

10. 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. The application was previously deferred by Members in June 2022 to allow for the Applicant and Officers to work together to find an improved design solution to reduce the impact of extension on the host building, and for the Applicant to provide a sufficient Heritage Statement which to allow a full assessment of impacts upon the building's heritage significance.
3. Considerable time has passed since the application was deferred. The applicant has recently provided a revised Heritage Statement and amended plans. Officers consider the Heritage Statement to be satisfactory and proportionate to the application.
4. However, the amended proposal still fails to address previous Officer concerns over scale and design and the impact of the two-storey extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the valued characteristics of the Conservation Area.
5. As a result, the application is recommended to members for refusal.

Site and Surroundings

6. The Orchards is a traditional detached farmhouse dating from at least the 19th century, sited within a fairly large plot on the eastern edge of the village and within the Conservation Area.
7. 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

8. 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 within which it is sited contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP3 and L3, Development Management policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC8, and DMH7, advice within the Authority's Design Guide and Alterations and Extensions SPD. The harm identified would not be outweighed by public benefits and therefore the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.**

Key Issues

9. 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

10. 1989 - NP/WED/389/129 - Extension to dwelling – Granted.

Consultations

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

Representations

13. One letter of representation has been received from the occupant of Orchard Farm to the North. The representation makes general comments which are summarised below:
 - a) Requests modifications to make the proposal less visually intrusive and more sympathetic to the local built environment.
 - b) A single storey extension would be less intrusive including those that use the public footpath which runs along the boundary.
 - c) Alternatively could an extension be built away from the boundary and on lower ground.
 - d) Would it be possible for the windows on the north side to be deleted as occupants of Orchard Farm overlook and may be able to see inside.
 - e) Query if it is possible to improve parking provisions.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

14. 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.
15. Paragraph 139 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.
16. In particular Para: 182 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.
17. Paragraph 203 in particular states, that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be considered 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.

18. 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.
19. 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

20. 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.
21. 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.
22. 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.
23. DS1 - *Development Strategy*. Supports extensions and alterations to dwellinghouse in principle, subject to a satisfactory scale, design and external appearance.
24. 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

25. 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.
26. 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.
27. 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.

28. 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.
29. 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.
30. 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

31. 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.
32. Policy DMH7 in particular 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

33. 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.
34. In this case, there has been no reduction in the size and massing of the proposed extension, it still remains a two-storey extension. In justification, the agent has stated in their submitted Design Statement that, '*The height of the extension has not been lowered because retaining the original height is necessary to facilitate access from the existing stable into the proposed extension*'.
35. All other alterations to the originally submitted proposal are design grounded, these include:
36. On the west gable elevation, a set of French windows has been replaced with a traditional stable door opening, and a ground floor window, both these elements are considered an improvement as they better reflect the traditional character and appearance of the host dwelling. In addition, a first-floor window has been reduced in size and now appears more in keeping with the property.

37. To the front of the main dwelling, there is a large uncharacteristic porch extension, this would be removed revealing the traditional front door of the house, which is welcomed.
38. Further change has occurred on the rear elevation which backs on to a public grassed footpath and faces Orchard Farm to the north. Two additional windows are proposed at first floor level to the proposed extension and a further window in the existing gable.
39. The scale of the extension in proportion to the existing dwelling and the arrangement by extending beyond the architectural front of the dwelling, (which is seldom considered appropriate or acceptable in design terms) is still large and therefore still considered unacceptable in size and massing in relation to the host property. Furthermore, the extension would be off the former stable and would result in the loss of the fenestration to this element and a significant loss of character.
40. 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 and results in a significant harmful change to the linear form of the parent building.
41. 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.
42. 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 would also harm its heritage significance in doing so.
43. 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.
44. 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 therefore contrary to policy DMC8.

Potential amenity issues

45. Outlook, amenity, privacy and daylight are fundamental considerations when altering or extending a property.
46. 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.
47. The nearest neighbouring properties are Orchard Farm sited approximately 35m to the North and Trevarnley, around 50m to the west of the new development.
48. The development would include facing windows to this property which would overlook part of the extended garden area of Orchard Farm and look towards that residential property and its more private garden areas. The new window to the bathroom would be obscurely glazed, however, the additional bedroom windows would overlook this neighbouring property and cause a loss of privacy.

49. These windows have been added to the scheme and are secondary windows to each bedroom. The need for safe egress during fire is understood however, this could potentially be provided by the windows to the south elevation. If permission were granted planning conditions would be recommended to ensure that the new window to the bath room is obscurely glazed and the two bedroom windows be omitted for the reasons set out above.
50. Subject to the above the proposal would be in accordance with Policies GSP3 & DMC3 in respect of the impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Highway matters

51. 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.
52. 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

53. 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.
54. The extension would be built using a modern insulated cavity wall construction, and constructed in an air tight manner. The ground floor and roof would be highly insulated reducing heat loss. The existing double-glazed windows would be replaced with modern gas filled double glazed windows to provide better thermal insulation. Low energy light fittings and A rated appliances would be installed to reduce energy consumption. All construction materials and finishes would be locally sourced and reusing materials such as stone and roof tiles where possible
55. 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

56. 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.
57. 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.
58. Consequently, the proposal is recommended to members for refusal.

Human Rights

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

60. List of Background Papers (not previously published)

61. Nil

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