

## **14. FULL APPLICATION – PROPOSED ERECTION OF A SINGLE GARAGE AND STORE AT 15 EYAM WOODLANDS, GRINDLEFORD (NP/DDD/0224/0208, WE)**

**APPLICANT: MR WILLIAM WATSON**

### **Summary**

1. This application seeks permission for the construction of a garage and store which would be located in front of the host property. It is a resubmission of a previous application (NP/DDD/0523/0496) which was refused through delegated powers in August 2023.
2. The garage/store would be built into the existing sloping garden in front of the property and project into the existing parking area. It would be constructed from natural gritstone, coursed and faced to match the dwelling. It would feature a green-roof, and a vertically boarded garage door with lintel stone above.
3. The garage would have a hexagonal, flat-roofed form.
4. It is considered that by virtue of the proposed garage's form, scale and height it would appear incongruous in its setting and have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the property, in addition to the street-scene. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

### **Site and Surroundings**

5. The application site relates to 15 Eyam Woodlands, a semi-detached property located on Main Road in Grindleford. The house is built out of squared stone rubble. The property features a single storey lean-to timber structure to the side (north) elevation.
6. The property stands at an elevated position, approximately 15m back from the road behind an area of hardstanding, retained by a stone wall (approximately 1m in height) which holds back a raised terrace. The application site is separated from the back edge of highway by a stone-built boundary which reaches approximately 800mm in height. The application site shares vehicular access with the neighbouring property, 16 Eyam Woodlands, which adjoins to the south.
7. The properties on the eastern side of Main Road are set back 12m from the highway, while Goatscliff Cottages, the run of terraced cottages opposite the development site, front directly onto the highway with small walled yard in front of them. This presents a contrast between the open character of the eastern side of the road with the more enclosed, historic eastern.

### **Proposal**

8. This application seeks consent for a garage/store on the land directly in front of the dwellinghouse. It would feature a hexagonal form, with approximately half the structure integrated into the sloping terrace in front of the property, with the front half extending onto the parking area.
9. The structure would be flat-roofed and feature a green roof. The structure would measure 8m in width and 2.95m in height. It would be faced in natural gritstone, coursed to match the host dwelling.
10. The garage door would be vertically boarded and be located on the face which is diagonal to the host house.

11. The submitted plans show that there would be planting northern and eastern section of the building.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

1. **The design, siting and scale of the proposed garage would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the property and the street-scene contrary to polices Core Strategy policy GSP3, Development Management policies DMC3 and DMH8 and the adopted Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document.**

### **Key Issues**

- Principle of development
- Design
- Amenity and Highway safety

### **History**

12. 2021 – NP/DDD/0721/0732 - Proposed extension of dwelling granted conditionally.
13. 2023 – NP/DDD/0523/0496 - Erection of a single garage and store. Refused on design and amenity grounds.

### **Consultations**

14. Derbyshire County Council Highway Authority – No highway objection.

*“I note the Local Highway Authority (LHA) response to refused application NP/DDD/0523/0496 was as follows: The proposal seeks the construction of a single garage / store, located on an existing area of hardstanding off Main Road (B6521). The existing area of hardstanding appears to accommodate the off-street parking of 2no vehicles. The proposed garage is of adequate dimensions for the parking of a single vehicle, and a parking space will be retained adjacent to the garage, therefore, the level of off-street parking will be un-altered. In view of the above, the Highway Authority has no objections to the proposal, however, as the retained parking space is bound on either side by the garage / boundary wall it is recommended the width of the parking space is increased to a minimum of 3.0m to ensure car doors can be opened free of obstruction.*

*The submitted Planning Statement has responded with the following:*

*'Furthermore, according to the Highways Authority, the parking bay that is set to be provided between the southeast elevation of the garage and the boundary wall (located at the back edge of the highway) is not of sufficient width to ensure car doors can be opened without obstruction. In the event the space was widened in accordance with the Highway Authority's recommendations (to 3m), there would result a knock-on impact on the position of the garage and the positioning of the garage doors, such that said doors and the opening would have to sit tight to the existing retaining wall making the prospect of manoeuvring [sic] into and out of the garage even more difficult.'*

*Therefore, as the previous LHA response was just a request and not recommended as a Condition and the refused Decision Notice (NP/DDD/0523/0496) makes no reference to this request, I can confirm that there are no highway objections to the above planning application.”*

15. Grindleford Parish Council – Support.

*“After sharing/further study of the online application and plans, there was a general discussion around what would be considered acceptable in this instance. With advice from Councillors as to PPP Guidance on suitable outbuildings, it was felt this particular proposal had worked within the bounds of the Detailed Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document for Alterations and Extensions. Given the property owners considerable efforts to add environmental innovation to the property, the 'new' garage proposal, in light of the previous refusal, would appear to answer those concerns. We were able to access this image (below). This assisted greatly with our majority vote in favour. We felt the sightlines were acceptable, given the elevated position of the main house, the imaginative hexagonal design would minimise visual impact and maximise storage, and the use of sympathetic materials (gritstone) and careful planting to soften impact. In short, we approved the proposed development, as the proposals Planning Statement Conclusion asserts, it; 'meets the objectives of the NPPF and the three dimensions of sustainable development. The design of the building will minimise the impact on the setting of the site and will ensure that the development does not have an unacceptable impact on the host building or the wider street scene.’”*

### **Representations**

16. No representations have been received to date.

### **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

17. 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.

18. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been revised (2023). 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 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.

19. 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.

### **Relevant 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. DS1 - *Development Strategy*. Sets out that most new development will be directed into named settlements. Taddington is a named settlement.
23. Policy CC1 states that development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources.

#### Development Management Policies

24. DMC3 – *Design*. 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.
25. DMH8 – *New outbuildings and alterations and extensions to existing outbuildings in the curtilage of dwelling houses*. Deals with outbuildings in the curtilage of a dwelling house. It states that the erection of new outbuildings will be permitted provided the scale, mass, form, and design of the new building conserves or enhances the immediate dwelling and curtilage, any valued characteristics of the adjacent built environment and/or the landscape, including Listed Building status and setting, Conservation Area character, important open space, valued landscape character.

#### Supplementary Guidance

26. The Alterations and Extensions Detailed Design Guide SPD (2015) (the "SPD") provides guidance on designing new garages at paragraphs 3.24-3.27 stating that often the best approach is to design the garage as a separate building, possibly using a traditional outbuilding as a starting point. The SPD continues, at paragraph 3.27, that an appropriate alternative is a 'non-building' approach where the garage is located underground or concealed behind high walls. This is one of the few situations where a flat roofed solution is more appropriate.

#### **Assessment**

##### Principle of Development

27. The principle of erecting an outbuilding in the location proposed is considered to be acceptable in accordance with the provisions of Policy DMH8. It outlines that new outbuildings will be permitted provided the scale, mass, form, and design of the new building conserves or enhances the immediate dwelling and curtilage.

##### Design

28. 15 Eyam Woodlands is a semi-detached property constructed from coursed gritstone. Its principle elevation is atypical in form, featuring a broadly horizontal frontage with a catslide roof on the northern extent of the building. Immediately in front of the property is a raised garden comprised in two terraces with drystone retaining walls. Policy DMH8 outlines that new outbuildings should be of an appropriate scale, mass, form and design which conserves the immediate dwelling and curtilage. The adopted Alterations and

Extensions SPD advises that garages should be designed in sympathy with the property they serve, with materials and roof pitches reflecting those of the house.

29. The proposed form of the garage is considered to be at odds with the host property and the wider locality. The properties fronting onto Main Road typically feature a form wherein the principal elevations front directly onto the highway. The unusual hexagonal form of the garage would be visible from the highway, with the angles of the proposal contrasting the largely rectangular and solid form associated with the Peak District vernacular.
30. In addition to its irregular form, the structure would also feature a flat-roof. It is acknowledged that this would decrease the overall scale of the structure; however, it is considered that the flat-roof, coupled with the form of the structure, would result in the garage having a bulky and squat appearance when viewed from the street-scene as a result of its fairly large footprint and relatively low height.
31. At present, the property features a raised front garden which is split into two levels with drystone retaining walls. This application seeks to build the garage approximately 3.6m into the front garden with the other half of the garage projecting from the raised garden and the lower retaining wall. The green roof of the garage would sit just above the floor-level of the ground floor of the property. The rationale of the design is understood and acknowledged; it seeks to incorporate the structure into the existing retaining wall to try and assimilate it into hard landscaping of the property.
32. Officers consider that the proposed design would not achieve this. The green roof would go above the height of the top raised garden, and extend eastward some 3.6m from the lower wall. The proposed garage would not sit comfortably on the site, and would be a visible extension of the property's built-form directly in front (albeit below) the property's principal elevation.
33. It is therefore considered that the proposed development fails to conserve the character and appearance of 15 Eyam Woodland and the wider street-scene. The squat and irregular form of the garage would be at odds with the largely traditional form found in this section of Grindleford, and the projection of the garage from the raised garden would introduce additional built-form in front of the property's principal elevation which would have a poor visual appearance when viewed from the highway.
34. On this basis, it is considered that the proposed development is contrary to policies DMC3, DMH8 and the guidance contained within the National Park Authority's adopted guidance.

#### Residential Amenity and Highway

35. As noted, 15 Eyam Woodlands is a semi-detached property which shares an access point and parking area with its immediate neighbour. Included within the previous reason for refusal was concern that the proposed garage *would have an adverse effect on the amenities of adjoining residents and their ability to access and park freely within their property.*
36. The garage proposed through this application is smaller than the one proposed through the previous planning application. In addition to this, the form of the garage has been amended which pulls the front of the garage away from the area reserved for parking by 16 Eyam Woodlands, which would result in the garage having a less dominating influence on the parking area.

37. The Highway Authority has been consulted on this application and raised no highway safety concerns. Therefore, the proposed development is considered acceptable on highway safety grounds.
38. The proposed development would extend the built-form of the host property forward into an area previously reserved for carparking. Notwithstanding this, it is considered that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. The garage would be set below the finished floor levels of the adjacent properties, and would therefore have no impact on privacy, light, or other enjoyment of the properties.
39. The submitted plans show that the garage would have a green-roof. There's no indication that the roof would be used as an extension to the garden; however, if this application is approved it is considered that the Authority would have limited powers to restrict its use as such. Should the roof be used a form of garden terrace, this would have an unacceptable impact on the visual appearance of the garage by way of exacerbating its flat-roof style. It would appear as a raised terrace which would be at odds with the uniformity of the properties along Main Road.
40. Notwithstanding this, it is acknowledged that the development site is currently a front garden, and the proposed siting of the garage would mean that it would not contribute to a loss of privacy or have an overbearing impact. On this basis, it would not have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

### **Conclusion**

41. The proposed design of the garage is considered to be at odds with the character and appearance of the host property and the street-scene. The garage would extend the built-form of the property forward from the host property's principal elevation. While it would be set below the frontage of the property, it would still appear incongruous with the relatively uniform frontages found on the eastern side of Main Road in this section of Grindleford.
42. The proposed form and height of the garage would also result in a structure which appears squat and unusually bulky with a flat-roof, which would result in an inappropriate contrast between the proposed garage and the prevailing built-form on Main Road.
43. The proposed development would fail to conserve the character and appearance of 15 Eyam Road. It is therefore considered to be contrary to policies DMC3, DMH8, and adopted design guidance. In the absence of any further material considerations the application is recommended for refusal.

### **Human Rights**

44. Any human rights issues have been considered and addressed in the preparation of this report.
45. List of Background Papers (not previously published)  
  
Nil
46. Report author: Will Eyre, North Area Senior Planner