current owners since they purchased it in March 2018 which has led to its current poor state of repair and overgrown appearance. There are several similar style and size bungalows already at this end of Sherwood Road.
- We note that the applicants have commissioned a ‘heritage statement’ in support of their application. However, it does not deal with all the material planning issues objectively and includes inaccuracies and questionable opinions. This is particularly

concerning as Peak Park Planning Policy DMC8 states that applications for development within a conservation area or its setting should be adequately detailed to enable an assessment of their effect.

- The site faces the Tideswell Conservation Area on three sides and has a major impact on it. The site is currently open, albeit overgrown through neglect, affording views across to Peak District countryside and across the Conservation Area. The current building is a single storey bungalow with modest bulk and a relatively low profile that inherently has little impact on the Conservation Area and views into and out of it
 - The front line of the existing property is approx. 5.4m from Sherwood Road. The proposed new development is approx. 3.4m from Sherwood Road,
 - The existing property occupies a relatively small footprint. The proposed property will approximately double the existing footprint, As the proposed property is two storeys, this proposal will at least treble the volume of the existing property .
 - Elevation B in the submitted plans shows 8 large windows, totally out of keeping with the small windows in the neighbouring properties
 - The design statement makes reference to an existing garage. This garage is derelict and the gravel space referred to in front and side of the garage has been left untended and allowed to overgrow with vegetation. If cleared away there would currently be sufficient space to allow 2 vehicles to be parked without impinging on the pavement, contradicting what is claimed in the access statement. The proposals replace the existing single garage with a larger double garage, providing an additional off-road parking space. The garage is extended up to the back of the pavement, which eliminates the small margin of gravel in front of the existing garage and prevents cars from partially blocking the pavement.
 - The provision of an additional parking space would be for the occupier of the proposed development. The vehicles which currently park alongside the derelict garage do not belong to the applicant and will not have access to the newly provided garage space. Therefore, these two vehicles, belonging to residents of Sherwood Road will have to be parked on Sherwood Road, an already crowded road, adding two vehicles to the road, not taking one away.
 - Accessing and exiting the garage will be difficult, dangerous with the possibility of damaging parked vehicles due to the congestion caused by constant street parking directly opposite by local residents who do not have anywhere else to park.
 - Sherwood Road is already congested with parked vehicles, restricting access to larger vehicles, which often includes the weekly refuse collection.
 - Share the concerns of the Parish Council and Highways Department concerning the size and position of the proposed garage.
 - Concerned with the location of the proposed plant room which is adjacent to my property and would be concerned about noise and how it looks.
18. The representation of support is summarised as follows:
- The bungalow is not typical of houses in Tideswell, even though there are other similar examples at the far end of Sherwood Road. Hillcroft has been virtually derelict for many decades. The proposed design will be a huge improvement for the neighbourhood. It's great to see a high amount of sustainability in the application. The applicants have already done a huge amount of work restoring the back garden which had laid untouched for over 30 years, and the proposed new house will do the same for the Sherwood Road end of the plot.

Main Policies

19. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, GSP4, L1, L2, L3, HC1, CC1, CC2, T3, T7.

20. Relevant Development Management policies: DMC3, DMC5, DMC8, DMC11, DMC12, DMC13, DMH9.

National Planning Policy Framework

21. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 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 our 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. There is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the development plan and the NPPF and our policies should be given full weight in the determination of this application.
22. Paragraph 172 states that *“great weight should be given to conserving 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 landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.”*
23. Paragraph 77 says that in rural areas, planning policies and decisions should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs. Local planning authorities should support opportunities to bring forward rural exception sites that will provide affordable housing to meet identified local needs, and consider whether allowing some market housing on these sites would help to facilitate this. Paragraph 78 states that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.

Peak District National Park Core Strategy

24. 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). GPS1 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.
25. Policy GSP2: *Enhancing the National Park* states that:
- Opportunities for enhancing the valued characteristics of the National Park will be identified and acted upon.
 - Proposals intended to enhance the National Park will need to demonstrate that they offer significant overall benefit to the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area.
 - When development is permitted, a design will be sought that respects the character of the area.
 - Opportunities will be taken to enhance the National Park by the treatment or removal of undesirable features or buildings. Work must be undertaken in a manner which conserves the valued characteristics of the site and its surroundings.
 - Development in settlements necessary for the treatment, removal or relocation of nonconforming uses to an acceptable site, or which would enhance the valued characteristics of the National Park will be permitted.

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. Policy GSP4 says that to aid the achievement of its spatial outcomes, the National Park Authority will consider the contribution that a development can make directly and/or to its setting, including, where consistent with government guidance, using planning conditions and planning obligations.
28. Policy DS1 sets out the Development Strategy for the National Park.
29. Policy HC1 says that exceptionally, new housing can be accepted where the proposals would address eligible local needs and would be for homes that remain affordable with occupation restricted to local people in perpetuity. The provisions of HC1 are supported by policy DH1, DH2 and DH3 of the Development Management Policies, which gives more detailed criteria to assess applications for affordable housing to meet local need.
30. Policy L3 'Cultural heritage assets of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance' states that:
 - A. Development must conserve and where appropriate enhance or reveal the significance of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic assets and their settings, including statutory designations and other heritage assets of international, national, regional or local importance or special interest;
 - B. 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 of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance or its setting, including statutory designations or other heritage assets of international, national, regional or local importance or special interest;
 - C. Proposals for development will be expected to meet the objectives of any strategy, wholly or partly covering the National Park, that has, as an objective, the conservation and where possible the enhancement of cultural heritage assets. This includes, but is not exclusive to, the Cultural Heritage Strategy for the Peak District National Park and any successor strategy
31. Policy CC1 states that development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources, taking into account the energy hierarchy and achieving the highest possible standards of carbon reductions and water efficiency.

Development Management Policies

32. The most relevant development management policies are DMC3, DMC5, DMC8, DMC13 and DMH9.
33. Policy DMC3A says 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 that contribute to the distinctive sense of place.
34. Policy DMC3B sets out various aspects that particular attention will be paid to including: siting, scale, form, mass, levels, height and orientation, settlement form and character, landscape, details, materials and finishes landscaping, access, utilities and parking, amenity, accessibility and the principles embedded in the design related SPD and the technical guide.

35. Policies DMC5 and DMC8 say 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 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.
36. DMH9 Replacement dwellings states that the replacement of a dwelling will usually be permitted. The policy states that all proposed replacement dwellings must enhance the valued character of the site itself and surrounding built environment and landscape, reflecting the guidance provided in the Peak District National Park Authority Design Guide (2007) or any successor adopted Design Guide. It goes on to say that larger replacement dwellings should demonstrate significant overall enhancement to the valued character and appearance of the site itself, and the surrounding built environment and landscape. In all cases the replacement dwelling must not create an adverse impact on neighbours' residential amenity. In all cases the replacement dwelling must exhibit high sustainability standards.
37. Policy DMC13 says that planning applications should provide sufficient information to enable impact on trees, woodlands and other landscape features to be properly considered. Development should incorporate existing trees which should be protected during the course of the development.

38. Design Guide

At paragraph 2.15 the Design Guide acknowledges that it is not easy to introduce modern architecture successfully into an area of traditional styles, and advises on use of local materials and good quality workmanship. In paragraph 2.18 it goes on to say that *'it is preferable to find a design solution which reflects or reinterprets the local tradition and is also a product of our time....New modern buildings often fail in design terms when their designers are more intent on current architectural fashion than respecting the context they are working within'*.

The Design Guide states that *"...there are still some basic principles that need to be respected if the new is to harmonise successfully with the old. These relate to the three main characteristics of traditional elevations:*

- *A balance of proportions between the overall shape of the walls and the openings they contain.*
- *A high solid to void ratio in which the wall dominates.*
- *A simple arrangement of openings, usually formal (often symmetrical) in the case of houses, and informal in the case of outbuildings".*

Paragraph 3.11 says that new buildings should be in harmony with the earlier buildings around them. At paragraph 3.29 it acknowledges that whilst modern construction allows much larger openings than could traditionally be achieved, it is of note that successful modern buildings that fit well in the Peak District often have a high degree of visual solidity. Where large openings are necessary, they should be balanced by a complementary area of solid walling alongside.

Assessment

Principle of proposed development

39. The main policy in relation to the principle of the proposal is DMH9 of the Development Management Policies, which allows for the replacement of a dwelling subject to specific criteria. In all cases policy DMH9 requires the replacement dwelling to achieve an enhancement. DMH9 also allows for dwellings which are larger than the ones they replace but there is a requirement that this results in a significant enhancement of the site and surrounding built environment. The existing dwelling is not traditional and is of no historic or vernacular merit, being a single storey gritstone building in a context characterised by traditional limestone buildings which are typically two storeys. It is not in keeping with the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, so provided the development achieves a significant overall enhancement then policy DMH9 would allow for the existing dwelling to be lost and replaced by a larger dwelling in principle. The Authority's adopted policies do not allow new housing in the National Park unless there are exceptional circumstances. With regards to the principle of residential development, whilst this is replacement dwelling rather than an additional dwelling, policy HC1(C)I of the Core Strategy states that exceptionally new housing can be accepted where, in accordance with core policies GSP1 and GSP2, it is required in order to achieve conservation and/or enhancement of valued vernacular or listed buildings.

40. Paragraph 117 of the NPPF states that "*Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions. Strategic policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously developed or 'brownfield' land.*" DMP Policy DMH6 allows for the redevelopment of Previously Developed Land for residential use. Part (i) of Policy DMH6 states that development will be permitted provided that "*the development conserves and enhances the valued character of the built environment or landscape on, around or adjacent to the site*".

41. The resubmitted application is also supported by a Heritage Statement. The Heritage Statement assesses the heritage significance of the site and sets out the principles that have guided the design approach to replacement dwelling. It provides a detailed assessment of the site. It concludes that:

"Hillcroft house comprises an area of 20th century infill within the western end of an earlier, post-medieval burgage plot, and the southernmost part of a block of historic burgages that lay between Buxton Road and Sherwood Road and which extend towards the centre of Tideswell. The site makes a limited negative contribution to the heritage significance of Tideswell Conservation Area and the cultural heritage interest of the Peak District National Park, and the setting of the listed buildings contained within it (assets of national to high national significance) in regard to the limited positive legibility of its historic boundary form, and the negative qualities of its unsympathetic form of development.

Hillcroft house and garage are considered to possess no heritage interest, whilst the drystone boundaries to the north and south of the gardens are considered to possess local heritage interest.

The scheme will remove a building that makes a negative contribution to the setting of the Tideswell Conservation Area, and construct a high-quality contemporary building that has derived from a developed understanding of its historic context. The scheme will conserve and enhance the contribution of the site to the setting of the Conservation Area"

42. The assessment set out in the Heritage Statement is consistent with the advice given by the Authority's Senior Archaeologist. Officers agree with this assessment of the significance of the site and the negative impact that the existing dwelling has, so the principle of a replacement dwelling is considered to be acceptable under policy DMH9. The removal of the existing building and its replacement with a dwelling of an appropriate design in terms of scale, massing, materials, design and siting could, in principle, result in a significant enhancement of the site and its setting, including the setting of the Conservation Area. It could also provide a building which meets or exceeds modern standards of sustainable design in terms of energy efficiency. There are two possible approaches to this, either a scheme which follows a traditional approach to design, copying the local vernacular, or a scheme which reinterprets this in a modern way. The applicants and their architect have adopted the latter approach so this is dealt with in the next section.

43. Design Considerations

The proposals for the redevelopment of this site have been subject to extensive pre-application advice and officers have agreed that an approach which provides for a more contemporary design that reflects the local building tradition in terms of scale, massing and materials may be acceptable. When the previous application was refused at the Planning Committee in December 2020 Members asked officers to work with the applicants and their architect to find an appropriate solution. The current scheme is a new design as the architect has sought to address the issues raised by the previous refusal. As noted above, this includes a research-based re-assessment of the site, including a Heritage Statement.

44. The submitted Planning Statement sets out the key design elements as follows:

- *The demolition of the existing dwelling and replacement with a two storey dwelling and single storey ancillary garage building which would provide significant enhancement to the site and surroundings.*
- *The siting and massing has been designed based on the analysis of the 18th, 19th and early 20th century piecemeal infill development which has occurred in the area. The development would be a staggered yet linear form of development, with a series of volumes that step down the site with the topography.*
- *Taking note of the local vernacular, the roofs would be pitched and gabled. All flat roofs have been removed.*
- *A new garage would be built adjacent to the pavement at the front of the site with the house itself brought closer to the road, with a small front garden and stone boundary wall to the road frontage.*
- *In response to the local vernacular, it is proposed to use 'layers' of limestone for the external walls, which, in line with Design Guidance would be a contemporary reinterpretation of the local surroundings.*
- *The design would also comprise solid volumes with random openings and the appearance of a large solid to void ratio. The openings would be of a more traditional appearance, but still allow for natural light and passive solar gain.*

45. The Design and Access Statement says that the current proposal has been redesigned to take account of the built and natural landscape setting of the site and to reflect the historic context of the site and the distinctive character of the local area. In terms of its form, the proposed design is a staggered linear group of narrow blocks, stepping down with the topography of the site. This stepped arrangement is similar to existing buildings in the locality. The scheme now also includes two storey elements to address concerns with the 2020 scheme. The breaking up of the massing as the building steps down the site means that the new house would be broken up into different, smaller elements, rather than the long expanse of the previous scheme. The building has also been moved closer to the road frontage, as is common with the streetscape along Sherwood Road; as a result the

new dwelling now sits approximately 4m from the pavement rather than 12m in the 2020 scheme. The width of the end gables ranges between 5.5 and 6.5m, a relatively narrow gable width as recommended by the Design Guide, with lean-to extensions at ground floor level to provide additional circulation and ancillary spaces. In terms of massing, the proportions of the new house are of a scale similar to the surrounding buildings. With regard to the concerns of the objectors, it is acknowledged that the new dwelling will be larger and more visible than the existing building, but this does not, in itself, make it unacceptable. The site is relatively long and the distances between the proposed replacement dwelling and existing dwellings is such that it will not have an overbearing or domineering impact on any neighbouring dwellings.

46. With regard to detailing, the fenestration has been simplified and reduced in size, with a strong solid to void ratio and a vertical emphasis. Whilst the detailing is relatively modern, as compared to traditional building styles, it is sympathetic to this tradition. The Design and Access Statement explains that the design also balances the need for natural light and passive solar gain, which are fundamental for minimising operational energy and mitigating climate change to achieve Passivhaus standards. As a result the house has minimal openings to the north, to the Conservation Area, whilst it opens up to the south and east to the gardens to the rear. The design includes half and full height stone walls and fixed external stone shading maintains the strong solid to void ratios. The architect has been asked to provide additional details of these; this can be conditioned as part of an approval. Sliding external timber louvres at ground floor openings are designed to reflect traditional agricultural buildings.
47. With regard to materials, the proposed building would be finished with natural limestone, with an aspiration that this would be laid in linear 'strata' layers (subject to local availability), which the architect considers would allow for a contemporary, yet traditional appearance. This can be conditioned so that a sample panel could be approved before construction. The roof would be natural slate, presumably blue slate, with inset solar panels on some elevations. The use of limestone and natural slate would be an enhancement as compared to the existing gritstone walls and artificial tile roof.
48. In conclusion it is considered that the proposed replacement dwelling is of a sympathetic contemporary design which by virtue of its scale, massing, detailed design and materials would be an enhancement to the site and its setting. Whilst it would be larger than the existing building, the new buildings would be of an acceptable scale on this site. The application therefore accords with the requirements of policy DMC3 and the Design Guide.

Sustainable building and climate change

49. Policy CC1 and the NPPF require development to make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources, take account of the energy hierarchy and achieve the highest possible standards of carbon reductions and water efficiency. The application provides a Sustainability Statement. The statement sets out how the reinstated dwelling would meet the requirements of policy CC1 and our adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Climate Change and Sustainable Building. The scheme is designed to produce a highly sustainable new dwelling, which would include the following measures:
 - insulation to Passivhaus standards;
 - use of solar panels;
 - maximising the effects of solar gain and thermal mass; and
 - utilising energy efficient technologies such as rainwater storage and passive ventilation.

The proposal is considered to meet the requirements of policy CC1 in these respects and would be a good example of a sustainably designed dwelling.

Impact on amenity

50. Whilst there were no reasons for refusal relating to amenity in the refused 2020 scheme, the potential amenity impact on adjoining neighbours has been a consideration in the revised proposals, as is reflected in the representations received. This is relevant to a change in the building line to Sherwood Road, with the new building being set closer to the road. However, the scheme maintains a setback from the pavement line and the properties to the west are on the other side of Sherwood Road, so it is considered that there are no issues in terms of overlooking or overshadowing of surrounding residential properties. Having taken into account the concerns of the objectors, it is nonetheless considered that the proposal does not give rise to any amenity issues. The proposal therefore accords with policies GSP3 and DMC3 in these respects.

Trees and landscaping

51. There are a number of mature trees within and adjoining the boundary of the site. A tree report has been submitted as part of the application; this was considered by our Tree Officer. The proposed tree protection plan is acceptable but if approved would need to be secured by way of a planning condition. In addition to this the Authority's Landscape Architect raised concerns about the lack of a landscape plan to address the loss of existing trees and vegetation. As noted in the consultation section above, he raised objection unless a landscape scheme was submitted. This has now been done and he considers it to be acceptable. Implementation of this scheme can be required by planning condition, in accordance with policy DMC13.

Ecology

52. A protected species survey has been submitted with the application and considered by our ecologist who raises no objection subject to conditions.

Highway issues

53. The proposal includes replacing the existing, derelict prefabricated garage with a double garage in a similar location, but set slightly closer to the road. Both the County Council (as Highway Authority) and the Parish Council considered that the garage should be no closer to the road than the existing garage, so that there is more room for a vehicle to pull off Sherwood Road before entering the garage. This has been raised with the architect and it is covered in the Design and Access Statement. They cannot move the garage back because of the site boundary so it could only be set back by making it narrower. The Design and Access deals with this point as follows: *"The proposals replace the existing single garage with a larger double garage, providing an additional off-road parking space (A). The garage is extended up to the back of the pavement, which eliminates the small margin of gravel in front of the existing garage and prevents cars from partially blocking the pavement. As a car cannot be fully pulled off the road and pavement in the existing situation, the proposals do not make this situation any worse - by taking another car off the road, they improve the parking situation"*.
54. In response to the concerns expressed by the Highway Authority and the Parish Council, officers asked the architect to reconsider the scheme. A revised plan has been submitted which sets the front wall of the garage back slightly further, approximately 2 metres from the edge of the road and 1.25 from the edge of the pavement. Whilst this is below the normal standard, it would not make the existing situation worse and would provide an additional off-road space, although as the objectors note it could reduce the availability of roadside parking. The Highway Authority has now responded to this revised plan and raises no objection, subject to conditions. Consequently, it is considered that the scheme for the garage is acceptable as shown in the revised plan.

Conclusion

55. The application proposes the demolition of the existing dwelling and garage, which are non-traditional buildings which have a negative impact on the wider area, including the Conservation Area. The scheme has been re-designed since the previous refusal in order to overcome the issues raised within the 2020 application. Officers now consider that the proposed development would provide an enhancement to the site as a whole, to the benefit of the setting of the character and appearance of the existing building and within the wider setting, including the adjacent Conservation Area. Whilst the design of the new dwelling is contemporary, it follows design guidance in terms of form, massing and materials, providing a sympathetic, modern interpretation of the local vernacular. The proposals also create a sustainable and energy efficient dwelling, replacing one that lacks these qualities. It is therefore considered that for these reasons the proposals accord with Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP3 and CC1, and DMP policies DMC3, DMC8, DMH9 and the Design Guides.
56. Having taken into account all material considerations and issues raised in representations we conclude that the proposed development is contrary to the development plan. Therefore, the application is recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

Human Rights

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

58. Nil
59. Report Author: Steven Wigglesworth, Planner