

8. FULL APPLICATION – REAR/SIDE EXTENSION AND INTERNAL ALTERATIONS. NEW GLASSHOUSE AT OLD HALL, CREAMERY LANE, PARWICH (NP/DDD/0125/0057, LB)

APPLICANT: HARVEY

Summary

1. The application site comprises of a Grade II listed dwelling located in the village of Parwich, north of Tissington.
2. Planning permission is sought for an extension, external boiler and new glasshouse.
3. The application fails to adequately establish the significance of the Listed Building or the effect of the proposals on upon its significance, those of its setting, or of the Conservation Area. This is contrary to policy DMC5 and paragraph 207 of the NPPF.
4. The lack of heritage assessment means it is not possible to conclude that the development could conserve the significance of the listed building or conservation area, contrary to policies L3, DMC5 and DMC7.
5. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Site and Surroundings

6. Old Hall is a Grade II listed building located within the northern area of Parwich and its Conservation Area.
7. The three-storey dwelling, dates mid-17th century, (but was restored in 1925 when the stairwell extension was added), comprises of coursed rubble limestone with sandstone dressings under a plain and fish scale tiled roof with stone coped gabled, moulded kneelers and ball finials.
8. The dwelling sits within a large curtilage in an elevated position overlooking Parwich. A glasshouse is located to the north east within the curtilage and outbuildings located immediately to the north. Creamery Lane, and access, bounds the curtilage to the south west.
9. The nearest neighbouring property is Barn Cottage located 20 metres to the north.

Proposal

10. Planning permission is sought for a side extension, an external boiler and new glasshouse.
11. Plans propose a single storey extension under a stone parapet flat roof with glazed lantern, located on the north east corner of dwelling. The extension would measure 5 metres x 3.7 meters, by 1.6 metres in height and would provide a kitchen, relocated from within the dwelling. Double glazed doors are proposed in the eastern elevation and two single windows in the north elevation.
12. A replacement boiler is proposed on the east elevation adjacent to the existing single storey projection.
13. Plans also propose a glass house located within the north eastern corner of the site. The glass house would measure 3.5 meters x 1.7 meters, 1.2 metres to eaves and 2.1 metres to ridge. The structure would sit on a plinth. Elevations would comprise of slim vertical glazing panels which would be reflected within the roof structure. A decorative pitch is proposed with finial on the apex of each gable elevation.

14. Internally, alterations are proposed to amend the ground floor layout, relocating the dining room and kitchen. However, these works do not comprise development requiring planning permission because they are internal. They do however require listed building consent; a listed building application was submitted in parallel to this planning application but has been withdrawn prior to its determination.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reason:

- 1. The application fails to provide adequate heritage assessment to allow an understanding of the significance of the listed building to be reached, or for the impacts of the development on the significance, architectural or historic interest of the listed building or conservation area to be understood, contrary to Development Management policies DMC5 and DMC7 and the NPPF.**
- 2. The application fails to demonstrate that the development would conserve the significance of the listed building and conservation area, or that arising harm would be outweighed by public benefits, contrary to policies Core Strategy policy L3, Development Management policies DMC5 and DMC7, DMC8, and the NPPF.**
- 3. The proposals would require and facilitate internal alterations to the building which would require listed building consent. No such consent has been granted at this time. Approval of the application could be deemed prejudicial to the consideration of any future listed building consent application. It would also not be appropriate to grant a planning permission that would not be capable of implementation.**

Key Issues

15. The impact of the proposed works upon the significance of the Grade II listed building, its setting and wider Conservation Area.

Relevant Planning History

16. 2025 – NP/DDD/0125/0058 – Listed Building consent – rear / side extension and internal alterations. New Glasshouse. Application withdrawn based on officer advice that insufficient heritage information was submitted to fully assess the proposals.
17. 2023 – NP/DDD/0723/0831 – Listed Building consent - replacement rear / side extension, 1925 stairwell extension, internal alterations and standalone garden room. Application withdrawn as officers advised insufficient information to fully assess the proposal as a detailed heritage statement is required.
18. 2023 – NP/DDD/0723/0829 – Planning permission – replacement rear / side extension, 1952 stairwell extension, internal alterations and standalone garden room. Application withdrawn as officers advised insufficient information to fully assess the proposals as a detailed heritage statement is required.

Consultations

19. Parwich Parish Council – *‘Supports this application. The sympathetic treatment of the historic fabric of the building was appreciated’.*
20. Derbyshire County Council Highways: No objection as there appears to be no material impact on the public highway.

21. Derbyshire Dales District Council: No response to date
22. PDNPA Archaeology: No archaeological comments
23. PDNPA Conservation Officer – Object to the application on grounds of insufficient information to assess impact of proposal.

They note that the application provides only a half-page summary of the background and significance of the building, largely restating the contents of the list description. They also note that the document makes almost no mention of the Conservation Area, or what impact the development would have upon it.

As the proposed extension would both obscure a large part of one elevation, and result in the removal of wall, they advise that the heritage statement should, as a minimum, assess the age of the fabric removed and set out the contribution this makes towards the significance of the building and conservation area, and the impact of the development upon it in order to accord with policies DMC5 and DMC7.

Because this information has not been provided they advise that there is insufficient information to assess the impact of the proposals, noting that advice on what is required to allow the application to be adequately assessed has previously been provided to the applicant.

Representations

24. During the course of the Application the Authority has not received any letters of representation.

Main Policies

25. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP3, L3, CC1
26. Relevant Development Management policies: DMC3, DMC5, DMC7, DMC8, DMH7

National Planning Policy Framework

27. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material consideration. Development plan policies relevant to this application are up-to-date and in accordance with the NPPF and therefore should be given full weight in the determination of this application.
28. Paragraph 189 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.
29. Paragraph 207 states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. It notes that the level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. It advises that as a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary.

30. Paragraph 208 states that local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
31. Paragraph 212 states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, 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.
32. Paragraph 213 states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of Grade II listed buildings should be exceptional.
33. Paragraph 214 states that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm (or total loss of significance of) a heritage asset consent should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or that all of the following apply:
 - a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
 - b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
 - c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
 - d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.
34. Paragraph 215 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

Peak District National Park Core Strategy

35. Policy L3 states that development must conserve and enhance cultural heritage assets.

Development Management Policies

36. DMC3 covers siting, design, layout and landscaping. Sets out 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. DMH7 notes extensions and alterations to dwellings will be permitted provided the proposal does not detract from the character, appearance or amenity of the original building, its setting or dominate the original building. Any addition must not create an adverse effect on, or lead to undesirable changes to the landscape or any other valued characteristic.
38. Policy DMC5 provides detailed criteria relevant for 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 applications.

39. Policy DMC7 provides detailed criteria relating to proposals affected listed buildings and states that;
- a. Planning applications for development affecting a Listed Building and/or its setting should be determined in accordance with policy DMC5 and clearly demonstrate:
 - (i) how their significance will be preserved;
 - (ii) why the proposed development and related works are desirable or necessary.
 - b. Development will not be permitted if applicants fail to provide adequate or accurate detailed information to show the effect on the significance and architectural and historic interest of the Listed Building and its setting and any curtilage listed features.
 - c. Development will not be permitted if it would:
 - (i) adversely affect the character, scale, proportion, design, detailing of, or materials used in the Listed Building; or
 - (ii) result in the loss of or irreversible change to original features or other features of importance or interest.
 - d. In particular, development will not be permitted if it would directly, indirectly or cumulatively lead to (amongst other things):
 - (i) removal of original walls, stairs, or entrances or subdivision of large interior spaces
 - (ii) removal, alteration or unnecessary replacement of structural elements including walls, roof structures, beams and floors.
40. DMC8 states that development within a Conservation Area, should assess and clearly demonstrate how the character or appearance and significance of the Conservation will be preserved.

Assessment

Principle

41. In principle extensions and alterations to dwellings are supported within the National Park. Policy DMH7 states extensions will be permitted provided the original proposal does not detract from the character, appearance or amenity of the original building, its setting or dominate the original building. DMC3 also states that siting, design, layout and landscaping is also key and should be appropriate to the context.
42. DMH8 also supports new outbuildings within the curtilage of dwelling houses provided the scale, mass, form and design of the new outbuilding conserves or enhances immediate dwelling and curtilage and any valued characteristics of the adjacent built environment and landscape, including listed buildings.
43. Therefore, as plans propose a single storey extension to the north west corner of the dwelling to extend the property relocating the kitchen, the principle of the extension is clear and therefore accepted. In addition, the principle of a new glass house within the curtilage of the dwelling house also raises no objection.

The impact of the development upon the significance of the listed building and its setting

44. Old Hall is a Grade II listed building positioned in a large curtilage, and located in a prominent elevated position within the northern area of Parwich and its Conservation Area. The list description dates the house to the mid seventeenth century, but restored in 1925.
45. As noted above, the application proposes a single storey extension, (relocating the kitchen at Old Hall), an external boiler, located against the north east elevation and a glasshouse, to be located within the curtilage, in close proximity to the dwelling.
46. In assessing the proposal relevant policies in the development plan and the NPPF make it clear that the Authority must have special regard to the desirability of conserving the heritage asset, and its setting, as well as the character and appearance of the conservation area.
47. In particular, Development Management Policy DMC7 addresses development affecting listed buildings, advising that applications for such development should be determined in accordance with policy DMC5 and should address how their significance, character and appearance will be conserved, and why the proposed development and related works are desirable or necessary. It makes clear that if applicants fail to provide adequate or accurate detailed information to show the effect of the development on the significance of the heritage asset and its setting, the application will be refused.
48. Part B of DMC7 also states that development will not be permitted if it would directly, indirectly or cumulatively lead to: the removal of original walls; removal, alteration or if the application fails to provide adequate or accurate detailed information to show the effect on the significance of the listed building.
49. DMC5 also requires 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. L3 of the core strategy reiterates this.
50. Further, chapter 16 of the NPPF requires local planning authorities to put great weight on the conservation of designated heritage assets; the greater their significance, the greater the weight.
51. Both the NPPF and the PDNPA's local policies state that if a development were to cause less than substantial harm the application should be refused unless the harm is outweighed by the public benefits arising from the proposals, if any.
52. In this case, the application has been submitted with a Design, Access and Heritage Statement which provides a summary of the background and significance of the dwelling, largely reiterating the contents of the official listing description and makes almost no consideration of the Conservation Area.
53. The single storey extension is proposed to project from the north east elevation of the main dwelling and wrap around onto the recessed north-east elevation of the single storey cat slide projection which houses the staircase. At ground floor the scheme would obscure a substantial amount of the original north east elevation, resulting in the loss of 4 ground floor windows, and require the physical intervention of the removal of a large amount of external wall / fabric, alongside the overlapping of quoins, to allow internal access to be achieved. Externally the proposed flat roof overlaps the sill of a first-floor window and would be further obscured by the lantern roof.

54. The application also proposes the addition of a new external boiler. The application does not provide any detail of the appearance, size and scale of the boiler or if it is to be screened in any way. No explanation for its proposed external positioning is detailed either.
55. The removal of the historic fabric is likely to be harmful to the significance of the building and the position, form, and design of the extension and other proposed works could also potentially impact upon the significance and setting of the building. However, the application provides no information regarding the significance of the building beyond its listed status, of its fabric, of the affected elevation of the building, or of the impact that the development would have on such significance or that of the conservation area.
56. In more general design terms, the flat roofed form of the extension would not reflect or complement the form of the existing building, and the extent of projection would complicate the massing of the building because it would result in a staggered rear elevation across the dwelling.
57. In addition to the extension a free-standing greenhouse is also proposed, within the property's garden. There is an existing greenhouse on the site, which is not shown on the submitted plans. The proposed block plan identifies the location of the proposed greenhouse; however, it is not clear if the proposed greenhouse is intended as a replacement or as an additional greenhouse. The proposed structure may impact the setting of the house and the conservation area, but again no supporting assessment has been submitted.
58. In summary, the heritage statement does not sufficiently assess the significance of the building, or the impacts of the proposed development upon it. Based on what information is available, it is very likely that a degree of harm would arise. The NPPF and policy DMC5 require any harm to a designated heritage asset arising from planning proposals to be weighed against the public benefits of the development. To do so however, it must first be possible to establish the significance of the asset, and the impacts of the development upon it. Without this, a balanced judgement cannot be made. The need for this information was established with the applicant when applications for similar proposals were submitted, and ultimately withdrawn, in 2023.
59. It is therefore particularly regrettable that this information is still missing and that as a result the impact of the proposals on the significance and architectural and historic interest of the Listed Building, its setting, and the Conservation Area cannot be fully established, contrary to the requirement of paragraph 207 of the NPPF, and to those of policies DMC5 and DMC7.
60. Further, the listed building consent application that was originally submitted in parallel with this planning application has been withdrawn prior to its determination. As currently put forward the proposed development would require and facilitate internal alterations to the building which would require listed building consent. No such consent has been granted at this time. It cannot therefore be determined whether any permission granted would be capable of implementation, because an assessment of whether those works could be supported has not yet been carried out, and because they are not yet otherwise authorised or lawful. It would be unreasonable to grant planning permission for a development that may not be capable of being implemented.
61. Additionally, a favourable decision on this planning application could be deemed prejudicial to the consideration of any future listed building consent application; this view was shared by the Inspector dealing with APP/M9496/W/24/3342623 (Scaldersitch Farm, Sheen) when dismissing an Appeal that paralleled this scenario in terms of a planning application preceeding the grant of listed building consent.

62. The lack of listed building consent for works related to the current proposals therefore represents a further reason that the application is recommended for refusal.

Climate change and sustainable building

63. Policy CC1 sets out that in order to build in resilience to and mitigate the cause of climate change all development must work towards climate change.
64. An Environmental Performance and Mitigation statement has been submitted within the Design, Access and Heritage Statement. Details state the proposed extension would be highly insulated significantly improving the thermal performance of the property whilst reducing its carbon footprint. Materials from the existing stone from the demolition will be retained and reused in the extension. All additional materials are proposed to be from local sustainable sources.
65. Given the scale and type of development proposed these measures are considered sufficient to accord with CC1.

Amenity

66. Policy DMC3 and DMH7 states that particular attention will be paid to the amenity, privacy and security of the development of nearby properties.
67. In this case, the nearest neighbouring properties are Barn Cottage, 20 metres to the north and Bluebell Cottage approximately 20 metres to the north east. The site itself is bounded by a high mature dense hedge, and taken together with the sloping nature of the site and the window positioning on the proposals, the location and design of the extension would not result in any adverse impact upon the amenity of any nearby residents.
68. Therefore, in these regards the proposal accords with DMC3 and DMH7.

Highways Safety

69. DMT3 Access and design criteria states 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.
70. The highway authority have concluded the proposal would not result in any material impact on highways grounds and we agree with that assessment.
71. As such, the proposal would not impact on highway safety or amenity, in accordance with DMT3.

Archaeology

72. The Authority's Archaeology officers have reviewed the application and advised the proposal does not result in any archaeological concerns.

Conclusion

73. The submitted heritage statement has not provided the information required to fully assess the significance of the listed building, or the heritage harm that would arise from the development, in conflict with policies DMC5 and DMC7 and the NPPF at section 16.
74. As such, the proposals fail to demonstrate that the development would conserve the significance of the affected heritage assets, or that any harm arising would be outweighed by public benefits, contrary to policies L3, DMC5, DMC7, DMC8, and paragraph 213 of the NPPF.

75. Further, it would be prejudicial for a planning application to be approved prior to listed building consent having been granted for the works requiring this.

76. Subsequently, the application is recommended for refusal.

Human Rights

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

78. Nil

Report Author: Laura Buckley – Assistant Planner – South Area