

7. FULL APPLICATION – ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION TO OLD HALL, CREAMERY LANE, PARWICH (NP/DDD/0626/0578), LB)

APPLICANT: MR AND MRS HARVEY & WATSON

Summary

1. The application site comprises a Grade II listed dwelling located in Parwich.
2. Planning permission is sought for a single storey lean-to extension that would infill the north east corner of the building.
3. Plans also show the existing boiler would be replaced and enclosed by a new boiler cupboard.
4. The proposed extension and alterations would fail to conserve the significance of the grade II listed heritage asset and its immediate setting and harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and Conservation Area, contrary to policies GSP1, GSP3, L3, DMC3, DMC7, DMC8 and DMH7.
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 the Designated Parwich Conservation Area (CA).
7. The three-storey dwelling, dates mid-17th century, (but was restored in 1925 when the stairwell extension was added), comprises two ranges constructed from 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. Outbuildings are 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. The application is for a single story predominantly glazed rear extension. The base of the glazed extension would consist of random coursed stone while the doors and windows would have slimline metal frames. Metal cladding would join the extension to the existing building. A new opening in the existing rear elevation would be created to allow access into the proposed extension; this new opening would result in the loss of some original stonework, an original stone window and an adjacent window dating to 1925.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. **By virtue of the poor incongruous design, inappropriate scale and massing, and harm to and loss of historic fabric the development would fail to conserve the significance of the listed building and its setting and the arising harm would not be outweighed by public benefits, contrary to Core Strategy policies GSP1, GSP3 and L3, Development Management policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC7, DMC8, DMH7 and the NPPF.**

Key Issues

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

History

12. 2026 – NP/DDD/0126/0013 – Rear / side extension and internal alterations. New Glasshouse. Application refused as the proposal failed to demonstrate conservation of the significance of the heritage asset, or that any harm would be outweighed by public benefit.
13. 2026 – NP/DDD/0126/0014 – Listed Building consent – rear / side extension and internal alterations. New Glasshouse. Application refused as the proposal failed to demonstrate that the development could conserve the significance of the heritage asset, or that any harm would be outweighed by public benefits, contrary to policy.
14. 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.
15. 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.
16. 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

17. Derbyshire County Council (Highways): No objection to the proposal as there would not be an unacceptable impact upon Highway Safety or a severe impact on congestion.
18. Parwich Parish Council: Support – *‘provides natural light to areas of the house while respecting its historic character. The applicant has provided a comprehensive heritage statement. The original stone building will remain visible. The extension has been redesigned to be smaller and lighter and subordinate to the historic house. Previous concerns look to have been carefully considered’.*

Representations

19. During the consultation period 6 letters of support have been received. The reasons for support are summarised below;
 - Design and scale of proposal is modest and respects the host building and is of a high standard.
 - Scheme allows Old Hall to remain legible. Glazed link demonstrates stages of the property and avoids competition with the existing building.
 - Extension will sit comfortably within its setting
 - Improve quality of life for owners.
 - Proposal is discreet and does not infringe on the quality of the Conservation Area.
 - Proposal would not overlook nearby properties, or result in noise or disturbance on residential amenity
 - Reflects vernacular design consistent with the rest of the village.

- Design is lighter in appearance and sympathetic to the character of the existing building.
 - Character of the existing property is retained
20. In addition to the representations received above, 4 letters of support were also submitted by the agent in the early stages of the application. Officers cannot confirm what proposals the letters respond to because all 4 letters pre-date the submission and validation date of the current application. Therefore, Officers have afforded these letters very limited weight.

Main Policies

21. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP3, L3, and CC1
22. Relevant Development Management Plan policies: DMC3, DMC5, DMC7, DMC8 and DMH7

Statutory Framework

23. 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: 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 they carry out these purposes, they also have the duty to; seek to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities in National Parks.
24. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that special regard must be had to the desirability of preserving listed buildings and their settings. Section 72 of the same Act requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas. Section 73 places a general duty upon decision makers that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

25. The NPPF is a material consideration and carries particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date. Paragraph 189 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.
26. In the National Park, the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy (2011) and the Development Management Policies (DMP) (2019). The development plan provides 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 the NPPF.
27. Paragraph 207 of the NPPF 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.

28. 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.
29. 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.
30. 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.
31. 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.
32. 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.

Relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance

Conversion of Historic Buildings SPD
Building Design Guide
Alterations & Extensions SPD

Assessment

Principle of development

33. In principle extensions and alterations to dwellings are supported within the National Park as established in Policy DS1.
34. Policy DMH7 sets out extensions will be permitted provided the proposal does not detract from the character, appearance or amenity or the original building, its setting or dominate the original building.
35. Policy DMC3 requires high standards of design must be achieved which respects siting, scale, massing and orientation of existing buildings and their surroundings. Layout and landscaping are also key and should be appropriate to the context.

36. Therefore, as plans propose a single storey lean-to extension to the north west corner of the dwelling, alongside some internal alterations, the principle of the extension is accepted in accordance with policy.
37. As such, the design and acceptability of the impacts upon the listed building, a heritage asset, and its setting, will be considered to determine if the requirements of policy DMC3, and DMH7 in particular are achieved.

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

38. Old Hall is a substantial three storey grade II dwelling positioned in a large curtilage in a prominent elevated position on Creamery Lane within the northern area of Parwich and its Conservation Area. The list description dates the house to the mid-17th century, but restored in 1925.
39. Submitted plans propose a lean-to extension located within the north east corner of the dwelling to provide a garden room. The extension would wrap around an existing single storey extension, which houses an internal staircase, and form an 'L' shaped floor plan, infilling the external space.
40. The extension would have a metal frame construction, housing a glazed lean-to roof alongside almost fully glazed elevations, sat on a random coursed stone dwarf wall. The roof would project under the eaves of the main dwelling and the staircase extension.
41. Slimline metal doors and windows would be provided alongside an area of powder coated flat metal cladding on the north elevation. The doors and windows are divided into groups of three-square glazing panels. The existing extension would project above the roof of the proposed extension.
42. Plans also propose a new opening in the external existing north east elevation which serves the kitchen, to allow a new access to the proposed garden room.
43. Internally, within the existing kitchen a pantry is to be rebuilt to house a new boiler.
44. In assessing the proposal relevant policies in the development plan and the NPPF make it clear 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.
45. The Authority's Local Development Framework policy L3 sets out that cultural heritage assets of architectural or historic significance must be conserved and where appropriate enhanced. Other than in exceptional circumstances development will not be permitted where it is likely to cause harm to significance of cultural heritage assets.
46. 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.
47. 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.

48. 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.
49. 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.
50. 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.
51. This application has been accompanied with a detailed heritage statement.
52. Previously, planning and listed building consent applications for extension of the listed building were refused by the National Park Authority for reasons, in part, which included because the heritage statement for the applications did not provide adequate information to allow a clear understanding of how the building evolved correctly over time, and therefore the impacts of the proposed works upon it.
53. The heritage statement accompanying this application has been updated to reflect these comments from the Authority's Conservation Officer, in particular regarding the phasing of the building.
54. Between 1900 and 1926 the building was operated as a creamery. After this date the building was converted back to a dwelling evidenced through a date stone. Historic mapping shows a large extension was built abutting the north of the house. Its adaption to a creamery and subsequent reconversion to residential later on demonstrates an unusual sequence of functional change that contributes to its historic interest.
55. The building typically dates 17th century in character with double chamfered mullion windows and cavetto molded drip molds feature alongside a steeply pitched roof form, sharp gables and molded kneelers. The front elevation has a symmetrical nature, common for 17th century context, alongside the chimney stack being in line with the front door suggesting an original lobby entrance.
56. Stylistically, nothing suggests the east and west parts of the dwelling are from different dates of construction.
57. The south elevation features gables of both ranges with clear unity and symmetry, as the creamery was configured.
58. Doors seen in photos in the heritage statement and sales particulars are of 6 panel design which indicates the floorplan of 1900 largely survives.
59. In regards to the rear elevation and existing extension, (staircase projection), this is a later extension with some windows dating 1926. However, the style of stonework and some of the windows are likely to place its construction around the same time as the rest of the house. The rear elevation of the front range also contains a mix of what would appear to be original windows.
60. Whilst this elevation does not contribute as much as the front elevation to the architectural interest of the building, the consistent architectural style and early fabric make an important contribution to the overall architectural significance of the building.
61. Therefore, the architectural significance derives from its layered development and its retention of historic fabric from different periods, vernacular construction and high-quality

stone dressings which is clearly legible in its external appearance and layout. The character and form of the building are also evident in its historic use and function.

62. The building itself is visible from the public highway sited at the top of Creamery Lane on high ground. To this end it is also considered to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, its setting and local significance.
63. All of these factors all contribute to the heritage significance of the site, and any development should conserve and where appropriate enhance or further reveal its significance.
64. The proposed scheme has significant parallels with the previously refused applications; being a lean-to extension infilling the north eastern corner of the building. The difference being the design in this application proposes a glass roof and would not cover the existing extension.
65. The extension now proposed would project from the north east corners of each range, wrapping around the existing extension, forming an 'L' shaped floor plan. The existing extension would project above the glazed roof.
66. As noted above, the structure would comprise of slim line metal with integrated doors and windows, sat on a random coursed stone dwarf wall. A section of the north elevation would have flat metal cladding finished in a powder coated green. The roof is to be fully patent glazed. This would introduce modern materials that would starkly contrast the existing.
67. As the extension would extend from the corner of the ranges fully filling the perimeter of the space available the form and massing of the extension would be of a substantial scale, encompassing the whole area and wrapping around the staircase.
68. The elevation would cut through all quoins and details on both ranges and as such is not subserviently stepped back from the gables.
69. The historic plan form would be amended as the ranges would become joined and an overall, almost square footprint would be created for the building.
70. By wrapping around the existing staircase, the roof of the existing extension would project above the proposed glazed roof, creating an arrangement of awkward planes that does not transition comfortably into onto another, losing fluidity of the building in this corner. Whilst this detail has been derived from comments regarding the covering of eaves and the angles of the roof in the previous scheme, this amendment is not considered an improvement or an acceptable way to mitigate previous design concern.
71. The eaves of the proposed extension are set below both the cornice details on the original part of the building and significantly below the eaves on the extension. Whilst this allows the angle of the glazed roof to match that of the existing extension, visual simplicity upon the original listed building is lost, in particularly when viewing the building from the east.
72. In regard to materials, proposing a fully glazed roof is not considered to improve the design. Whilst the glazing may allow the building to be seen beyond the glass, it would also mean the slimline metal frame would be seen over the historic features of the building, losing clarity of the elevation. Further, over time the domestication of the interior would also be viewed alongside the listed building, resulting in further harm to its significance, character and appearance.
73. The modern metal framed structure and powder coated panels are not considered to be a traditional material, being at odds with the dwelling. Further the scale of the glazing and

its proportions and design do not reflect or respect the existing fenestration throughout the dwelling.

74. To that end, the proposal remains a bold, dominant, incongruous addition which is clearly not subordinate and would obscure much of the rear of the building resulting in less than substantial harm to the significance of the building. The obtrusive, unsympathetic and alien addition would result in harm upon the details and architectural features, completely harming the character and appearance of the grade II building.
75. Whilst the application argues that the rear of the building would remain clearly distinguishable and visible through the glass, in practice this is rarely the case and does not make it acceptable. The reflectivity of the glass would obscure most of the interior and clash with the solidity of the rest of the building.
76. As such, it is considered the modern proposal significantly harms the significance, character, and appearance of the grade II building contrary to L3, DMC7, DMC5 and DMH7.
77. In addition, the extension would also require the linking through to the kitchen, necessitating the removal of part of the east ranges rear wall at ground floor level, including two windows, one which dates from the 17th century. This would require removal and loss of historic fabric which would harm the building and its significance.
78. Overall, the introduction of a fully glazed extension, wrapping around the existing solid extension, would result in a modern unsympathetic structure of a substantial size, scale and massing that would fill the north east area between the listed ranges. Even though the structure would be glazed throughout it would still cover or remove extensive architectural features that contribute to the significance of the building, or reflect or complement it. The proposal remains wholly at odds with the architectural character of the building which would significantly harm this, and reduce its heritage significance.
79. Further, the NPPF and local policy DMC5 state that proposals that would cause harm to a designated heritage asset should be refused unless outweighed against the public benefits of the development.
80. The previously refused applications asserted that an extension in this location would help to improve the thermal performance of the building, over time reducing heating costs which in the long term may secure further longevity. However, this is not considered to be a public benefit of any significance as the continued use of the building at present is highly likely. As such, this can be afforded very limited weight. Whilst energy efficiency improvements in general are a public benefit, at this scale they are very minor and would not outweigh the identified harm.

Impact upon the Parwich Conservation Area

81. As the site is located within the Parwich Conservation Area (CA) Policy DMC8 also needs to be considered. DMC8 sets out that development that affects its setting of important view into, out of, across or through the area, should assess and clearly demonstrate how the character or appearance and significance of the CA will be preserved or enhanced.
82. As the proposal is to be located within the north eastern area of the building, the development would be completely screened from the south and west (as it would be screened by the dwelling itself). The bottom half of the northern elevation of the dwelling is set below the garage and parking area of Barn Cottage and due to its orientation in relation to the highway, it is considered that only glimpses of the north easternly point of the extension may be visible in its immediate and slightly wider setting with minimal impact. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal is unlikely to affect the wider setting

of the listed building or views into or across the site in particular from the north and north west on Creamery Lane.

83. Therefore, wider impacts upon the CA would be limited. Nevertheless, the listed building makes a positive contribution to the CA and the harm arising from the development to the listed building would in turn result in harm to the CA.

Climate change and sustainable building

84. 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. However, the supporting SPD states that for household development there is no expectation that extensions will achieve gains beyond those required by building regulations. Therefore, there is no objection to the proposals on these grounds.

Amenity

85. Policy DMC3 and DMH7 states that particular attention will be paid to the amenity, privacy and security of the development of nearby properties.
86. 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 therefore screened from the nearest properties. As such, it is unlikely the extension would result in any adverse impact upon the amenity of any nearby residents. However, if in the future, if the hedge was removed, due to the external glazed treatment on the extension, it is likely amenity issues such as overlooking and loss of privacy may arise on nearby residents.
87. Therefore, it is considered the proposal would accord with DMC3 and DMH7, in these respects.

Highways Safety

88. DMT3 Access and Design criteria stated 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.
89. Highways have concluded that there would not be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or a severe impact on congestion. As such proposals accord with DMT3.

Archaeology

90. The Authority's Archaeological Officers have not been consulted, however, on a previous application 0125/0057 for an extension in the same location as this proposal, Archaeological officers did review the proposal and advised that the scheme did not result in any archaeological concerns.

Conclusion

91. It is concluded that the proposed extension would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Grade II listed building and its setting. The massing of the extension would dominate and obscure much of the rear of the building whilst the reflectivity of the glass would obscure most of the interior and clash with the solidity against the rest of the building significantly harming the character and appearance of the heritage asset. Existing historic features contributing to the significance would also be harmed or removed. In addition, removal of historic fabric to aid access internally is not acceptable.

92. As such, the application fails to demonstrate that the development could conserve the significance of the heritage asset, or that any harm would be outweighed by public benefits.
93. Consequently, the application is contrary to policies GSP1, GSP3, L3, DMC3, DMC7, DMC8, DMH7 and the NPPF.
94. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Human Rights

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

Nil

Report Author: Laura Buckley, Planning Assistant