

**11. HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION – SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING DWELLING AT THE OLD CHAPEL, HEATHCOTE, HARTINGTON (NP/DDD/0922/1164/PM)**

**APPLICANT: MR STEVE STOFFELL**

**Summary**

1. The Old Chapel, is a residential dwelling, a converted former Methodist chapel located within the settlement of Heathcote.
2. A single storey extension to the property is proposed.
3. The design and positioning of the proposed extension is not considered to be complementary to the parent building in terms of form and massing nor reflective of the local vernacular building tradition of simple building shapes. It is considered that the proposal would detract from the existing appearance of the property as a former religious chapel.
4. The application is therefore recommended for refusal as the proposal does not conserve or enhance the character, appearance or significance of the non designated asset, and therefore is not in accordance with the relevant adopted policies.

**Site and Surroundings**

5. The application property is a residential dwelling, a converted former Methodist chapel dating from the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It is located within the small settlement of Heathcote, approximately 1.5 km east of the village of Hartington.
6. The property is constructed from roughly coursed limestone rubble with gritstone dressings and has a slate tiled roof.
7. The property is recorded on the Derbyshire Historic Environment Record (HER) as “A former 19<sup>th</sup> century Wesleyan Methodist Chapel, later used by the Primitives, in Heathcote which is now a private residence”. Original features on the exterior of the building are sufficiently complete for the building to be read as a former religious building. The property is considered to be a non designated heritage asset. Additionally, heritage significance is considered to derive from the social history of its former use as a place of worship within the settlement.
8. Prior to being converted into residential use in the 1990s the building was most recently used as an agricultural storage building for a nearby farm.
9. The front elevation of the building faces in a south easterly direction towards a vehicular access track to Chapel Farm. The majority of the garden land serving the residential dwelling is positioned between the front elevation of the property and the access to Chapel Farm. The main street in Heathcote passes to the north east of the application property, passing the side elevation of the property. The site is bounded by drystone walls.
10. The Grade II listed Heathcote Farmhouse is located approximately 30 metres to the east of the application property. Adjacent residential properties to the south west and north west are Chapel Farm and Chapel Barn. The application site is not located within a conservation area.

11. Public footpaths from the north west and south west converge on the edge of the settlement and then pass immediately to the rear of the application property.

### **Proposal**

12. Planning permission is sought for the erection of a extension protruding from the front elevation of the existing side extension to the property by approximately 3 metres. The extension would have a dual pitched roof and front gable.
13. Plans as originally submitted also proposed a large porch to the front door of the property. Amended plans have seen the porch removed from the proposal, and a reduction in the amount of glazing proposed in the extension.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**The design and positioning of the proposed extension is not considered to be complementary to the parent building in terms of form and massing nor reflective of the local vernacular building tradition of simple building shapes. The proposal would detract from the existing appearance of the property as a former religious chapel. The proposal would not conserve or enhance the character, appearance, setting or significance of the non designated heritage asset and is contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3 and L3 and Development Management policies DMC3, DMC5 and DMH7.**

### **Key Issues**

- The principle of the development.
- The impact upon the appearance, character and heritage significance of the property.
- The impact upon highway safety.
- The impact upon the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.
- Climate change mitigation

### **History**

14. 1993 – Conversion of Former Chapel to dwelling – Planning Permission granted.

### **Consultations**

15. Highway Authority – No highway objection subject to no loss of parking
16. District Council – no response
17. Parish Council – Supports the proposal, noting that the existing dwelling is a small building for a dwelling, the proposal is in keeping with the design of the existing building, and that neighbours have not objected to the proposal.
18. PDNPA – Archaeology – Highlights that the application property is on the HBSMR and is considered to be a non designated heritage asset. Expresses concern that the the extension will project forward from the chapel frontage changing its simple original appearance.

### **Representations**

19. A representation letter has been received from the Derbyshire Dales Ramblers Group. The group has no objection to the proposal subject to nearby public footpaths remain unaffected at all times both during and after the construction of the proposal.

### **Main Policies**

20. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L1, L3, CC1
21. Relevant Development management policies: DMC3, DMC5, DMH7

### **National Planning Policy Framework**

22. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012 and replaced a significant proportion of central government planning policy with immediate effect. The Government's intention is that the document should be considered to be a material consideration and carry particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date. In the National Park the development plan comprises the East Midlands Regional Plan 2009, the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and saved policies in the Peak District National Park Local Plan 2001. Policies in the Development Plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. It is considered that in this case there is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and more recent Government guidance in the NPPF.
23. Paragraph 176 of the NPPF 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.

### **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 states, amongst other things, that when development is permitted, a design will be sought that respects the character of the area.

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 DS1 - Sets out the development strategy – the forms of development that are acceptable in principle in all settlements and in the countryside outside of the Natural Zone.
28. 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.
29. Policy L3 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.
30. Policy CC1 states that development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources.

#### Development Management Policies

31. DM1 – *The presumption of sustainable development in the context of National Park purposes.* These being (i) to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the National Park; and (ii) to promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the valued characteristics of the National Park.
32. DMC3 - *Siting, Design, layout and landscaping.* DMC3 states that where development is acceptable in principle, it will be permitted provided that its detailed treatment is of a high standard that respects, protects and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape, including the wildlife and cultural heritage that contribute to the distinctive sense of place.
33. 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.
34. DMH7 - Extensions and alterations. States (amongst other things) 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.

#### Supplementary guidance

35. The PDNPA has a Supplementary Planning Document (Detailed Design Guide) for alterations and extensions. Chapter 3 relates to extensions to dwellings and states that there are three main factors to consider: (1) massing, (2) materials and (3) detailing and style. All extensions should harmonise with the parent building, respecting the dominance of the original building. The original character of the property should not be destroyed when providing additional development. Further guidance is provided by the 1987 Building Design Guide

## **Assessment**

### **The principle of the development**

36. Planning policy is supportive of proposals for extensions to dwellings in principle.

### **The impact upon the appearance, character and heritage significance of the property**

37. The property largely retains the form and appearance of its original use as a religious chapel. Notwithstanding the existing side extension the building can be read as a former chapel when viewed from the street, the existing side extension being subordinate in scale and appearance to the former chapel building.
38. Key features of the form and design of the property which suggest a former place of worship are the large arched windows positioned high up on the walls. On the front elevation these are located either side of a centrally placed arched doorway. Additionally, the property has a high eaves level for what was originally a single storey building.
39. The original property is of a simple rectangular form. The roof has a central ridge with gabled ends. The simple form and design of the original building is similar to vernacular residential properties of a similar age. The openings are also vertically proportioned and positioned away from edges and corners, features also of traditional vernacular residential buildings.
40. The proposed front extension to the existing kitchen to provide a 'snug' would significantly change the appearance of the front elevation of the former chapel detracting from its current appearance as a former religious building. The proposed extension to the kitchen would project forwards of the front elevation of the current building undermining the dominance of the former chapel building when viewed from within and from beyond the front garden of the property. Additionally, the proposed front extension extending off the existing side extension, effectively results in a 'wrap around' side / front extension. This necessitates a complex roof arrangement which is not in keeping with the vernacular tradition of simplicity of form resulting from a balanced plan and simple roof shape.
41. The design and positioning of the proposed extension is not considered to be complementary to the parent building in terms of form and massing nor reflective of the local vernacular building tradition of simple building shapes. The proposal would detract from the existing appearance of the property as a former religious chapel. The proposal would not conserve or enhance the character, appearance, setting or significance of the non designated heritage asset and is contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP3 and L3 and Development Management policies DMC3, DMC5 and DMH7.
42. The submitted heritage statement highlights that there has previously been an extension in the approximate location of the now proposed extension and that as such there is historic precedent for an extension projecting to the front of the property. However, it is considered that the existence of a previous front extension is of limited relevance when considering the setting of the heritage asset in its current restored condition. The former front extension was erected at a time when the building was being used as an agricultural storage building, after it had ceased to be used as a place of worship. The former front extension existed when the building was in a state of

relative disrepair with bricked up windows and fibre cement roof sheets. A front projecting extension is not a form of development associated with the time that the building was in use as a place of worship.

43. It is its former use as a place of worship from which the heritage significance of the building is derived. The conversion of the former chapel to residential use in 1993 conserved and enhanced the character and appearance of the building. As part of this enhancement, the former front projecting extension was demolished and replaced with a more appropriate side extension which is subordinate in scale to the main building and of simple design. The reintroduction of a built form to the front of the former chapel, removed in 1993 as part of a process of enhancement cannot therefore now not been seen as an action which conserves or enhances the character, appearance, setting or significance of the former chapel.
44. Permitted Development rights for alterations and extensions to the property were removed at the time that the property was converted to residential use in 1993. The application description makes reference to alterations as well as to an extension. The key external alteration proposed for the existing dwelling is the insertion of a rooflight into the side facing roof slope of the existing side extension. There are concerns about the design of this rooflight as shown on the submitted plans however were other aspects of the proposal considered acceptable, it would be possible to use a condition to require a conservation style rooflight.

#### Impact upon highway safety

45. The consultation response received from the highway authority advises that there is no objection subject to no loss of parking. There would be a reduction in available driveway as the proposed front extension would protrude into the front driveway by more than 3 metres. However, the existing front driveway is long and it is considered that the reduced length of the driveway could accommodate 3 cars. There is a further off road parking space to the side of the property. The proposed extensions do not create additional bedrooms which might be expected to create demand for more vehicle parking space. It is considered that there would be sufficient off road parking provision for the size of the dwelling as extended.

#### Impact upon the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers

46. The proposal extension would not result in any harm to the residential amenity of nearby residential occupiers. The proposed rooflight to be inserted into the side of the existing extension has the potential to allow for overlooking towards the residential property at Chapel Farm, and particularly the garden area to the front of the property at Chapel Farm, which is currently not visible from the street scene or from other nearby occupiers. However, were other aspects of the proposal acceptable, it would be possible to resolve this concern by the use of a condition to require the rooflight to be obscurely glazed and non opening.
47. It should be noted that this concern applies only to the rooflight proposed for the existing extension. The two rooflights proposed in the side of the proposed extension have a different relationship with Chapel Farm and an existing substantial hedgerow would prevent the potential for overlooking from these.

#### Climate change mitigation

48. The submitted Design and Access Statement outlines proposed measures to minimise resource use and maximise energy efficiency. Having regard to the scale of the proposed development it is considered that these measures are sufficient to ensure compliance with policy CC1.

## **Conclusion**

49. The design and positioning of the proposed extension is not considered to be complementary to the parent building in terms of form and massing nor reflective of the local vernacular building tradition of simple building shapes. The proposal would detract from the existing appearance of the property as a former religious chapel. The proposed extension would not conserve or enhance the character, appearance, setting or significance of the non designated heritage asset, contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP3 and L3 and Development Management policies DMC3, DMC5 and DMH7. There are no material considerations which outweigh this conflict. It is therefore recommended that the application be refused planning permission.

## **Human Rights**

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

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

51. Nil

## **Report Author and Job Title**

52. Peter Mansbridge – Planner - South