

**12. FULL APPLICATION – PROPOSED EXTENSION TO DWELLING AT THE ORCHARDS, MONSDALE LANE, PARWICH. (NP/DDD/0921/0990, SC)**

**APPLICANT:** MR P KIRKHAM

**Summary**

1. The application seeks permission to construct a two storey extension to the front elevation of the dwelling at The Orchards, Monsdale Lane, Parwich.
2. In this case, by virtue of its siting, scale and design, the two storey extension fails to respect the simple character and appearance of the host dwelling and the valued characteristics of the Conservation Area. As a result, the application is recommended for refusal.

**Site and Surroundings**

3. The Orchards is a traditional detached farmhouse dating from at least the 19<sup>th</sup> century, sited within a fairly large plot on the eastern edge of the village and within the Conservation Area. The nearest neighbouring dwelling is Orchard Farm sited around 35m to the north. A public footpath runs in roughly an east to west direction adjacent with the northern boundary of the property.

**Proposal**

4. Planning permission is being sought to erect a two storey extension to the front elevation of the property.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:**

1. **By virtue of its position, scale and design, the two storey extension would harm the simple character and heritage significance of the existing dwelling and the valued characteristics of the Conservation Area.**

**The development therefore conflicts with Local Plan Policies GSP1, GSP3, L3, DMC3, DMC5, DMC8, and DMH7, advice within the Authority's Design Guide and Alterations and Extensions SPD, and Paragraphs 134, 176, and section 16 of the NPPF.**

2. **The application fails to include sufficient heritage assessment to allow a full assessment of impacts upon the buildings heritage significance to be made, contrary to policy DMC5 and paragraph 194 of the NPPF.**

**Key Issues**

5. The potential impact on the character and appearance of the host property, the Conservation Area, the privacy and amenity of neighbouring dwellings and highway safety.

**History**

6. 1989 - NP/WED/389/129 - Extension to dwelling – Granted.

## **Consultations**

7. Highway Authority – No objections, subject to sufficient parking provision being retained.
8. Parish Council - *Supports this application on the grounds that it is a sympathetic improvement to the housing stock in the village.*

## **Representations**

9. One letter has been received from neighbouring property (Orchard Farm). Commenting, that whilst they are sympathetic to the addition of an extension, a single storey extension would be less intrusive to all concerned, including users of the adjacent public footpath.

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

10. 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.
11. Paragraph 134 states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.
12. Paragraph 176 states, that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. It also states that 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.
13. Paragraph 194 states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. It advises that the level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.
14. Paragraph 199 states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset (in this case being the Conservation Area), great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
15. Paragraph 203 states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
16. In the National Park, the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy and the new Development Management Policies (DMP). These Development Plan Policies provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application.

## **Main Development Plan Policies**

### **Core Strategy**

17. GSP1, GSP2 - *Securing National Park Purposes and sustainable development & Enhancing the National Park*. These policies jointly seek to secure national park legal purposes and duties through the conversion and enhancement of the National Park's landscape and its natural and heritage assets.
18. GSP3 - *Development Management Principles*. Requires that particular attention is paid to the impact on the character and setting of buildings and that the design is in accord with the Authority's Design Guide and development is appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park.
19. L3 - *Cultural Heritage assets or archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance*. Explains that development must conserve and where appropriately enhance or reveal the significance of historic assets and their setting. 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 or its setting.
20. DS1 - *Development Strategy*. Supports extensions and alterations to dwellinghouse in principle, subject to a satisfactory scale, design and external appearance.
21. CC1 - *Climate change mitigation and adaption*. Sets out that development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources. Development must also achieve the highest possible standards of carbon reductions and water efficiency.

### **Development Management Policies**

22. DMC3 - *Siting, Design, layout and landscaping*. Reiterates, that where developments are acceptable in principle, Policy requires that design is to high standards and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape. The siting, mass, scale, height, design, building materials should all be appropriate to the context. Accessibility of the development should also be a key consideration.
23. DMC5 - *Assessing the impact of development on designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting*. The policy provides detailed advice relating to proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, requiring new development to demonstrate how valued features will be conserved, as well as detailing the types and levels of information required to support such proposals.
24. DMC8 - *Conservation Areas*. States, that applications for development in a Conservation Area, or for development that affects it's 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.

25. DMH7 - *Extensions and alterations*. States that 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 particularly where it is a designated or non-designated cultural heritage asset; or
  - (iii) amount to the creation of a separate independent dwelling; or
  - (iv) create an adverse effect on, or lead to undesirable changes to, the landscape or any other valued characteristic; or
  - (v) in the case of houses permitted under policy DMH1, exceed 10% of the floorspace or take the floorspace of the house above 97m<sup>2</sup>.
26. DMT3 - *Access and design criteria*. States amongst other things, that a safe access should be provided in a way that does not detract from the character and appearance of the locality and where possible enhances it.
27. The Authority has 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.

## **Assessment**

### **Principle of the development**

28. Generally, there are no objections to extending a dwelling, subject to a satisfactory scale, design and external appearance and where development pays particular attention to the amenity, privacy and security of nearby properties in accordance with the principles of policies DS1 & DMC3 respectively.
29. Policy DMH7 states, that extensions and alterations to a residential dwelling will be permitted provided that the proposal does not detract from the character, appearance or amenity of the original building.

### **Siting, design and materials**

#### **Proposed two storey extension**

30. The Authority's Design guidance states amongst other things, that it may be possible to add a well-designed extension provided it would be in harmony with the original building, subject to being appropriate in scale, design and external appearance, in accordance with good design principles.
31. However, there are matters of siting and design that are not considered acceptable in the current proposed two storey extension. In particular, the scale of the extension in proportion to the existing dwelling and the arrangement of extending beyond the architectural front of the dwelling, which is seldom considered appropriate or acceptable in design terms.
32. Whilst there is no evidence on file, the property appears to have been a farmhouse with attached barn which has been re-configured at some point in the past to create a single dwelling. It dates from before 1880 based on available historic mapping, although no heritage assessment accompanies the application to provide further detail in this regard. Given the property's age and character, it is considered a non-designated heritage asset.

33. To the front, a modest albeit uncharacteristic porch extension has been added, but the elevation otherwise retains its traditional plain and linear frontage.
34. The rear of the dwelling faces onto the private rear access, with the front elevation facing into the garden. Lean-to extensions project from the rear of the property.
35. The proposed extension is large and – significantly – would project from the front elevation of the building.
36. In terms of scale, the extent of projection from the wall of the building, along with a height equal to it and a wider gable than it would all serve to create a dominating extension that fails to be subservient to the parent building, as required by planning policy and design guidance.
37. Cumulatively these points make the extension appear unduly large in proportion to the host property, imposing on the original building and detracting from its character and appearance.
38. Perhaps even more significantly, these impacts would affect the principal elevation of the building. The Authority's adopted Alterations and Extensions SPD clearly states that extending to the front - the important façade architecturally - is seldom appropriate or acceptable.
39. In this instance the front elevation has a simple and traditional character and appearance that also contributes to its archaeological legibility and heritage significance. It makes a positive contribution to the built environment and cultural heritage of the National Park.
40. The proposed two storey extension would entirely undermine this simplicity of form, as well as resulting in significant harm to the buildings typical traditional appearance and, despite the lack of a supporting heritage assessment, it is clear that it would also harm its heritage significance in doing so. The full impacts on heritage assessment cannot be established however, as the lack of heritage assessment restricts understanding of the archaeology of the building, contrary to policy DMC5 and paragraph 194 of the NPPF.
41. Overall, the extension would be wholly out of keeping with the buildings character, as well as best practice in design as set out in planning policy and adopted design guidance. It therefore fails to accord with policies GSP1, GSP3, L3, DMC3, DMC5, and DMH7. It also fails to accord with paragraphs 134 and 176 of the NPPF, as well as the provisions of Part 16 for the assessment and conservation of heritage assets.
42. Further, the development is located within the village Conservation Area. As a result of the harm identified to the building itself, it stands that it would also harm the character of the Conservation Area, something compounded by its visibility from the footpath that passes the site to its immediate north. The development is also therefore contrary to policy DMC8.

### **Potential amenity issues**

43. Outlook, amenity, privacy and daylight are fundamental considerations when altering or extending a property.
44. This is to ensure that habitable rooms achieve a satisfactory level of outlook and natural daylight, there is adequate privacy and outdoor private amenity space and that no overbearing or harmful overshadowing of neighbouring property results.

45. The nearest neighbouring properties are Orchard Farm sited approximately 35m to the North and Trevarney, around 50m to the west of the new development.
46. In this case, due to these distances from the proposed development, there would be no harm to the amenity or quiet enjoyment of the occupants of these or any other residential properties in the locality.
47. Consequently, the proposal accords with Policies GSP3 & DMC3 in respect of the impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

### **Highway matters**

48. The Local Highway Authority raise no objections to the scheme, subject to it forming private, domestic, ancillary living accommodation for the existing dwelling and that sufficient parking associated with the site is available.
49. In this case, the extension would remain ancillary and there is ample space within the site to park and manoeuvre several vehicles. Subsequently, the scheme is acceptable in highway terms, according with policies DMT3 respectively.

### **Environmental Management and sustainability**

50. The new development would have to meet current building regulations regarding heat and power. However, the submitted details state, that it is proposed to exceed the requirements of the building regulations in terms of the thermal efficiency of the new build elements.
51. In this case, the extension would be built using a modern insulated cavity wall construction, and constructed in an air tight manner.
52. The ground floor and roof would be highly insulated reducing heat loss.
53. The existing double-glazed windows would be replaced with modern gas filled double glazed windows to provide better thermal insulation.
54. Low energy light fittings and A rated appliances would be installed to reduce energy consumption.
55. All construction materials and finishes would be locally sourced and reusing materials such as stone and roof tiles where possible
56. With regard to the above, the proposals are considered acceptable in generally meeting the climate change mitigation and adaption requirements of policy CC1 in these respects.

### **Conclusion**

57. By virtue of its position, scale and design, the two storey extension would harm the simple character and heritage significance of the existing dwelling and the valued characteristics of the Conservation Area.
58. The scheme therefore conflicts with the Authority's Development Plan Policies GSP1, GSP3, L3, DMC3, DMC5, DMC8, DMH7, advice within the Authority's Design Guide and Alterations and Extensions SPD, and Paragraphs 134, 176, and section 16 of the NPPF.
59. There are no material or further policy considerations that would indicate that planning permission should be granted.

60. Consequently, the proposal is recommended for refusal.

**Human Rights**

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

62. List of Background Papers (not previously published)

63. Nil

64. Report Author: Steve Coombes, South Area Planning Team.