

10. FULL APPLICATION/ HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION - TWO-STOREY EXTENSION BUILT TO THE REAR OF EXISTING HOUSE, AND CREATION OF PARKING SPACE AT HUNSTONE HOUSE, WINSTER. (NP/DDD/0526/0482)

APPLICANT: MR STEVEN SMITH

Summary

1. The application is brought before the Planning Committee because it has received five letters of objection raising material planning concerns in relation to amenity.
2. The proposal is for alterations and a lean-to rear extension in the centre of Winster, within the Winster Conservation Area. The residential dwelling is not a designated nor non-designated heritage asset.
3. The extension is considered appropriate within its setting and the character of the dwelling, and the alterations to be an improvement to the character of the dwelling and therefore its setting. Amenity concerns can be mitigated for by condition. All relevant material considerations have been addressed and as amended the development would be an acceptable extension to an existing dwelling in accordance with policy DME7.

Site and Surroundings

4. Hunstone House is located in the south of Winster village, within the Winster Conservation Area.
5. The property dates back to the 17th century. The openings are modern in style and material, constructed of white uPVC and horizontal in appearance. It is a two-storey dwelling, however the ground floor at the rear faces a retaining wall due to the steep terrain that rises southwards. The dwelling is constructed of random natural stone with gritstone surrounds and quoins and a slate tiled roof.
6. There is a garden to the rear which slopes upwards south, and is bound by a high stone wall, beyond which is a connecting road that curves round the west of the plot. The front of the house is set back from the road from which it is accessed, bound by a stone wall. A Public Right of Way runs along the eastern boundary.
7. The buildings in the area are clustered tightly together. Grade II Listed dwellings Bradley House, Hamster Cottage, and Autumn Cottage sit in close proximity to the dwelling, neighbouring it to the south east and south west, with Autumn Cottage 5 metres away from Hunstone House. Birch view sits over the road to the south, 3 metres from the corner of Hunstone House, and Kingsfield cottage is to the north east, over the road.

Proposal

8. The proposal is for a single-storey rear extension.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the to the following conditions:

1. **3-year implementation period**
2. **Adopt amended plans**

3. **The new window in the eastern elevation of the extension shall be obscure glazed.**
4. **The rainwater goods shall be of black cast metal.**
5. **Materials and pointing to match the existing in appearance.**
6. **The new and replacement windows proposed shall be of timber construction, with central glazing bar (set external to the glazing) to first floor window.**
7. **Detailed design of new back door to be approved.**
8. **All new retaining walls shall be faced with natural limestone rubble to all external faces.**

Key Issues

9. Design, impact upon the character, appearance and amenity of the property, its setting and neighbouring properties.
10. Impact on the character of the Conservation Area.

History

11. November 2025 - PE\2025\ENQ\53143 – Enquiry regarding two storey rear extension.
12. February 2026 - NP/DDD/0126/0133 – Application for a two storey extension built to the rear of existing house and creation of parking space - Refused

Consultations

13. Highway Authority - *Based on the analysis of the information submitted and a review of Local and National policy the Highway Authority concludes that there would not be an unacceptable impact on Highway Safety or a severe impact on congestion. There are no justifiable grounds on which an objection could be maintained.*
14. District Council – No response received
15. Parish (Town) Council - *Following Winster Parish Council meeting, the following concerns were raised regarding the planning application*
 - *Chimneys removed — Chimneys have been taken down but are not shown in the application, meaning the submission does not reflect works already undertaken.*
 - *Lack of specialist reports — No excavation or structural assessments have been provided despite the complexity of the site.*
 - *Deteriorating boundary wall — The boundary wall is visibly deteriorating, with no proposals for repair, restoration, or protection.*
16. PDNPA Ecology - *I'm satisfied that we don't require any surveys in this case although, I would offer the usual precautionary advice that if bats or nesting birds are discovered during the implementation of works, work should cease and the advice of a suitably qualified ecologist should be sought with respect to how to proceed.*
17. PDNPA Built Environment - *The application is accepted in principle and subject to comments regarding opening details. It will comply with relevant local and national heritage policy criteria in the NPPF and PDNPA Local Plan respectively.*

Representations

18. 5 letters of representation were submitted, all in objection to the development. These were for reasons of:

- Insufficient detail
- Design and scale of the proposed extension
- Overlooking and privacy concerns
- Damage to boundary wall
- External lighting
- Excavation requirements
- Internal layout movements
- Construction materials

Statutory framework

19. 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:

- a) Conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage
- b) 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.

20. In the Peak District National Park, the development plan comprises the Core Strategy (adopted 2011) and the Development Management policies (adopted 2019) and an adopted neighbourhood development plan (where relevant).

21. This application must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Main Policies

22. Relevant Core Strategy policies: DS1, GSP1, GSP3, L3, and CC1

23. Relevant Development Management policies: DMC3, DMC5, DMC8, and DMH7

Supplementary Planning Documents

- Climate Change and Sustainable Building (2013)
- Design Guide (2007)
- Building Design Guide (1987)
- Alterations and Extensions (2014)

National Planning Policy Framework

24. 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.

25. Paragraph 189 of the NPPF states: 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. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks. The scale and extent of development within all these designated areas should be limited, while development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas.

Assessment

Principle of development

26. As established in Policy DS1 in the Core Strategy (2011) and DMH7 Development Management Policies Document (2019), an extension to a dwelling is acceptable in principle. This is subject to the alterations or extensions being of a suitable design, scale, form and massing and does not raise any amenity issues upon the dwelling itself, any neighbouring properties, or its setting, in accordance with the principles of policies DS1, DMC3, and DMH7.
27. The development proposed is therefore acceptable in principle, however will be subject to analysis regarding its visual impact on the host property, street scene, Conservation Area setting, and its impact on the amenities of any neighbouring properties and landscape character.

Design and impact upon character and appearance

28. 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.
29. In accordance with the design guide, the proposed extension is visually subsidiary to the existing dwelling with a traditional lean-to form and set back from the corners of the existing rear elevation. The roof of the extension continues just below the existing eaves where it has been stepped down, visually separating the new roof from the existing. Retaining proportionality, the extension's length is less than the width of the existing house by over 400mm. Furthermore, the dimensions of the extension would result in an increase in floor area of only 12 square metres, compared to the existing 51.48 square metres. The extension would therefore result in a 23% increase in floor space, in accordance with the advice in the Authority's Design Guidance. The simple extension therefore reflects the parent dwelling's modest size and simplicity of form.
30. The small extension is also proportionate to its surroundings within its relatively small curtilage, the tightly knit cluster of buildings that surround it, and its central location between the public right of way and road, and thus officers consider that the proposed extension would relate well to the parent building and its wider setting in design and form.

Openings

31. On the rear elevation, the top modern window of horizontal proportionality is to be altered to a square window. This would remove a main contributing factor to the squat appearance of the rear elevation, and is therefore considered an improvement. However, to further enhance the vertical proportions, the window should have a central glazing bar. This could be secured by condition. The rear door is also proposed to be altered. Following conversations with the applicant, it was decided that the final design of the door would be secured by condition in the event the application is approved. Two windows are proposed in the extension. These are both vertically proportioned and

therefore reflect the traditional window shape, and are acceptable. The new window in the eastern elevation is to be obscure glazed, which could be secured by condition.

Materials

32. The proposed materials of rough random local stone and slate to match the existing would be considered acceptable. The pointing on the extension should also match the existing and this could be conditioned on approval.
33. The existing windows are uPVC. The proposed windows are to be of timber construction, which would be an improvement to the character of the building and its setting.

Other Design Matters

34. Representations raised concerns over internal layout arrangements of rooms and access to the bathroom via the proposed stairs. In regards to the changes to the internal layout, whilst officers understand general concerns over privacy, it would be unreasonable to control via condition the changes to the internal layout of the existing dwelling; these changes are not development for the purposes of planning control, and could be carried out with or without the proposed extension.
35. Regarding access to the bathroom from within the house, the practicality/viability of which has been queried in some representations, this is a matter for the applicant rather than a planning matter. Officers have nevertheless liaised with the applicant on this, in the interests of ensuring that any approved scheme can practically be built out. The applicant has already discussed the matter with building control and both parties are satisfied that access can be acceptably achieved within the external built form shown on the application plans.
36. Concerns were also raised regarding the alterations that have been made to the property's chimney. Alterations to chimneys fall under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class G of the General Permitted Development Order. In this case, it is considered Permitted Development.
37. Finally, regarding the proposed impacts arising from earthworks, extensions requiring excavation of ground are not uncommon. Given the scale and nature of the proposed development there will be multiple ways that the ground can be retained without risk of collapse. This does not raise any planning concerns.

Design summary

38. The proposals are considered acceptable in materials and design. Concerns raised in representations regarding design are either beyond planning control or do not give rise to unacceptable planning impacts. Concerns over the impact of the design on privacy is addressed in the amenity section below.
39. In matters of design, the proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with policies GSP3, DMC3, and DMH7.

Cultural Heritage

40. Policy DMC5 requires that development that affects the setting of a heritage asset must demonstrate its significance including how any identified features of value will be conserved and where possible enhanced; and why the proposed development and related works are desirable or necessary.
41. A Heritage statement has been provided that satisfies these requirements.

42. The PDNPA Conservation officer states that:

43. *The form and size are now appropriate to the existing character of the conservation area, while the proposed matching materials will complement the main building. Overall, the application is now considered acceptable (with provisos) with important views across the site remaining unhindered and the proposed extension will have a neutral impact upon the character and appearance of the Winster conservation area. Improvements proposed include replacing concrete lintels with stone.*

44. The extension also retains the historic blocked mullioned stone window at the rear, and replaces uPVC windows at the rear with timber, as well as existing concrete lintels with period stone lintels. The modern door is proposed to be replaced. Subject to a condition securing the detailed design of any replacement, a design more sensitive to the character of the building can be secured.

45. Overall, these alterations are considered an enhancement to the existing building that would improve the setting of the Conservation Area.

46. The proposals therefore comply with the requirements of DMC5, DMC8, and L3, and are in accordance with the NPPF.

Ecology

47. The proposal is exempt from the requirements of biodiversity net gain legislation due to being for householder development.

48. As the extension would be connected just below the existing eaves, it is not considered that a protected species survey is required as the development would not affect bat or bird access or habitat.

Climate change and sustainable building

49. Policy CC1 requires that new development makes the most efficient and sustainable use of land, building and natural resources and achieves the highest possible standards of carbon reductions and water efficiency.

50. For extensions, there is no requirement in the Core Strategy to go beyond Building Regulations in terms of sustainability standards. Developments will be required to comply with building regs at the construction stage. However, planning applications should consider how to reduce the need for energy, to conserve water wherever possible, and to increase the capacity for energy generation where it does not compromise the valued characteristics of the National Park.

The construction will reuse the rubble on-site where possible, reducing transport requirements and therefore emissions. uPVC windows will be changed to timber, which is a more sustainable material due to its ability to naturally biodegrade.

It has not been stated how the development would reduce the need for energy or conserve water, however, considering the scale of the development and adopted guidance only requiring compliance with building regulations for householder developments, the measures above are considered sufficient.

Amenity

51. Outlook, amenity, privacy and daylight are fundamental considerations in planning. 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.

52. Grade II Listed dwellings Bradley House, Hamster Cottage, and Autumn Cottage sit in close proximity to the dwelling, neighbouring it to the south east and south west, with Autumn Cottage 5 metres away from Hunstone House to the east. Birch view sits over the road to the south, 3 metres from the corner of Hunstone House, and The Spook sits 14 metres away to the north east, with Kingsfield cottage over the road.
53. The proposed floor plans show that the bedrooms of Hunstone House would be relocated to the ground floor, which is currently the living room, and the living room relocated to the first floor. This change in room usage raises a concern regarding the privacy of the residents of the applicant's dwelling of Hunstone House, as it would result in only a 2.5 metre distance between the bedroom windows and the public road. However, privacy may be created using vegetation should the occupants desire and, as stated earlier, the internal layout of an existing property may be changed without planning permission. Therefore, this alteration of existing living spaces is not considered sufficient a concern in this case to contribute to a refusal.
54. The concerns raised regarding the impact of the internal layout have been addressed in the design section above. Regarding the impact of these changes on the privacy of The Spook, it is considered that the 14-metre separation distance between the existing eastern window of Hunstone House and The Spook's front elevation is sufficient to retain privacy, considering also that a Public Right of Way runs between the two houses.
55. Hunstone House is currently separated by 10.7 metres from the centre of the rear elevation to the centre of Autumn Cottage to the east, with a Public Right of Way running between the two dwellings. The proposed rear extension would reduce this gap to 9 metres, measured from the south eastern corner of the extension to the centre of Autumn Cottage. The lean-to roof decreases in scale at an angle to 2.1 metres. Therefore, considering the distance retained and the small scale of the extension, the proposal is not considered to result in any overbearing on Autumn Cottage.
56. The distance of the extension from the Public Right of Way combined with its scale and low roof height also mean it would not result in any overbearing impact upon the PRoW.
57. Concerns were raised regarding the proposed window in the southern elevation of the extension. As stated above, the extension is of a relatively small scale, projecting outwards 3 metres from the rear. Its tallest point is where the roof reaches the eaves of the existing at 4.7 metres, however this drops swiftly down at an angle to 2.17 metres, 0.7 metres of which would be within the embankment. The rear of the extension therefore rises only 1.4 metres above ground, below which sits the window, facing into the retaining wall. Considering this, as well as the existing high boundary wall that wraps around the grounds at the rear of the property, it is considered that this proposed window would not create any unacceptable overlooking to any neighbouring properties.
58. Regarding privacy concerns at Birch view to the west, the new window on the western elevation of the extension would be obscure-glazed by condition, preventing overlooking. Given this, that there is a public highway between the two buildings, and given the distance of 7.5 metres between the buildings, the development would not create any unacceptable impact on the rear amenity space of Birch view road.
59. In summary, due to the small scale of the extension, position of openings and boundary treatments, it is considered there would be no amenity impacts upon the neighbouring dwellings. Concern regarding the proposed internal layout changes to the existing dwelling do not amount to development and cannot reasonably be controlled under a permission arising from this application.
60. Therefore, as it is considered that in all other respects the proposed development would have no adverse impact or significantly harm the neighbouring properties with regard to

appearance, outlook, amenity, privacy and daylight, it would accord with policies GSP3, DMC3, and DMH7 in these respects.

Highway safety

61. No new or altered access is proposed as part of the development.
62. The Highway Authority raise no objections to the proposals. Due to the potential impact on the highway network during construction they advise the applicant to contact the Highway Authorities Network Management Team before undertaking any work, to discuss any temporary traffic management measures required, such as footway, Public Right of Way, carriageway closures or temporary parking restrictions a minimum of eight weeks prior to any activity on site to enable Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders to be prepared and a programme of Temporary Traffic Management measures to be agreed. An informative can be added to any decision to bring this to the applicant's attention.

Conclusion

63. In conclusion, the size, massing and design of the extension are acceptable and would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling, its immediate setting or that of the other neighboring dwellings. Within the context of the dwelling, the extension and proposed openings would not result in any unacceptable amenity issues.
64. On this basis, and taking account of all other material considerations, the scheme accords with Development Plan Policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC8, and DMH7 from the Authority's Local Plan and Policies GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L3, and CC1, and is therefore commended for approval, subject to conditions.

Human Rights

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

66. Nil

Report Author: Mark Nuttall, Principal Planner