

9. HOUSEHOLD APPLICATION – ALTERATIONS AND EXTENSIONS TO WYNFIELD, HOLME LANE, BAKEWELL (NP/DDD/0823/0901, LB)

APPLICANT: Mr Jeff Cooper

Summary

1. The application seeks planning permission for alterations and extension to the dwellinghouse of Wynfield, Holme Lane, Bakewell. These comprise alterations to the roof, a single storey extension, and a garden room replacing the existing conservatory.
2. Planning policy supports alterations and extensions to dwellings in the National Park provided they are of a suitable design, scale, form and massing and would not harm the character, appearance or amenities of the host property or the amenities of neighbouring properties.
3. In this case, by virtue of scale, design and massing, the alterations to the roof and proposed extensions fail to harmonise with or adequately respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the immediate surrounding Conservation Area and street scene. Consequently, the application is recommended for refusal.

Site and Surroundings

4. Wynfield is a semi-detached bungalow located on Holme Lane in Bakewell, within the designated Conservation Area and within Flood Risk Zone (2 & 3). The single storey dwelling is primarily constructed from natural limestone with ashlar detailing and lies under a mixture of pitched and hipped roofs with clay tiles. A conservatory is attached to the rear of the dwelling.
5. The nearest neighbouring property is the attached, Rosslyn.
6. A grade II listed field barn is located approximately 12 metres from the curtilage of the dwelling to the east. Two grade II listed dwellings are located 30 metres to the north on the opposite side of the highway.
7. A public footpath is located 180 metres to the east.

Proposal

8. Planning permission is being sought for alterations to the roof and kitchen, a single storey extension to the east and a garden room at the rear.
9. The roof alterations will comprise of the existing hipped roof arrangements replaced with a gabled roof to create a bedroom, landing and stairs area within the roof space and alterations to the existing kitchen.
10. A single storey extension is proposed on the east of the dwelling to provide a gun room and utility.
11. The conservatory at the rear will be replaced with a garden room.
12. The footprint of the building would increase due to the amendments to the kitchen and the addition of the single storey extension. The roof would change from a hipped to pitched roofs with an increase in height.
13. Materials and detailing would match the existing.

RECOMMENDATION:

14. That the application is REFUSED for the following reason:

By virtue of its scale, form, massing and design, the proposed roof alteration fails to harmonise with or adequately respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. It would also result in harm to the character of the Bakewell Conservation Area. The proposal therefore is contrary to Core Strategy Policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3 and DS1 and Development Management Policies DMC3, DMC8 and DMH7.

Key Issues

15. Design and scale, location, landscape impact and amenity issues.

History

16. NP/DDD/0810/0833 – Conservatory, approved subject to condition.

17. NP/NMA/1110/1140 – Conservatory, amendments split decision.

18. NP/DDD/0211/0128 – Change of use of land from agricultural to domestic, granted conditionally.

19. NP/DDD/0623/0626 – Alterations and extensions, withdrawn prior to determination.

Consultations

20. Highway Authority – No objections to the proposal, on the basis that a minimum of 3 no off-street parking spaces will be retained.

21. Bakewell Town Council – No objection to the proposal subject to the provision of onsite parking.

22. Environment Agency – No formal comment as though the development falls within flood zone 3 the development is minor therefore flood risk standing advice needs to be followed.

Representations

23. Five letters of support have been received. One letter states the proposal is supported 'based on the planning gain that it offers'. No material planning considerations are referenced in the other letters.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

24. 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.

25. 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, considering any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.

26. In particular Para: 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.
27. 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.
28. 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.
29. 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

30. 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.
31. 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.
32. DS1 – *Development Strategy & L1 - Landscape character and valued characteristics*. Supports agricultural development in the open countryside, provided that development respects, conserves and enhances the valued characteristics of the site paying particular attention to impact upon the character and setting of buildings and siting, landscaping and building materials.
33. 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

34. 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.

35. DMC8 - Conservation Areas. States, that applications for development in a Conservation Area, or for development that affects its 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.
36. 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 97m².
37. 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

38. 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

39. Generally, there are no objections to extending a dwelling subject to 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.
40. 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 & Materials

Alterations to roof and north elevation

41. Wynfield is the first residential property on Holme Lane when approaching from the east, clearly visible in its immediate and wider setting from the highway.
42. The attractive, well-proportioned dwelling is well balanced and sits comfortably alongside the attached neighbouring single storey property, making a positive contribution to the appearance of the locality and Conservation Area.

43. The roofscape is a series of predominantly hipped roofs, with rear-facing gable ends under dual pitched roofs to part of the rear of the property. The overall arrangement serves to break up the massing of the roof. When viewed from the north elevation, the result of this and the staggered building line is the appearance of a building of multiple elements of modest size, that relate well to each other and that are individually and collectively unimposing in the street scene.
44. Submitted plans show a 4th bedroom is to be created within the roof space, alongside a landing area and staircase for access.
45. To accommodate this, the existing front wall (currently serving the kitchen) would be pulled north to run flush with the rest of the existing building line on the north elevation, and extended upwards as a front-facing gable.
46. The dual pitched roof that would be created would span over the ground floor bathroom, stairs, kitchen, and bedroom 1. Whilst not projecting forward of the overall building line, it would have the appearance of a wide front-facing gable.
47. This would serve to dominate the front elevation of the building and would relate poorly to its existing character by virtue of projecting above the main perpendicular ridge line of the property and through the introduction of a gabled roof in views otherwise comprising entirely hipped roof detailing.
48. The width of the gable would dwarf the width of the property and would be wholly out of proportion with it, and as such the extension fails to respect the dominance of the parent building as advocated by adopted design guidance.
49. Cumulatively, these impacts represent a significant and harmful change to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the relationship to the attached neighbouring property. In effect the current balance and harmony the property enjoys would be lost, impacting adversely upon its character.
50. Further, the development is located within the 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, due to its clear visibility from the adjacent footpath and highway that pass the site.
51. Therefore, the proposed roof alterations and changes to the north elevation are contrary to Development Management Policies DMC3, DMH7 and DMC8, and adopted design guidance.

Extension on east elevation

52. The application also proposes a single storey extension off the east elevation for a utility and gunroom.
53. The extension would project over an existing area of hardstanding, past the garden, towards the adjacent allotment.
54. The footprint is of a simple rectangular form, of modest size and scale; subsidiary in comparison to the existing floor plan of the dwelling.
55. The proposed materials, fenestration and door details raise no objection, reflecting those of the parent building.

56. The eaves are set just below that of the existing, whilst the ridge height is set considerably lower than that of the proposed ridge height of the roof over the main part of the dwelling.

57. Taken on its own, the extension is considered to be in accordance with adopted policy.

Garden Room rear extension

58. It is also proposed to replace the conservatory to the rear of the dwelling with an extension on the same footprint.

59. The extension would be built from stone under a blue slate roof to match the existing. The roof pitch and eaves are set at a similar height to the existing conservatory, which raises no objection in its own right. However, like the proposed extension on the east, the difference in height between the ridge height of the garden room and the proposed roof over the dwelling is very pronounced, increasing the awkward relationship between this area of increased height and the rest of the dwelling.

60. The gabled roof does not raise the same concerns as that to the front of the dwelling, replacing as it would an existing gabled structure, being positioned away from the principal elevation, and being much more modest in size.

61. The elevations would have a more solid appearance than the conservatory, and would result in the the structure being less prominent within its wider setting during hours of darkness, as light from the conservatory can be seen currently be seen in wider view public views. Therefore, the proposal offers some modest improvement to the appearance of the wider locality.

62. In its own right, the size, scale, massing, form and location of the garden room are in accordance with policies DMC3 and DMH7, raising no objection.

Potential amenity issues

63. Outlook, amenity, privacy and daylight are fundamental considerations when altering or extending a property.

64. Due to the location and position of the extension, garden room, window openings, rooflights in the proposed roof and intervening distance from the attached neighbouring property, the proposal will not result in any amenity issues.

Highway matters.

65. The Highway Authority have raised no objection to the proposals subject to the retention of three off street parking spaces.

66. The hardstanding area to the front of the dwelling has sufficient space for the parking of three vehicles. This area will not be affected by the proposed development.

67. Therefore, the proposed development is acceptable in highway safety terms, accordingly with policy DMC3, in these respects.

Environmental Management and Sustainability

68. An environmental management plan has been submitted within the design and access statement. Given the scope of development proposed the measures put forward are considered to comply with policy CC1.

Conclusion

69. When taken as a whole, by virtue of the proposed alterations and extensions to the front of the dwelling, the development fails to conserve or enhance the dwelling and would result in harm to the character and appearance of the building and would be harmful to the Bakewell Conservation Area and to the special qualities of this part of the National Park. The application is contrary to policies GSP1, GSP3, DS1, DMC3, DMH7 and DMC8. The Application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Human Rights

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

71. List of Background Papers (not previously published) Nil

72. Report Author: Laura Buckley, Assistant Planner, South Area Planning Team.