
FULL PLANNING PERMISSOIN – EXTENSION TO DWELLING AT SWEET BRIAR COTTAGE, CONKSURRY LANE, YULGRAVE (NP/DDD/0825/0825), LB

APPLICANT: MR & MRS SHIMWELL

Summary

1. The application is for a single storey extension to the north elevation of the converted residential barn.
2. The development would not conserve the character or appearance of the barn or its setting.
3. The application is recommended for refusal.

Site and Surroundings

4. Sweet Briar Cottage is a single storey converted barn located within the village of Youlgrave and its Conservation Area. The north elevation of the building forms part of the Conservation Area's boundary.
5. The building was converted after 1999 and is constructed from limestone and gritstone with gritstone quoins under a blue tiled roof, with dark stained timber windows and doors throughout. A yard area and garden over two levels is located immediately to the north and north west.
6. The nearest neighbouring dwelling is Corneia, one of the three dwellings within the converted two storey range of barns located immediately to the south west elevation of Sweet Briar.

Proposal

7. Planning permission is sought for a single storey extension.
8. The extension would be located on the northern elevation of Sweet Brair nearest the western gable end of the building. As the north elevation of Sweet Briar forms part of the boundary to the Conservation Area, the extension itself, would be located outside the Conservation Area.
9. The extension would be single storey under a pitched roof and project from the dwelling by a flat roof glazed link. Full height glazing is also proposed to the north and west elevation. The east elevation under the pitched roof is to remain solid, with matching stonework.
10. It is advised the extension would provide a garden room for required additional living space to accommodate the applicants' children and grandchildren upon visiting.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed extension would by virtue of its form, scale, detailing and use of unsympathetic materials represent an incongruous feature that would lead to a less than substantial harm to the significance of the non-designated Heritage Asset by undermining its historic character and appearance. It is considered that the harm would not be outweighed by any public benefit and that the proposals are contrary to the aims of Policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L3 of the Core Strategy and Policies DMC3, DMC5 and DMH7 of the Development Management Plan.**
- 2. The extension by fundamentally altering the historic character and appearance of the building would consequently undermine the retained, legible character and appearance of the former barn complex and the contribution it makes to the setting and significance of the Youlgrave Conservation Area. It is considered that the harm would not be outweighed by any public benefit and that the proposals are contrary to the aims of Policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3 and L3 of the Core Strategy and Policies DMC5, DMC8 of the Development Management Plan.**

Key Issues

11. Whether the principle of extending the converted building is acceptable,
12. The potential impact of the development on the significance of the character and appearance of the building, its setting, Conservation Area and wider landscape.

Relevant History

13. PDNPA Enquiry 35706 – Report issued 09/12/2019: Proposed small conservatory on rear of property. PDNPA advised the proposed design would be modern in appearance with too much glazing and would result in harm to the character of the dwelling. For this type of traditional building smaller simple lean-to extensions using material to match are more suited, however in this case as this building is single storey, this may not be possible due to limited height.
14. NP/DDD/0212/0200 – Approved 08/05/2012: Replacement front door, approved.
15. DDD01099047 – Approved 22/06/1999: Conversion of barns to four dwellings, Conksbury Lane, Youlgrave. Granted subject to conditions by planning committee. Permitted Development Rights removed by condition for various types of development, including alterations to a dwellinghouse.

Consultations

Highway Authority – no material impact on the public highway, so no comments to make.

Youlgrave Parish Council – *‘Supports this application which is in keeping with extension to surrounding properties.’*

Representations

16. During the consultation period the Authority has received one letter of support stating *‘It can only enhance the property and would blend in well with existing’*.

Main Policies

17. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L3

18. Relevant Local Plan policies: DMC3, DMC5, DMC8, DMH7

National Planning Policy Framework

19. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) replaced a significant proportion of central government planning policy with immediate effect. A revised NPPF was published in December 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 the National Park the development plan comprises the of the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and policies in the Peak District National Park Development Management Policies document 2019. Policies in the Development Plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purpose 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.
20. Paragraph 189 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.
21. Paragraph 212 of the NPPF 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.
22. Paragraph 215 of the NPPF 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 including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
23. Paragraph 216 of the NPPF states that where the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account 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.

Peak District National Park Core Strategy

24. GSP1 & GSP2 – Securing National Park Purposes and sustainable development & Enhancing the National Park. These policies set out the broad strategy for achieving the National Park's objectives, and jointly seek to secure national park legal purposes and duties through the conversion and enhancement of the National Park's landscape and its natural heritage.
25. GSP3 - Development Management Principles. This states that all development must respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings, paying particular attention to, amongst other elements, impact on the character and setting of buildings, scale of the development appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park, design in accordance with the National Park Authority Design Guide and impact on living conditions of communities.

26. DS1 - Development Strategy. This sets out what forms of development are acceptable in principle within the National Park.
27. L3 - Cultural heritage assets of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance: This states that development must conserve and, where appropriate, enhance or reveal the significance of archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic assets and their settings. 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.

Local Plan Development Management Policies

28. DMC3 - Siting, design, layout and landscaping. This states that where development is acceptable in principle, it will be permitted provided that its detailed treatment is of a high standard that respects, protects and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape, including the wildlife and cultural heritage that contribute to the distinctive sense of place.
29. DMC5 – Assessing the impact of development on designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings. This relates to development impact on designated and non-designated heritage assets.
30. DMC8 - Conservation Areas: This states that applications for development in a Conservation Area, or for development that affects its setting or important views into, out of, across or through the area, should assess and clearly demonstrate how the character or appearance and significance of the Conservation Area will be preserved or enhanced.
31. DMH7 – Extension notes alterations and 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.

Supplementary Planning Guidance

32. The PDNPA Design Guide (2007) refers to the principles of good design and designing in harmony with the local building tradition. However, this must only be applied where a development is otherwise justified by other policy criteria.
33. Other Supplementary Planning Guidance of relevance to the consideration of this application includes Building Design Guide (1987), Alterations and Extensions (2014) and Conversion of Historic Buildings (2022).

Assessment

34. In principle extensions and alterations to dwellings are supported within the National Park. Policy DS1 supports domestic extensions in principle whilst 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.
35. Policy DMC3 also states that siting, design, layout and landscaping is also key and should be appropriate for context.
36. The submitted plans propose a single storey extension to Sweet Briar that would project off the western part of the building's north elevation. The intention of the proposal is clear, which in principle is acceptable, as noted in policy DS1 in particular.

37. Sweet Briar is a converted barn, part of a wider range of attractive converted traditional barns located within the northern boundary of the Youlgrave Conservation area off Conksbury Lane. The property is a single storey building with an original linear plan form under a long uninterrupted pitched roof, resulting in a building which has a simple character and appearance.
38. Due to the traditional character and appearance of the set of buildings, they were considered worthy of conversion (under application DDD0199047) with Sweet Briar converted within its existing shell maintaining its original form without any additions or alterations.
39. The building is orientated so the ridge of the roof runs east / west. Immediately to the south west of the western elevation, a large attractive two storey barn has also been converted into residential use and divided into 3 dwellings. Again, this building has a linear form under a simple pitched roof with traditional characteristics.
40. Together, Sweet Briar and the two-storey barn conversion create an 'L' shaped range that once would have formed a traditional farmyard / courtyard area, with the southern elevation of 'Sweet Briar' looking onto this.
41. Subsequently, due to the building's close relationship to each other and as a group, they are considered to have aesthetic value that reflect building tradition, and have a clear visual design, form and historic relationship to one another.
42. Sweet Briar is set back from the highway, Conksbury Lane, but due to the openness of the access and the fact that the vegetation between the building and the highway does not provide an unbroken screen, the eastern gable elevation and part of the northern elevation of Sweet Briar is visible from the public highway. There are also glimpsed views of the adjacent converted two storey barn.
43. Overall, it is considered, that individually, and when viewed as part of the building group, the former farm buildings are considered of local historic and architectural interest and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance to this part of the Youlgrave Conservation Area, its setting and local significance. Given the age of the farm building complex with their clearly articulated architectural detailing and significance, the converted barns including Sweet Briar would be considered non-designated heritage assets in their own right.

Design

44. The submitted plans propose a single storey extension and link, to create a dining area, located within the western area of the north elevation. The extension would project from the dwelling by the flat roofed glazed link.
45. As Sweet Briar is a non-designated heritage asset, policy DMC5 needs to be taken into account when assessing the proposal which requires new development to demonstrate how valued features will be conserved as well as detailing the types and levels of information required to support proposals affecting heritage assets.
46. Further, DMC3 and DMH7 are also key policies as design is required design to a high standard and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape. Extensions and alterations to dwelling should not detract from the character and appearance of the original building, or dominate the original dwelling particularly where it is a non-designated heritage asset, or create an adverse effect on, or lead to undesirable changes to the landscape or any other valued characteristic.

47. It is also noted that in the Authority's Conversion of Historic Buildings SPD it advises '*Schemes should work within the shell of the existing building, avoiding additions or extensions*'.
48. In addition, the Authority's Design Guide (2007) '*states all extensions should harmonise with the parent building*'. Further, it goes on to say '*it may be possible to add a well-designed extension in a modern style provided it is in harmony with the original building and does not diminish its quality or integrity*'.
49. Given the above, the matters for consideration are the potential impact of the proposed development on the significance of the character and appearance of the building, its setting, Conservation Area and wider landscape.
50. The introduction of an extension on the north elevation would result in the loss of the existing simple linear form and rectangular plan of the building; this form is an important part of its distinctive historic, former agricultural character and appearance and its loss would be harmful. The extension would also disrupt the simple, L shape layout of the former farm buildings which is a key characteristic of the setting of the site and its contribution to the Conservation Area.
51. The projection would furthermore appear awkward and contrived with its combination of flat roof and pitch roof when compared with the simple western gable to which it would be adjacent while its sizable depth would ensure it would compete for visual prominence with the existing western gable. The pitch of the extension would be above the eaves of the building and so would dominate the north and west elevation, particularly as there are no other existing additional projections off the existing original linear form.
52. The original approved conversion scheme sought to retain the historic features of the barns and this is strongly reflected by the northern elevation that consists of a broad stone wall with just two narrow window openings. The discordant form of the extension and the extent of the proposed glazing would not be a sympathetic addition to this largely blank elevation but would instead radically alter its appearance and overwhelm its character.
53. The visual harm identified is further exacerbated by the proposed large areas of glazing that would not reflect the existing size or design of the existing openings and would conflict with the high solid to void ratio while the flat roof would also contrast with the pitched roofs covered in slate.
54. Subsequently, the proposed extension of the converted barn would result in undue harm to the character and appearance of the historic linear form of the building and would be deemed poor design that would not protect or enhance the non-designated heritage asset. As such the proposal is contrary to policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L3, DMC3, DMC5 and DMH7.

Siting with the Conservation Area

55. The property is within the Conservation Area, which is a designated heritage asset, and as such policy DMC8 needs to be taken into consideration. DMC8 states that development affecting its setting or important views into, out of, or across or through the area, should be assessed and clearly demonstrate how the character and appearance of the significance of the Conservation Area will be preserved.
56. Sweet Briar itself, and the range of buildings as a whole, is considered to contribute to the character and appearance of the Youlgrave Conservation Area.

57. Due to the proposed location of the extension to the northern elevation of the building, the eastern elevation of the extension would be seen from a public vantage point within the Conservation Area; from the vehicular access on Conksbury Lane and upon approach to the building. The proposal would result in visual intrusion to the immediate setting of the building and the historic farmstead.
58. The introduction of the proposed extension would fundamentally alter the historic character and appearance of the building, which as a result would harm the character and appearance of the retained historic, agricultural character of the former barn complex and the contribution they make to the Conservation Area. As such, the scheme is contrary to policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L3, DMC5 and DMC8.

Public benefit

59. Policy DMC5 (f) states the development of a non-designated heritage asset will not be permitted unless it would result in harm to the significance of the character and appearance of the heritage asset unless there is clear and convincing justification that substantial harm or loss of the significance is necessary to achieve substantial public benefit that would outweigh the harm.
60. The addition of an extension would result in a private benefit to the owners of additional living accommodation. However, the building is in a use which will conserve it in the long term and there are no public benefits that could justify the harm identified.

61. Amenity

62. Policies DMC3 and DMH7 states that particular attention will be paid to the amenity, privacy and security of the development of nearby properties.
63. The extension would project into an enclosed private yard, with surrounding garden and mature tree cover, and would be a reasonable distance away from the nearest neighbouring properties to the north and north west, therefore, it is considered unlikely the proposal would result in amenity issues such as loss of privacy. Further, due to the proposed scale, and again intervening distances between the nearest neighbouring properties which are set on slightly higher land to the north, no overbearing impacts upon neighbours would occur.

Conclusion

64. The proposed extension would by virtue of its form, scale, detailing and use of unsympathetic materials represent an incongruous feature that would lead to a less than substantial harm to the significance of the non-designated Heritage Asset by undermining its historic character and appearance. It is considered that the harm would not be outweighed by any public benefit and that the proposals are contrary to the aims of Policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, L3 of the Core Strategy and Policies DMC3, DMC5 and DMH7 of the Development Management Plan.
65. Furthermore, the extension by fundamentally altering the historic character and appearance of the building would consequently undermine the retained, legible character and appearance of the former barn complex and the contribution it makes to the setting and significance of the Youlgrave Conservation Area. It is considered that the harm would not be outweighed by any public benefit and that the proposals are contrary to the aims of Policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3 and L3 of the Core Strategy and Policies DMC5, DMC8 of the Development Management Plan.
66. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Human Rights

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

Nil