

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

**HPK/2023/0514
VALID 28/11/2024**

**TORINO, ST MARYS ROAD,
NEW MILLS, DERBYSHIRE,
SK22 3BW**

**RE SUBMISSION OF
HPK/2022/0498 - RAISE ROOF
LEVEL TO PROVIDE
ACCOMMODATION AT FIRST
FLOOR, SINGLE STOREY
REAR EXTENSION, NEW
PORCH AND ALTERATIONS
TO WINDOWS AND DOORS
(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

MAIN ISSUES

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

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site is located within the settlement boundary for New Mills as defined by the Local Plan policies map. The site relates to a detached bungalow which is located on the edge of a predominantly residential area. The site forms the end property of a row of dwellings located on the eastern side of St Marys Road. A detached outbuilding is located to the rear of the property. To the south of the site is St Marys RC Church and churchyard, to the east St Marys Catholic Primary School and to the west is High Lea Park. The site is adjoined by the New Mills Conservation Area.

PROPOSAL

This application proposes an upward extension to the dwelling, including the raising of existing eaves and ridge heights of the dwelling in its entirety, to create a two storey property. Two dormer/gable windows are proposed within the front elevation. A single storey extension to the rear/side is also proposed. The scheme also includes a new porch and alterations to existing fenestration.

A kitchen dining area, lounge, snug and utility are proposed at ground floor and three bedrooms (one en-suite), shower room and large landing at first floor level.

This application is the resubmission of a previously refused application for an upwards extension (HPK/2022/0498). That application was refused on the basis of the effect of the development on the streetscene/character and appearance of the area, and the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Local Plan (Adopted 2016)

S1	Sustainable Development Principles
S1a	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
S2	Settlement Hierarchy
S6	Central Sub-area Strategy
EQ1	Climate Change
EQ6	Design and Place Making
EQ7	Built and Historic Environment
CF6	Accessibility and Transport

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

Residential Design (2005)
High Peak Design Guide (2018)
New Mills Character Appraisal (2008)

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 12: Achieving Well-designed Places
Section 16: Conserving and enhancing the Historic Environment

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/2022/0497	Conversion of outbuilding to provide ancillary accommodation – Approved – 06/01/23
HPK/2022/0498	Raise eaves and ridge of existing bungalow to form two storey dwelling, new front porch, new single storey rear extension and alterations to windows and doors – Refused – 21/06/23

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 22/12/23
Neighbour consultation period ends: 21/12/23

Public Comments

None received

Town / Parish Comments

No objection

DCC Highways

Drawing 200 was submitted for application HPK/2022/0498 and the above application has submitted drawing number 200 Rev B which has not altered the footprint of the dwelling or the amount of bedrooms previously proposed, so again I can confirm that there are no highway safety objections to the application subject to the existing on site parking provision remaining available.

Conservation Officer

Background:

The proposal site situated on the boundary of and therefore within the immediate setting of New Mills Conservation Area, designated heritage asset, sees the existing conditions responding successfully to the topography and open nature of the vicinity. As such the existing, despite it being a modern or later bungalow of no architectural value, allows the dwelling to sit quietly and subserviently in this location.

Opposite the dwelling is GII High Lee Hall and GII Store House (Formerly Carriage House to High Lee Hall) set among grounds, now garden of remembrance. To the immediate south of the site is The Church of the Annunciation, St Mary's Road and graveyard, with respective original drystone boundary walling, also set back and among mature trees and greenery.

Appraisal:

New Mills in 1835 was described as a Hamlet, formerly alongside 9 other Hamlets in the area grouped together known as Bowden Middlecale. The area previously forming part of the Royal Forest of the Peak, passing into the hands of the Duchy of Lancaster in 1372. The 10 in total hamlets were grouped as follows:

Great Hamlet, Phoside and Kinder.

Bear, Ollersett, Thornsett and Whitle.

Chinely, Bugsworth and Brownside.

Substantial industrial development of the area is focused around the 1800s with railway bridges, viaducts and roads being constructed to feed the Mills around the Torrs and Goyt in circa 1864 onward. A response to the vast variations in land and topography, the construction of such forms part of the integral identity of the area. Characterised by the rough stone of the vernacular, this is also seen forming part of the workers (or locals), social and domestic architecture in the street scene of the villages and towns.

The earliest calico printing Mill appeared in the area in 1821, with further Mills and respective industrial buildings for cotton and printing also seen around this time. Industry in both fabrics and printing began to peter out toward the late 1800s with only Torr Vale Mill continuing to be active until 2000, giving that Mill over 200 years of service.

The Church of the Annunciation, St Mary's Road, was built in circa 1846. In a decorated gothic style, a revival of an ancient parish Church, its Spire is imposing and particularly narrow, and can be seen from a variety of points across the area. The earliest maps available dated 1882 demonstrate the Church, along with High

Lee Hall in this vicinity. Both are set close to the former Sheffield and Midland Committee Railway (Marple to New Mills and Hayfield) with on this edition, the Torr Mill seen a short way to the south east. There are no dwellings enveloping the Church at this time. A former school house lies to the immediate south with the Church orientated semi-perpendicular to the now modern day St Mary's Road. It is situated on an eminence (a piece of rising ground) and consists of nave, aisles, south porch, sacristy, and tower and spire. The east window intricately decorated in stained glass depicts a representation of the Annunciation.

High Lee Hall, home to the Barnes Family and later the Bennett family both owners of two local Mills, is also of the vernacular. The Barnes family name recorded in the area since 1781. It was built originally as Farthing Hall, said to have been constructed using the farthings of Mill workers when they were fined for poor time keeping. Thomas Barnes final resting place is also said to be at the Church of the Annunciation. Subsequent later wealthy occupiers of the Hall consisted of calico merchants, ironmongers, master steam engine builders and paper manufacturers. (A list too long to create for the purpose of this appraisal).

In present day the route of approach is a gradual incline and ascent to the north, seeing a curvature arcing north east with the Church on the right hand side, or east of this road. A small school house survives today at the southern corner of the immediate vicinity, in the matching vernacular stone masonry of the Church, further contributing to the historic legibility of this place. The positioning of the Church a deliberate act. Shortly after the school house, the Church is revealed in a vast and impressive view. On return the route complements the view back toward the south and across the open park and garden space surrounding High Lee Hall.

The area remains well read, of strong historic significance and a relationship remains between the pattern of the street scene, reflecting of the towns early development.

Due to the significance of the Church of the Annunciation and this vicinity being a gateway introductory location, I would be minded to view the status of this Church as equivalent to a NDHA. It is not a listed building due to its continuing use as a place of worship. A well survived primitive yet substantially built early Georgian gothic revival piece, its placement in this vicinity contributes strongly to a sense of place and identity. The full range of heritage values are evident, and it is seen to contribute substantially to the setting of the Conservation Area and setting of High Lee Hall and grounds adjacent.

Proposal:

The proposal sees the enlarging of the existing bungalow into a two storey and more contemporary dwelling. Other features include but are not limited to; extensive glazing at south elevation (facing directly into the graveyard and onto the Church), proliferation of rooflights, grey upvc window joinery, white rendered walling, Juliet balcony and large central porch to front. The roofing and height is raised but such that when viewed in south elevation, it looks to be an uncomfortably large form and with overbearing roof lines.

I do not agree that this scheme would impose no harm on the Conservation Area, its setting, and views in and out of this exposed location. I assess that due to the unnatural appearance of the proposal; it would be severely visually obtrusive and cause much visual conflict. The southern gable with the extensive and uncomfortable fenestration looks to substantially compete with the natural green and humble setting of the area. This of which does not provide enhancement to the setting nor context of the Church. In addition to this, it does not appear subservient nor considerate to the historic context of the Church to have such an open and transparent side to the dwelling.

To conclude:

I cannot support this scheme and recommend refusal. With the High Peak Design Guide SPD being relevant and by virtue of the scale and form, including substantially pronounced contemporary finishing materials and features; I do not see this project sitting quietly and harmonising successfully with its historic context. I am unsure as to what has been used to inform the project as above, and there is no precedent for domestic architecture of this kind in this vicinity.

The proposals would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, contrary to Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. With regard to the NPPF the heritage harm would be less than substantial, however at this time it is not considered there are any public benefits to outweigh this harm. Paragraphs 202 being relevant.

It is seen at this time the scheme also contravenes the following Local Policies: EQ6 and EQ7.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application proposes householder development within the settlement of New Mills. Policy S6 confirms that within the Central Sub Area sustainable growth will be promoted which reflects the historic character of the settlements, provides increasing range of employment opportunities, promotes the growth of a sustainable tourist economy and meets the housing needs of the local community.

Householder development in such locations is considered to be acceptable, as a matter of principle, subject to in this instance, matters relating design, including the setting of heritage assets, amenity and highway safety.

Design Considerations (including impact on Heritage Assets)

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.

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.

Policy EQ 7 states that the council will conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. The application site is located adjacent to the New Mills Conservation Area and as such is within its setting.

The application proposes a predominantly upwards extension, which would change the character of the existing dwelling from a bungalow to a detached two storey dwelling. Upwards extensions clearly would not represent subservient additions to the host dwelling and therefore the original character of the host property would be lost. Nonetheless, it is necessary to assess the effects of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

The existing dwelling represents an anomaly within the surrounding streetscene which is characterised by two storey properties of traditional form and design, comprising predominantly semi-detached properties with hipped roofs. Given the siting of the dwelling adjacent to the churchyard the dwelling occupies a prominent location from the open space to the south. Nonetheless, the single storey nature of the existing building provides a gradual transition of built form between the row of residential properties and the open character of the adjacent to the church yard of St Mary's RC Church. Furthermore, views are retained towards the church when approaching along St Marys Road from the north.

In addition to the increases in height, the scheme includes the introduction of large elements of glazing on its southern elevation, the introduction of gable dormers on the front elevation, and the rendering of the property. These elements introduce non-traditional design approaches to the area. The use of gable dormers to the front elevation is inconsistent with the more simple and traditional form of dwellings in the area.

The introduction of a two-storey dwelling would be more prominent from the church yard, particularly the mass and scale of its large flank gable elevation which is proposed to address the churchyard. This elevation also includes large elements of uncharacteristic glazing, and render, which would be prominent and attract undue attention to the building. It is considered that this would represent a dominant and incongruous form of development when viewed from the church yard. Additionally, due to the scale, design and appearance of the proposed dwelling, it would be more

prominent and from St Marys Road, which viewed from the south. The design approach is considered to be harmful from these vantage points.

When approaching from the north, given the scale of the development, existing views of the church would become obscured by the two-storey scale of the proposed development. While the applicant suggests that views of the church would not be significantly obscured, it is clear that an increase in scale of the building would erode existing views of the church tower which, would have a negative effect on the character and appearance of the area, and appreciation of the church.

The church and churchyard are located within the Conservation Area and the application site is clearly within the setting of the Conservation Area. There is a statutory duty, under s.72 of The Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

The New Mills Character Appraisal identifies the adjacent St Marys Roman Catholic Church significantly contribute to the townscape quality of the conservation area and the character of sub-area 5 (High Lea Park). The Conservation Officer has provided a detailed appraisal of the Conservation Area in this location. It is considered that the significance of the heritage asset, insofar as it relates to the application proposals, relates to the historic pattern of development reflecting the towns early development.

It has been identified that the application site lies within the immediate setting of the Conservation Area, and the existing development is relatively discrete in this regard and allows for views to/from the adjacent church and church yard to not be unduly affected or compromised. The site therefore contributes towards its setting, both visually and functionally. For the reasons identified above, the proposed development would fail to ensure that an appropriate relationship is maintained and given its scale, prominence and design would result in a development which fails to preserve and enhance the setting and as such would affect the significance of the heritage asset.

It is therefore considered that the proposed development would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area, due to erosion of its setting. Great weight is attached to harm to heritage assets, and ought only be approved where there are public benefits which outweigh the harm.

The applicants cite two storey development which has been constructed to the south of the church. This development has a more intimate physical relationship with the church and surrounding buildings and does not address the church yard. Furthermore, these buildings have a more traditional design approach. The proposals therefore are not considered to be directly comparable and do not set a precedent.

This application is the resubmission of an earlier refused application for upward extensions to the property. That application was refused due to the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the streetscene and setting of the Conservation Area. While it is acknowledged that the scheme has been reduced in

height, the issues arising are prevailing and the harm has not been overcome through the amended proposals.

In this instance, it is not considered that such public benefits exist.

The development therefore conflicts with the Policies of the Development Plan and guidance contained within the NPPF.

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 extended dwelling would be sited in a position which follows the existing building line, largely on the same footprint, and as such the relationship with rear facing habitable rooms of No.34 would not be altered. It is noted that there are side facing windows within the flank elevation of No.34 but these would not be considered to be principal openings, while the driveway of No.34 between would provide some relief in terms of outlook.

Given the siting of the dwelling, it is not considered that the proposals would result in any significant overshadowing or overbearing to private amenity spaces to result in an adverse impact upon amenity.

Principal openings to habitable rooms would be sited on the front rear, and southern side elevations and as such would not directly face towards residential properties. A Juliet Balcony is proposed to the rear elevation however, again, this would look towards the garden rather than directly over any adjacent private amenity space. First floor ensuite windows are proposed to the side elevation facing towards No.34 and these can be conditioned to be obscured glazed in order to preserve privacy for both properties.

Highway Safety

LP Policy CF6 'Accessibility and Transport' seeks to ensure that new development can be safely accessed in a sustainable manner and minimise the need to travel, particularly by unsustainable modes.

There would be sufficient off street parking to serve the dwelling, along with the ancillary accommodation which has been recently approved.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

It is considered that the proposals would fail to 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: 23/01/2024

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council