

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2022/0383
Valid 12/10/2022

10, ROBERTSON ROAD,
BUXTON, DERBYSHIRE,
SK17 9DY

DEMOLITION OF EXISTING
OUTBUILDINGS AND THE
ADDITION OF A SINGLE
STOREY SIDE/REAR
EXTENSION WITH
ASSOCIATED INTERNAL
ALTERATIONS TO INCLUDE
THE CONSTRUCTION OF
DETACHED ANCILLARY
ACCOMMODATION AND
ALTERATIONS TO THE
BOUNDARY WALL FRONTING
THE HIGHWAY
(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of Development
- Design Considerations (including impact on Heritage Assets)
- Impact upon Residential Amenity
- Highway Safety
- Nutrient Neutrality

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site lies within the development boundary for Buxton as defined by the Local Plan policies map. The application site relates to a two storey semi-detached dwelling which is located within an area that is predominantly residential in character. The site has a modest flat roof outbuilding located to its side and includes off street parking to the front and private amenity space to the rear. The site lies within the College area of the Buxton Conservation Area.

PROPOSAL

This application seeks permission for the demolition of the existing outbuilding and construction of a new ancillary outbuilding and rear extension.

The outbuilding would measure approximately 12.5m in length and 5.7m in width (according to the floor plan), although elevation details a wider development when scaled. Due to land level changes the outbuilding would be partially excavated into the slope with access steps down. Maximum eaves and ridge heights would measure 3.6m and 6.9m, according to the gable elevations. While the side elevation shows differing eaves and ridge heights of 3.1m and 5.7m respectively. Materials would comprise vertical timber boarding to the elevations and a plain tile roof. The

plans purport to show a gym with kitchenette, study, shower w/c room, and a hallway.

The proposed rear extension would be flat roofed and project to the rear by a maximum depth of 3.6m. The maximum height of the extension would be 4m according to the side elevation, however the rear elevation measures a height of 5.4m. The proposals would be largely glazed. Accommodation would include a dining room and utility.

The scheme also includes the widening of the existing access.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Local Plan (Adopted 2016)

S1 Sustainable Development Principles
S1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
S7 Buxton Sub-area Strategy
EQ6 Design and Place Making
EQ7 Built and Historic Environment

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

Residential Design (2005)
High Peak Design Guide (2018)
Buxton Conservation Areas Appraisal (2007)

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 12: Achieving Well-designed Places
Section 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

None

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 24/11/22
Neighbour consultation period ends: 01/12/22

Public Comments

4 letters of objection received. Salient points being:

- Rear extension glazing unacceptably high, dominating feature which has no relationship with house
- Outbuilding disproportionate and overdevelopment of plot

- No relationship to existing house and alien to area
- Glass gable dominating and unacceptable, amenity issues
- Intrusive development
- Examples of appropriate extensions at 12 and 14
- Question end use
- Inconsistent plans
- Concerns over length and height
- Appears closer to boundary
- Foundations could damage wall
- Loss of daylight to windows
- Elevations incorrect
- Materials out of keeping
- Unmapped sewers
- Heritage statement errors, inaccuracies
- Outbuilding in good condition
- Changes in site levels, boundary wall is a retaining wall
- Impact on trees
- Building material concerns with Building Regs
- Nutrient neutrality concerns

Councillor Comments

Cllr Thrane - Please note that if this application is recommended for approval, then I request that it be considered by the Development Control Committee. The reasons for the call in include the size and position of the ancillary accommodation and the consequential impact on the neighbours, and the conservation area.

Town / Parish Comments

None received

Conservation Officer

Objection. Recommend Refusal. Comments conclude - Currently the scheme shows a moderate level of impact and therefore harm imposed on Buxton College Conservation Area and as such cannot be supported.

DCC Highways

No objection subject to condition

Severn Trent Water

No mapped sewers at site

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application proposes householder development to a property which is located within the settlement of Buxton as defined by the Local Plan Policies Map, which lies within the Buxton Sub Area. Within such locations extensions to dwellings are acceptable, as a matter of principle. The main considerations in this instance whether the design is appropriate, taking into consideration its siting within a Conservation Area, whether an amenity issues would arise, whether there would be an impact upon highway safety, and the impact upon the Peak District Dales Special Area of Conservation.

Design Considerations

Policy S1 states that new development will be expected to make a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities and where possible enhancing the environment which would be achieved by, inter alia, securing high quality and locally distinctive design. Policy EQ6 states that all development should be well designed and of a high quality and that this will be achieved by requiring development to be well designed to respect the character of the townscape, and requiring development to contribute positively to an areas character, identity and history in terms of scale, height, density, layout, appearance, materials and relationship with adjacent buildings.

Further guidance for extensions is contained within the High Peak Residential Design Guide SPD (2005), and the Design Guide SPD (2018).

The Residential Design Guide (2005) provides guidance in section 9, and states that extensions should be designed to be subordinate to the main house and that an extension results in a dwelling which is well designed in itself. Garages and outbuildings should relate to the main dwelling in terms of size, proportion and appearance. They should be subordinate in size and height and match the materials of the existing house.

The Design Guide SPD (2018) at 5.5 states that extensions should harmonise with the parent building and should respect the dominance of the original building, being subordinate to it in terms of size and massing. Paragraph 7.25 identifies that there is not tradition of external timber boarding in High Peak.

The NPPF also seeks to deliver high quality design in development and, at paragraph 134, states that development which is not well designed should be refused.

Policy EQ 7 states that the council will conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. The application site lies within The College area of the Buxton Conservation Area which is a designated heritage asset.

The Buxton Conservation Area Appraisal for the College area identifies some of the main characteristics of the area being a spacious setting in large gardens and glimpse views between streets laid out on different levels. The CAA identifies that *“the large gaps between the houses along College Road provides glimpses of properties at the rear on the raised land at Robertson Road”*, and goes on to state that *“Robertson Road has a generally more unusual mix of houses than either*

Spencer Road or Compton Road, and more individual variety within each pair of semis. The west side of Robertson Road overlooked College Road and there are interesting glimpses of buildings between the pairs of semi-detached houses”.

The application proposes the construction of a large detached outbuilding, and a single storey rear extension.

The existing outbuilding is modest in height and scale, and as such is discreet and unobtrusive within the streetscene, and as such preserves views between the buildings towards the properties beyond. This would be replaced by an outbuilding of significant scale. The siting and scale of the building is such that it would represent a significant addition to the plot which consumes a large proportion of the garden and at odds with the general pattern of development in the area. The scale and design of the outbuilding would be visually prominent between the existing dwelling and the adjacent villa (No.8) to the north. Given the design proposed this would appear visually at odds with the adjoining properties to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.

Furthermore, the proposals would be visible from the glimpse views between dwellings, identified as being a characteristic of this part of the Conservation Area. Given the scale and design of the proposed outbuilding, and the design of the rear extension it is considered that these views would be prejudiced and as such the development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and impact upon its significance.

With regard to the appearance of the outbuilding, it is proposed that this would be constructed from vertical timber boarding which is not a traditional approach in High Peak. Further, the Conservation Officer observes that there is no precedent for this in the historic environment, nor within Buxton College Conservation Area.

The siting, scale, and design of the proposed development is such that it would represent an incongruous and harmful addition to the Conservation Area, and character and appearance of the area generally.

The proposed rear extension includes a contemporary design approach which does not appear to be informed in any way by the existing building or its heritage setting. The Conservation Officer advises that *“the kitchen extension appears to be of such an incongruous size that the original floor plan of the dwelling would be rendered illegible, and therefore the character of the dwelling would be diluted. Though I have no issue with an extension in principle; the scale and massing of this intervention should be rethought to ensure a subtle integration into the environment. The overall design of this extension is quite lacking and doesn’t seem to take note of the principle dwelling in regard to architectural features or pattern of fenestration. I am concerned there is a risk of a conflict between the ‘old’ and the ‘new’, and that the vagueness of proposed materials could see a stark contrast of the two forms”*

The proposed rear extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and the Conservation Area generally. As observed above, one of the main characteristics of the CA are the glimpse views between streets and these

proposals would be visible and appear at odds with the general character of the area and heritage asset.

The widening of the existing access would still ensure that a significant portion of the existing boundary wall is retained and therefore this element would not harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.

It is considered that the proposed development would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset. The level of harm is considered to be less than substantial. In such circumstances, paragraph 202 of the NPPF confirms that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this instance it is not considered that the proposed development delivers any such public benefits to outweigh the harm caused to the Conservation Area.

Amenity

Policy EQ6 requires development achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and not cause unacceptable effects by reason of visual intrusion, overlooking, shadowing, overbearing effect, noise, light pollution or other adverse impacts on local character and amenity.

The Residential Design SPD states, at 9.2, that extensions should *“be of a scale and be designed and positioned to avoid undue harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties. They must have regard to the orientation of adjacent homes, the number and position of windows and land levels. Excessive overshadowing of neighbouring habitable rooms windows, glazed doors and private garden/amenity areas should be avoided.”*

At 9.3.1 the SPD states *“an extension should not unduly reduce outlook from a main habitable room window or produce a tunnelling affect. To prevent this, extensions affecting neighbouring property should not normally extend more than 2.5 m from the rear of the affected home”*.

With regard to the proposed single storey rear extension, this would be sited sufficient distance from the boundaries with the adjoining properties, and windows to serve habitable rooms do not cause any undue harm through loss of daylight, overbearing, or overshadowing.

With regard to the proposed outbuilding, it is proposed that this would be sited along the site boundary with No.8 to the north. There is an existing modest flatroofed outbuilding located along this boundary which would be removed to facilitate the development. The proposed outbuilding is significant in scale measuring 12.4m in length. There is conflicting information with regard to the eaves and ridge heights, based on measurements from the submitted scale bars. The front and rear elevations suggest maximum eaves height of 3.6m and ridge height of 6.9m. While the side elevation show eaves and ridge heights of 3.1m and 5.7m respectively. Regardless of which measurement is correct the proposed development would represent a larger addition along the site boundary.

The curtilage of No.8 to the north, is located at a lower land level than that of the application site. This would exacerbate the significant scale of the proposed building. Given the scale of the proposals, its proximity to the site boundary, and orientation, it is considered that the proposed development would result in significant overshadowing on the private amenity space of that property. The proposals would be unneighbourly, resulting in a prominent and overbearing development to the detriment of the enjoyment of that neighbouring dwelling. Furthermore, the scale of the development is such that there would be an unacceptable impact on the outlook of residents of that property.

With regard to the relationship with No.7 College Road, there would be a significant glazed elevation facing towards that property. Although the proposal relates to ground floor accommodation only, the low boundary stone wall would not provide any screening to prevent overlooking toward this neighbour and its rear facing windows and garden area. It is considered that this would give undue overlooking to the detriment of the amenity of that property.

The scale of the development is wholly unnecessary and inappropriate which does not represent an ancillary addition to the host dwelling. The proposals would cause adverse harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties and is contrary to the Development Plan.

Highway Safety

The proposed extension do not result in an increase in bedrooms at the property and as such there is no increased demand for off street parking. The application does include a large outbuilding and as such DCC Highways have recommended a condition on any permission for this to remain ancillary.

The widening of the existing access would have no detrimental impact on highway safety.

Nutrient Neutrality

The site lies within the catchment of the River Wye which forms the Peak District Dales Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The Council has been notified that action must be taken to address exceedances of phosphorus in the River. As such, the Council cannot grant consent for development unless it can rule out “likely significant effects” on the SAC. A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) will be required when the plan or project creates a source of water pollution or has an impact on water quality and when it is within the catchment of the SAC. Initially, a screening assessment will be required to consider if “likely significant effects” (alone or in-combination) on the SAC can be ruled out. If not, this will be followed by an “Appropriate Assessment” where the impact of the plan or project is considered in detail.

Screening Assessment

The proposal is not directly connected with or necessary for the conservation management of a European site. The proposal will not increase overnight stays.

However, the proposal does involve additional hard surfacing and roof area and will therefore increase surface water run-off. However, given the very limited extent of the additional roof and hardstanding it will not significantly increase run-off from the site and in turn will not risk having a significant negative effect on the SAC either on its own or in combination with other proposals and therefore it is not necessary to carry out an Appropriate Assessment.

There are no significant trees which would be impacted by the development.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

It is considered that the proposals would not comply with the policies contained within the Development Plan and guidance within the NPPF, and as such it is recommended that the application be refused.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

Case Officer: Declan Cleary

Recommendation Date: 07/12/2022

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council