

## **14. HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION – PROPOSED REAR SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION AT HOLE FARM, ELKSTONES, LONGNOR (NP/SM/0523/0493, PM)**

**APPLICANT: GLENN FELTON**

### **Summary**

1. Hole Farm is a residential property, a former farmstead recorded as a non designated heritage asset.
2. A single storey rear extension is proposed.
3. The design, form and massing of the proposed extension are considered to be confused and complex not in keeping with the vernacular building tradition of simplicity of form.
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 site a non-working farm lying in open countryside in the upland pastures of the South West Peak, approximately 500 metres to the south of Lower Elkstone.
6. The farmhouse and a stone outbuilding on the site are constructed from gritstone under a Staffordshire blue tiled roof, with the doors and windows a mix of timber and Upvc.
7. The property is not listed, however it is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset and is on the Historic Buildings, Sites and Monuments Record (HBSMR) recorded as *“A farmstead that existed by the late 19th Century. It has a linear plan with additional detached buildings.”*
8. The nearest neighbouring properties are Ryecroft Farm 400m to the north-west, Greenside Farm, 380m to the north-east, Crow Trees 600m to the east, and Hill Farm 542m to the southeast.
9. Access is gained along a private track from the main highway. A public right of way passes through the site.

### **Proposal**

10. Planning permission is sought for a single storey rear extension.
11. The extension would have two elements, a flat roofed part extending approximately 4.5 metres from the rear of the existing property and a pitched roof element with rear gable extending approximately 6.75 metres from the rear elevation of the existing property.
12. The proposed extension would be replacing an existing smaller single storey lean-to rear extension.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**The proposed extension, in its design, form and massing would not conserve or enhance the the character, appearance, setting or significance of the non designated heritage asset. As such the proposal conflicts with Development**

## **Plan policies GSP3, DMC3, DMC5 and DMH7.**

### **Key Issues**

13. The key issues for consideration are:

- 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

### **Relevant Planning History**

14. 2023 - NP/SM/1122/1352 – Proposed rear single storey extension - Planning Permission refused.
15. 2016 - NP/SM/0416/0366 - Proposed bedroom extension to rear of property – Planning Permission granted.
16. 1996 - NP/SM/1195/120 - Extension to dwelling – Planning Permission granted.
17. 1989 - NP/SM/0789/123 - Erection of double garage – Planning Permission granted.
18. 1988 - NP/SM/0888/0100 - Alterations and extension to dwelling – Planning Permission granted.

### **Consultations**

19. Parish Council – Supports proposal.
20. Highway Authority – No response to date
21. District Council – No response to date.
22. PDNPA Archaeology – No objection.
23. PDNPA Public Rights of Way – No objection

### **Representations**

24. We have received no letters of representation to date.

### **Main Policies**

25. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L3, and CC1
26. Relevant Development Management policies: DMC3, DMC5, DMH7, DMT3.

### **National Planning Policy Framework**

27. 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. It was last revised and re-published in July 2021. 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.

28. In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and the Development Management Policies document 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. 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.
29. 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.'
30. Section 16 of the revised NPPF sets out guidance for conserving the historic environment.

#### Peak District National Park Core Strategy

31. DS1 – *Development Strategy* sets out the Development Strategy for the National Park and supports development of small-scale retail and business premises, in Bakewell, in principle, so long as the designs comply with the National Park Core Strategies and Design Management Policies.
32. GSP1 and 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.
33. 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.
34. 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.
35. 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.

#### Development Management Policies

36. DMC3 – *Siting, Design, layout and landscaping* states 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.
37. 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.

38. DMH7 - *Extensions and alterations*. States that extensions and alterations to dwellings will be permitted provided that the proposal does not detract from the character, appearance or amenity of the original building, its setting or neighbouring buildings.
39. 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.

#### Supplementary planning documents (SPD) and other material considerations

40. The Authority's Design Guide and Detailed Design Supplementary Planning Document for Alterations and Extensions are material considerations in the determination of this application.

#### **Assessment**

##### Principle of Development

41. Policies DS1 and DMH7 support the principle of extensions to existing residential buildings in all settlements and in countryside outside of the Natural Zone.

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

42. The proposed extension introduces a complexity of form to the rear elevation of the existing property. The result is a rear elevation of confused and complex design. This is not reflective of the local vernacular building tradition of simplicity of form.
43. There is an existing two storey rear extension on the property with rear facing gable. The gabled element of the proposed rear extension would not relate well to the existing rear gable with an awkward difference in eaves and ridge height. The proposed extension is single storey but the eaves and ridge height are almost as high as the eaves and ridge height of the existing two storey rear extension. This element of the extension therefore is not read as a single storey element, further complicating the interpretation of the building.
44. The proposed flat roofed element of the extension does not relate well to the gabled element, each being a radically different design and with differing eaves heights.
45. As a whole the rear elevation of the property as proposed would have three rear projecting elements each with a different eaves and ridge height. There would be no coherence in design or simplicity of form.
46. Additionally, the proposed flat roofed element is not a traditional design approach and has a poor solid / void ratio with considerable amounts of glazing.
47. The proposed extension would extend project further from the property than both the existing two storey rear extension and the existing single storey extension proposed for demolition. As such the proposal undermines the established linear form of the property, and introduces a discordant and competing element.
48. Overall, the proposed extension, in its design, form, massing and scale would not conserve or enhance the the character, appearance, setting or significance of the non designated heritage asset. As such the proposal conflicts with Development Plan policies GSP3, DMC3, DMC5 and DMH7.
49. The description of the property on the HBSMR refers to the linear plan of the building. However the applicant has provided evidence in the form of a map from 1898 which

identifies the building as being L-shaped in nature at that point in time. It should be noted that the historic mapping available on the Authority's mapping portal and dating from a similar time to the 1898 map also identifies a L-shaped building or group of buildings but this differs in configuration to that shown on the 1898 map supplied by the applicant, throwing previous historic configurations in to some doubt.

50. In any case, it is accepted that historically there most likely was an L-shaped configuration of buildings at the site at some point, although it remains unclear if this was the buildings original layout. There is also no further information available regarding the massing and design of any former historic rear projecting element of the building. It is not known if the rear projecting elements were of equal scale and form to the linear part of the building or whether they were more secondary and subordinate in scale and appearance to the linear part of the building. The fact that they are not extant today gives some weight to the possibility that may have been secondary to the main linear part of the building which survives today; potentially lightweight or more temporary elements.
51. Limited weight has therefore been given any historic L-shaped arrangement of buildings because it is not known what the permanence, scale, massing and design of any former buildings projecting from the rear of the property was, and any efforts at reinstatement would therefore be largely conjectural, as well as remaining at odds with the buildings current form.

#### The impact upon highway safety

52. The Local Highway Authority had not responded at the time of writing the report. However, due to the siting of the proposed extension on the rear elevation of the dwelling, this would not affect the existing driveway and/or the current parking arrangements within the site. Consequently the scheme is acceptable in highway safety terms in accord with policy DMT3 in these respects.

#### The impact upon the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers

53. Due to the isolated setting of the property and the intervening distances of over 380m between the application site and the nearest neighbouring properties, the proposed extension would not have any detrimental effect upon the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

#### Climate Change Mitigation

54. The submitted application outlines proposed measures to enhance environmental performance. It is proposed to:
- construct the extension with walls, floors and roof having a better U-value rating than required by building control regulations.
  - use glazing to give both maximise natural daylight and solar gain.
  - retain, reuse and recycle material, where possible, from the existing extension proposed for demolition.
  - use a highly insulated and air tight construction, significantly improving the thermal performance of the property.
  - use timber from local sustainable sources where possible
  - supply water via an on site borehole.
55. For the scale of development proposed this is considered sufficient to accord with the requirements of policy CC1.

#### Conclusion

56. The proposed extension, in its design, form and massing would not conserve or enhance the the character, appearance, setting or significance of the non designated heritage asset. As such the proposal conflicts with Development Plan policies GSP3, DMC3, DMC5 and DMH7.

57. Accordingly it is recommended that planning permission be refused.

### **Human Rights**

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

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

59. Nil

Report Author: Peter Mansbridge – Planner (South Area).