

9. FULL APPLICATION – S.73 APPLICATION FOR THE REMOVAL AND VARIATION OF CONDITION 2 AND 7 ON NP/DDD/1222/1562 AT NEWBY HOUSE, OVER LANE, BASLOW (NP/DDD/0623/0639, WE)

APPLICANT: ALLISON AND SIMON CHALK

Summary

1. This application seeks to vary the conditions attached to a previous permission granted on site (NP/DDD/1222/1562). This permission granted consent for a rear extension to the property, in addition to two small lean-tos off the side elevations of the property, and a new detached garage with changes to the fenestration of the property. The approved plans had been amended during the determination of the application following Officer feedback.
2. This application seeks permission to change the design of the approved scheme through the variation of conditions 2 and 7. This application proposes to change the siting of the rear extension further north on the rear extension of the property, and vary the roof form of all the proposed extensions. Application NP/DDD/1222/1562 granted consent for a hipped roof rear extension, and two lean-to extensions off the side elevations of the property. This application proposes shallow zinc hipped roofs with a central rooflight.
3. It is considered that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of Newby House through inappropriately designed and sited extensions which do not reflect the prevailing character of the property. It is recommended for refusal on this basis.

Site and Surroundings

4. The development site is Newby House, a large detached property off Over Lane in Baslow. The property sits in a large plot, with a large front and rear garden. The property is non-traditional in form, comprising of two projecting gables joined through a hipped roof. Whilst it is non-traditional, the property is constructed from natural stone with an attractive frontage so is considered to have architectural merit.
5. The property currently has a large outbuilding which is used for additional living accommodation and garaging/storage.
6. The property is accessed off a large private track which serves two other bungalow properties. It is outside the Baslow and Bubnell conservation area.

Proposal

7. This application seeks to vary condition 2 and 7 attached to application NP/DDD/1222/1562.
8. This application proposes a rear extension which would be location further north on the rear elevation of the property. The rear extension would measure 8m x 5.3m. By virtue of its siting on the rear elevation, it would extend 2.8m beyond the northern elevation of the property.
9. The northern side extension would extend 2.75m from the northern elevation, and measure 4.85m in length. The southern side extension would extend 2.45m from the elevation and measure 6.21m in length.

10. The extensions would be heavily glazed, with the rear extension featuring bifold doors on every elevation with natural stone columns. The northern side extension would nearly be completely glazed apart from a 0.9m high stone wall base. The southern extension would be similarly glazed to the proposed northern extension with a glazed front corner; however, there would be more stone walling on the rear and side elevation of this extension.
11. The extensions would feature a zinc roof with a stepped hip leading to a central rooflight. The zinc roof would feature an overhang of approximately 0.6m from the external walling of the extensions.
12. The proposed side extensions would feature sliding aluminium fins.
13. The application proposes changes to the fenestration of the property, including the creation of a 2.5m wide two-storey glazed window on the rear elevation.
14. This application also proposes a new garage. This section of the proposal is unchanged from the previous scheme.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reason:

1. **The proposed development would harm the character and appearance of Newby House through the inappropriate siting of the rear extension, contrasting roof forms to the host property, and a detailed design which does not respond to the host property. It therefore does not meet the high standard of design required by local policy. On this basis, the proposed development is contrary to policies DMC3, DMC7, and the guidance outlined within the Alterations and Extensions SPD.**

Key Issues

- Design and impact on the character and appearance of Newby House
- Amenity.

History

- 2005 - Erection of single-storey timber framed conservatory – Granted conditionally
- 2022 - Demolition of timber conservatory. Conversion of existing garage to living space. Alterations and internal reorganisation of existing house including attic conversion from hipped to gabled roof. Erection of two single-storey side extensions including new garage and connecting links. New landscape design to the front and rear – Refused
- 2023 - Demolition of timber conservatory and existing garage. Alterations and internal reorganisation of existing house including attic conversion and ground source heat pump. Erection of 2no. single-storey lean to side extensions, rear extension and new garage with living space above. Amended drive, terraced areas. Basement gym and plantroom – Granted conditionally

Consultations

15. Derbyshire County Council Highways Authority – No highway objections to the variation of conditions
16. Baslow and Bubnell Parish Council – No comments to make

17. PDNPA Archaeology – No comments to make

Representations

18. The application received 6 representations. All representations were in support of the proposal.

19. The letters of support raised the following comments:

- The property is not traditional or vernacular so the broad design rules about extending traditional buildings are largely irrelevant;
- Scale of development has been established through previous application;
- The proposed scheme is contemporary in design which is supported by design guidance;
- Sloped roof is an interpretation on hipped roof;
- Hidden from view and would not impact street-scene or Conservation Area;
- The scheme is contemporarily designed using local materials;
- It would not dominant the property;
- Scheme would result in an enhancement.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

20. National Park designation is the highest level of landscape designation in the UK. The Environment Act 1995 sets out two statutory purposes for national parks in England and Wales: Which are; to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage and promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of national parks by the public. When national parks carry out these purposes they also have the duty to; seek to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities within the National Parks.

21. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been revised (2021). This replaces the previous document (2019) with immediate effect. 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. In particular 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.

22. In the National Park, the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and the Development Management Policies (DMP), adopted May 2019. These Development Plan Policies provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. In this case, it is considered there are no significant conflicts between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and government guidance in the NPPF.

Main Development Plan Policies

Core Strategy

23. 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.

24. 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.
25. DS1 - *Development Strategy*. Sets out that most new development will be directed into named settlements. Taddington is a named settlement.
26. L1 - *Landscape character and valued characteristics*. Seeks to ensure that all development conserves and enhances valued landscape character and sites, features and species of biodiversity importance.
27. Policy CC1 states that development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources.

Development Management Policies

28. 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.
29. Policy DMH7 deals with extensions and alterations to dwellings. It 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 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.
30. Policy DMH8 outlines that new outbuildings will be permitted provided the scale, mass, form and design of the new building conserves and enhances the immediate dwelling and curtilage.

Supplementary Planning Documents

31. 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, massing, materials, 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.

Assessment

Design and Impact on the character and appearance of Newby House

32. The property originally dates to the early 20th century and was originally a relatively modest detached dwelling constructed from natural stone and slate and set within a large garden. The property was substantially extended to the side and front in the early 21st century resulting in a more substantial dwelling with two projecting gables to the principal elevation.
33. The property is non-traditional in style with details including a hipped roof, projecting gables to the front, external chimneys and bay windows. Nevertheless, the property is

constructed from local natural materials and has a degree of architectural integrity.

34. Policy DMH7 states that alterations and extensions to properties are acceptable in principle, and policy DMC3 sets out that where a development is acceptable in principle, it will only be permitted provided 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. In particular, policy DMC3 requires attention to be paid to the siting, scale, form, mass height and orientation of the development and the degree to which the developments design, details, materials and finishes reflect or compliment the style and tradition of the locality.
35. The Detailed Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations SPD sets out the three main factors to consider for householder extensions: -
- Massing
 - Materials
 - Detailing and style
36. While Newby House is non-traditional and is not reflective of the wider Peak District building tradition, the property is considered to be of architectural merit. The property is constructed from natural stone, featuring traditional stone surrounds. The property's symmetrical front elevation presents a well-balanced and formal property set within its large curtilage. Whilst features such as the external chimney and hipped roof pull the property away from the local building tradition, its detailed design and material relate well to the locality and give the property a strong sense of character and attractive appearance.
37. The rear extension is broadly the same size as the previously approved scheme. As such, its scale is considered acceptable. Notwithstanding this, its location on the northern end of the western elevation is considered problematic. It would result in the extension going beyond the northern elevation of the property, creating a small appendage which extends beyond the existing built-form of the property. It is acknowledged that within the submitted scheme, when viewed from the principal elevation, this section of the rear extension would be concealed by the northern side extension; however, when assessing the impact on the property itself, it is considered to appear unresolved and poor in relation to the existing form of the property. The Authority are mindful of paragraph 3.8 of the Alterations and Extensions SPD which states that *extensions located on a corner of the parent building are best avoided because they only half-house the extension on the original building. The resultant massing is over-complicated and at odds with the vernacular traditional.*
38. The rear extension would feature a "stepped" roof. The Planning Statement suggests that the roof has been designed to take its inspiration from the hipped roof of the host building whilst giving it a contemporary style and design. The Alterations and Extensions outlines that contemporary detailing for an extension is a valid approach; however, it is noted that this is a contemporary style in form (as opposed to detailing). It is considered that if constructed, the extension would broadly be interpreted as flat-roofed, which the SPD outlines are "rarely appropriate" due to them being used as *the easy way of covering an unresolved plan*. There is also concern over the appearance of the flat-roof. By virtue of its steps, there are concerns that the roof would appear thick after construction. According to the plan, if viewed directly on, from the bottom of the overhanging eave to the top of the rooflight, the roof would measure 0.75m in thickness. It is considered that this would be contrary to policy DMC3 which requires detailed treatment which is of a "high standard".
39. The concerns over the roof-structure are equally relevant to the side extensions. Whilst the provision of two side extensions would assist in conserving the symmetry of the

wider property, it is considered that the extensions would appear out of keeping with property, resulting in a confused form.

40. In addition to concerns over the form and massing of the proposed extension, there are also concerns over the materials and detailed design. Whilst parts of the extension would be constructed from natural stone to match the host dwelling; the vast majority of the extensions would be glazed with a zinc roof. On the rear elevation, there would only be minimal columns between the bifold doors which would remain stone, whilst on the side extensions, there would be a small section of walling up to 0.9m; however, the majority of them would be glazed, including the corners.
41. In addition to the heavy glazing, the extensions would also feature contemporary design features such as the aluminium fins on slides. The Alterations and Extensions SPD outlines that contemporary detailed design is acceptable, however, it is best accomplished if the remaining variables, massing and materials, are both treated in a traditional manner.
42. As discussed, neither the massing or materials of the extensions can be considered “traditional”. As such, there is little which relates the proposed extensions to the existing property. The roof form would contrast the existing property, whilst the limited stone and heavy glazing would contrast the solid character; and the detailed design would similarly contrast the broadly traditional detailing of the property.
43. It is acknowledged that there was a lot of glazing permitted under the extant permission; however, the provision of the lean-to which matched the angle of the house and the hipped roof rear extension, in addition to the more substantial masonry in the original design, pulled the scheme back to the host property in terms of character and appearance.
44. In isolation, the proposed two-storey window is appropriate the existing scheme granted consent for a similar window detail, and whilst this one would be wider than approved, the other changes to the fenestration on the rear of the property would result in a stronger solid-to-void ratio. However, it is acknowledged that the decrease in windows on this elevation is due to the off-setting of the rear extension, which is considered inappropriate.
45. The proposed development would result in the construction of 3 extensions to Newby House. The extensions do not reflect the form, detailed design, or material of the existing property. The proposed development would result in a property with a confused form featuring insensitive and inappropriate alterations which detract from its character. When viewed from the principal elevation, the lean-to would appear out of keeping with the host property by virtue of their roof form, materials and design. When viewed from the rear, the proposed rear extension would extend beyond the northern elevation of the property, which would appear unresolved and inappropriate, and result in a confused massing to the wider property.
46. On this basis, the proposed development is considered contrary to policies DMC3, and DMC7. It would result in alterations to the property which do not respond to the form, mass, or orientation of the existing building. Additionally, the materials, details and finishes would not complement the style of the host property. As such, it is considered that the proposed development would detract from the character and appearance of the property, and also dominate the property through alterations which drastically contrast the original style, form, and design.
47. The proposed garage and ancillary living accommodation are considered appropriate and complies with policy DMC8.

Amenity

48. The development site is set on a large plot with a front and rear garden. As such, the extension, garage, or alterations to the fenestration would not have an impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties by way of loss of privacy or overbearing.

Other matters

49. The proposed garage would ensure that appropriate carparking spaces can be provided to the property, in line with policies DMT3 and DMT8 and Appendix 9 of the Development Management Policies Plan.
50. The proposed ground source heat pump is only shown indicatively on plans. If approved, a condition requiring full details of the system to be submitted and approved in writing by the National Park Authority shall be applied. A condition would also be applied stating that prior to completion of the extension and garage, the ground source heat pump shall be in operation.

Conclusion

51. It is considered that the proposed design alterations to the approved scheme would harm the character and appearance of Newby House. Whilst these alterations are acceptable in principle, it is considered that the proposed siting of the rear extension would result in the property having a confused form and massing. The proposed roof structure of all the extensions would contrast that of the wider property, whilst the detailed design would result in heavily glazed alterations which do not respond to the largely solid character of Newby House. As a result, the proposed plans are considered contrary to policies DMC3, DMC7, and adopted design guidance.

Human Rights

52. Any human rights issues have been considered and addressed in the preparation of this report.
53. List of Background Papers (not previously published)
54. Nil

Report author: Will Eyre, North Area Planner