

**11. FULL APPLICATION – SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND ALTERATIONS TO DWELLING AT 'IONA', LONGREAVE LANE, ROWLAND, (NP/DDD/0615/0558, P4239, 421013/371749, 15/06/2015/ALN)**

**APPLICANT: MR MICHAEL GREEN**

Note: This application is referred to Planning Committee because the applicant's wife is an employee of the National Park and has declared an interest.

**Site and Surroundings**

'Iona' is a residential property situated on Longreave Lane, Rowland. The lane runs north to south, midway between the hamlet of Rowland and Great Longstone. The property is one of a row of 11 detached dwellings that stretch along the west side of the lane. The property was built following approval in 2002 as a replacement for an earlier 1930s bungalow. It is a single storey dwelling constructed in natural limestone under blue slate roof.

A condition was attached to the original consent for the house (NP/DDD/1101/508) removing permitted development rights for extensions porches, ancillary buildings, satellite antenna, gates, fences, walls or other means of boundary enclosure.

**Proposal**

This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey gabled extension off the rear elevation of the property to provide space for an extended utility room. Permission is also sought for alterations to the dwelling in the form of widening windows, inserting new windows and rooflights and re-building the front boundary wall.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

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

- 1. 3 year implementation time limit.**
- 2. Adopt amended plans.**
- 3. Bathroom window to be obscure glazed in perpetuity.**
- 4. If the hedgerow on the southern boundary dies or is removed at any point in the future, it shall be replaced by a 2m high close boarded fence.**
- 5. New front boundary wall to be constructed in natural limestone as a traditional drystone wall.**
- 5. Minor design details.**

**Key Issues**

1. Impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling.
2. Impact on the amenity of neighbouring residential properties.

**History**

January 2002 – approval for demolition of existing buildings and erection of new bungalow and garage.

March 2002 - approval for erection of garden shed.

January 2003 - Amendment to design of new dwelling to incorporate 2 rooflights.

January 2003 - Amendments to siting and design.

October 2003 – Appeal allowed with regard to conditions 6 and 7 of approval ref NP/DDD/0802/394 which related to obscure glazing and fixing of rooflights on the south facing roofslope.

Enforcement Notice NAW/S191/P.4239 regarding limestone rubble walling in breach of condition requiring natural rubble limestone, random coursed. Appeal lodged and dismissed, Enforcement Notice upheld, on 11 September 2003. Walling subsequently reconstructed in accordance with condition. Enforcement Notice withdrawn 18 September 2012.

### **Consultations**

Highway Authority – No response to date

District Council – No response to date

Parish Council – No objections

### **Representations:**

One letter of representation has been received from the occupier of the adjacent property to the north, 'Fairfield'. The letter states that most of the alterations would enhance the 'current soulless character' of Iona. However it raises concerns with regard to rooflights, in particular the proposed rooflight over the bathroom which the neighbour feels would affect her privacy as it would face into Fairfield's bedroom and living room spaces. The letter also raises concerns that the rooflights on the south facing roofslope, looking towards 'Meadow View' were not installed in accordance with conditions, by the previous owner and that the Authority did not enforce against these breaches. Finally, the letter points out that the application forms refer to the boundary wall being in gritstone and that actually it is built in limestone and should be re-built in the same materials.

### **Main Policies**

Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1

Relevant Local Plan policies: LC4, LH4

In principle, DS1 of the Core Strategy is supportive of extensions to existing buildings and policy LH4 of the Local Plan provides specific criteria for assessing householder extensions. LH4 says extensions and alterations to dwellings will be permitted provided that the proposal does not:

- i. detract from the character, appearance or amenity of the original building, its setting or neighbouring buildings; or
- ii. dominate the original dwelling where it is of architectural, historic or vernacular merit; or
- iii. amount to the creation of a separate dwelling or an annexe that could be used as a separate dwelling.

The Authority has also adopted three separate supplementary planning documents (SPD) that offers design guidance on householder development namely the Design Guide, the Building Design Guide and the detailed Design Guide on Alterations and Extensions. This guidance offers specific criteria for assessing the impacts of householder development on neighbouring properties and contains a number of suggestions for the appropriate design of outbuildings such as garaging.

### **Wider Policy Context**

The provisions of policies DS1 and LH4 and guidance in the Authority's adopted SPD are supported by a wider range of design and conservation policies in the Development Plan including policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3 and L1 of the Core Strategy and policy LC4 of the Local Plan, which promote and encourage sustainable development that would be sensitive to the locally distinctive building traditions of the National Park and its landscape setting. Policy LC4 and GSP3 also say the impact of a development proposal on the living conditions of other residents is a further important consideration in the determination of this planning application.

These policies are consistent with national planning policies in the Framework (the National Planning Policy Framework) not least because core planning principles in the Framework require local planning authorities to always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

### **Assessment**

In this case, 'Iona' has recently changed hands and the new owner wishes to make alterations partly in association with converting the roofspace and the integral single garage into additional living accommodation. The key issues raised by the proposals are the impact of the extension and alterations on the character and appearance of the dwelling and on the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties. The applicant did seek pre-application advice although the scheme as presented differs somewhat from that upon which advice was sought. A detailed Planning Statement has been submitted with the application

#### **Issue 1: Impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling.**

Whilst the dwelling is a recently built bungalow, it does exhibit qualities that are in keeping with the local building style, including modestly sized gables, a relatively steep roof pitch, natural materials and a high solid to void ratio on the walls.

The proposed extension would be a single storey gabled extension of modest proportions (2.3m x 3.3m), projecting off the rear elevation of the dwelling. It would be set in from the end, gable wall and would have one double casement window in its gable end. Materials would match the main house. This small, simply designed extension would harmonise with the character and appearance of the dwelling in accordance with policies GSP3, LC4 and LH4.

There are also two windows and a patio door currently on the existing rear elevation of the house. It is proposed to widen all three of these openings. The two double casements would be widened to three light casements and the patio door would be widened from 1.2m to 1.8m wide. Whilst the increase in size of these openings would weaken the appearance of this elevation by reducing the amount of masonry, on balance, given that the elevation faces onto a private rear garden, it is considered that the alterations can be accepted.

On the south facing elevation an existing double casement would be enlarge to form a deeper and wider window, divided into three lights. A new double casement window would be inserted adjacent. There is currently a 2.5m high boundary hedge, within the ownership of 'Iona', running directly adjacent to the elevation. Therefore whilst the proportions of the opening are relatively large, it is not considered that they would be cause harm to the character of the dwelling in this

discreet location.

On the north facing elevation, two new rooflights would be inserted. These would not be prominent from the road and are considered to be acceptable a design terms.

Finally on the front, road facing, elevation the existing garage door would be replaced with glazing in the form of three large glazed panels and a two light casement window would be increased in width to a three light window. The plans as submitted also showed the insertion of a new ground floor window (double casement) in the front facing gable end and a further three light window in the gable end at first floor level. Officers considered that the amount of additional glazing proposed reduced the solid to void ratio unacceptably and therefore detracted from the character and appearance of the dwelling when viewed from the road.

As a result of negotiations, amended plans will be submitted before the meeting showing the bathroom window moved round onto the north facing side elevation, under the eaves. It is also proposed to install a new three light casement on the road facing gable end at first floor level. This is not ideal as such a large window close to the roof verges is not traditional. However the applicant is keen to retain the window and, on balance, given that the solidity of the gable end would be improved by relocating the bathroom window, there are no overriding objections to the window.

As submitted the plans also showed a small top hung light in the central panel of the new window in the former garage door opening. This detracted from the verticality of the three light design and from the front elevation as a whole. The applicant has agreed to submit amended plans before the meeting which omit this and instead, to provide ventilation to the room, a single light casement will be shown on the north facing elevation and this is considered to be an acceptable solution.

The proposed rebuilding of the front boundary wall, which is currently in a state of collapse, would enhance the appearance of the property. The wall is currently constructed in natural limestone, so it is considered appropriate to rebuild as a natural limestone drystone wall (rather than gritstone) to match the other walls in the vicinity. It is considered reasonable and necessary to require this by condition.

As amended the proposals would conserve the character of the property in accordance with policies GSP3, LC4 and LH4.

## **Issue 2 - Impact on the amenity of neighbouring residential properties.**

Iona is flanked on both sides by other residential properties. The proposed extension would not harm the amenity of either property in that there is a 2m high close boarded fence on the northern boundary of the property which would prevent any overshadowing or overlooking onto 'Fairfield' to the north and to the south 'Meadow View' would be screened from the development by a 2m high hedge.

With regard to the proposed alterations, the two new rooflights on the north facing roofslope would face towards 'Fairfield'. However, with regard to the concerns raised by the occupier of Iona, the submitted sectional plan makes it clear that the bottom of the lights would be 1.8m above floor level within the rooms at Iona which would preclude the downward view that would be necessary to secure overlooking. The neighbour's criticism of the Authority with regard to enforcing conditions on the original approval regarding obscure glazing and fixing of rooflights on the south facing roofslope are unfounded as an appeal for the rooflights was allowed. The Inspector found that as the rooflights would be 2m above ground level, there would no impact on the amenity of Meadow View. Therefore with regard to impact on amenity and privacy, there are no grounds to resist the clear glazed, opening rooflights as proposed.

As a result of the design amendments, a new single light window would be inserted in the gable end that faces towards Fairfield. However the existing garage building belonging to 'Fairfield' and which sits on the southern boundary of its plot, adjacent to 'Iona', would effectively prevent any overlooking into the windows of 'Fairfield'. In addition the relocated bathroom window would also face towards 'Fairfield', but no overlooking would be possible as the window would look over the parking areas to 'Fairfield' and views of the house would be blocked by the presence of a garage belonging to 'Fairfield'. In addition a condition would be imposed to ensure that the bathroom window remains obscure glazed for the privacy of both properties. The owner of 'Fairfield' will be re-consulted on the amended plans and any response will be reported to the Committee.

To the south, the property known as 'Meadow View' is set further back in its plot than 'Iona'. The proposed enlarged and new window openings on the north facing elevation would face directly onto the high hedgerow, which would effectively prevent overlooking. The hedgerow is in the ownership of 'Iona'. If it were to die or be removed, there would be significant overlooking from the new windows onto 'Meadow View'. As a result, a condition that requires if the hedge were to die or be removed it should be replaced by a 2m high close boarded fence is considered to be reasonable and necessary.

In conclusion, as amended, the scheme would not unacceptably harm the privacy or amenity of adjacent residential properties in accordance with GSP3 and LC4 subject to appropriate planning conditions.

#### Highway Considerations

Condition no.4 of the latest planning approval required that the garage remain unobstructed for use at all times. Whilst the proposals would result in the loss of the garage facility there would still be sufficient space to park three vehicles in front of the property, with adequate space for turning such that reversing onto the highway is not necessary. This element of the proposal is in accord with GSP3, which requires adequate access.

#### Conclusion

The proposals, as amended would not harm the character or appearance of the dwelling or unacceptably impact on the privacy or amenity of neighbouring properties in accordance with Core Strategy Policy GSP3 and Local Plan policies LC4 and LH4, the Framework and advice in the Authority's adopted design guidance. Accordingly, the current application is recommended for conditional approval.

#### Human Rights

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

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

Nil