

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2023/0530
Valid 05/12/23

HIGHGATE HALL,
HIGHGATE ROAD,
HAYFIELD, DERBYSHIRE,
SK22 2JW

REPLACEMENT
OUTBUILDING (FULL -
HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of Development
- Design Considerations (inc setting of Listed Building)
- Impact upon Residential Amenity
- Impact upon Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site relates to a residential property which lies within the open countryside, in the green belt, as defined by the Local Plan policies map. The site includes a detached dwelling, which has been extended, a detached outbuilding, residential curtilage including gardens and parking areas. The dwelling is accessed via a sloping drive from Highgate Road, with the property set at a higher land level than the public highway. The site boundaries adjacent to the highway are well vegetated.

Highgate Hall is a Grade II Listed Building. The Official Historic England listing describes the property as:

PARISH OF HAYFIELD HIGHGATE ROAD (west side) Highgate Hall II House. C17, altered in C20. Coursed gritstone with large quoins. Gritstone dressings. Stone slate roof. Large external stack, stepped in towards top, to west elevation. Two storeys. Two bay west elevation. Large stack to north. C20 glazed porch to south, covering formerly two-light: recessed and chamfered window and C20 glazed door. Between porch and stack C20 window. To south, former three-light recessed and chamfered window, now with central square section mullion. Both gable walls have C20 windows. Chamfered quoined doorcase with pointed arched lintel to rear. C20 door.

PROPOSAL

This application proposes the replacement of the existing outbuilding. The existing outbuilding is located to the front of the main property on the opposite side of the driveway/parking area. The building comprises a timber structure with pitched roof and overall height of 2.56m. The proposed outbuilding would be sited in the same location as the existing building. It is proposed that the building would be vertically clad timber and would have a near flat roof. The proposed maximum height would be 2.56m. The building includes concertina doors to its northwestern elevation.

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
- EQ2 Landscape Character
- EQ3 Rural Development
- EQ4 Green Belt Development
- EQ6 Design and Place Making
- EQ7 Built and Historic Environment
- EQ9 Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

Residential Design (2005)
High Peak Design Guide (2018)

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 12: Achieving Well-designed and beautiful Places
Section 13: Protecting Green Belt Land
Section 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

Various (including applications for Listed Building Consent), the most relevant being:

HPK/2017/0191 - Replacement of existing wooden outbuilding (wendyhouse/shed) within the curtilage of a listed building – Approved – 06/07/17

HPK/2010/0638 - Erection of a timber garden store/shed to provide storage for grass cutting equipment and garden tools to maintain grounds and paddock, erection of timber fencing and gates and relocation of Wendy House – Approved – 01/03/11

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 30/01/24
Neighbour consultation period ends: 18/01/24
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None received

Town / Parish Comments

None received

DCC Highways

No objections

Conservation Officer

Objection. The heritage statement is poor and does not go into any analysis with regard to setting, nor does it appear to appraise the site appropriately and in accordance with NPPF paragraph 200 in order to demonstrate there is no harm. From preliminary investigation the site, asset, and proposal area is aloft on a bank at the traditional approach to the asset. With the proposal area 'seen first' and therefore within direct line of sight and setting of the asset. I encourage a revision of the heritage statement in order for me to assess accordingly.

OFFICER COMMENTS**Principle of Development**

The application proposes householder development to a property which is located within the open countryside, designated as green belt, as defined by the Local Plan Policies Map.

Policy E3 relates to rural development and states that extensions to existing dwellings may be acceptable provided that it is subsidiary to the building and does not have an adverse impact on the character of the landscape. Policy E4, which relates to Green Belt development, states that development in such locations will not be permitted unless it is in accordance with national planning policy.

The NPPF identifies that the construction of new buildings within the Green Belt will be considered to be inappropriate development and will only be allowed where it meets one of the exceptions identified within paragraph 154. Paragraph 154 allows for extensions to an original building, provided it does not result in disproportionate additions to the dwelling as originally constructed. In addition paragraph 154 allows for the replacement of a building provided that the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the building it replaces.

The proposal to replace the existing building could be an exception to development within the Green Belt provided it is in the same use, and not materially larger than the existing building.

The scheme is for householder development. The building would be incidental to the main dwellinghouse, as the existing building is. As such the proposals would not result in any material change of use of the planning unit. The development therefore complies with this stipulation.

There is no definition of what constitutes a “materially larger” building. This is therefore a matter of planning judgement based on the merits of the scheme. In this instance. The proposed outbuilding would be sited in the same position as the existing building. The existing buildings footprint is 6m x 3m (18sqm), while the proposed building would have a footprint of 7m x 3.5m (24.5sqm), representing an overall increase of just over 25%. The increases in width (1m) and depth (0.5m) of the building would not be significant, the building would remain modest.

The development would have the same maximum height as the existing building, although there would be a change in roof design from gable to near flat roof. Consequently the building would be bulkier. Nonetheless, the increase in mass of the modest building is not considered to be significant. Given the building is sited in the same location, and only increases the scale of the building by a minor degree in width, depth and height (to eaves), the building would have a similar effect on the spatial and visual elements of openness, and is not considered to be materially larger than the building it replaces.

For the above reasons, it is considered that the proposals represent appropriate development within the Green Belt.

Design Considerations

This dwelling is a Grade II Listed Building. S.66(1) of The Town and Country Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the LBCA), requires that special regard be had to the desirability of preserving the building, its setting, and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

The proposal does not affect the Listed Building itself, although the location of the proposed outbuilding lies within its setting.

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.

Policy EQ 7 states that the council will conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance and that particular protection will be given to designate heritage assets and their setting.

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

The Conservation Officer has raised concern with regard to the robustness of the heritage statement, and the impact on the development on the main approach/view into the site. A heritage statement has been provided and, while very brief, given that

the proposals relate to the replacement of a structure, which is largely like for like in scale and materials, it is considered sufficient to support the application in this instance. This conclusion has been reached following the benefit of a site visit.

As has been identified in the above section, the proposed building would not be materially larger than the existing building. Furthermore, the proposal would be of similar materials and, therefore, its appearance would also be similar.

The building is located on a slightly lower land level than the main driveway. Although the site itself is elevated, by some degree, from the public highway. Existing landscaping largely screens the development from Highgate Road, as such the building is not prominent or adversely affect views of the Listed Building, which itself is also largely screen. Historic streetview imagery shows that when the site does not benefit from screening the outbuilding, and Listed Building would be visible. Nonetheless, the larger glazed elevation which would be visible would assimilate with the expanse of glazing within the modern extension to the Listed Building which would represent a continuation of distinguishing between old and new. This would be a more appropriate elevation than the side of the existing shed. Therefore, should the landscaping be lost or significantly reduced then it is considered that no harm to setting, over the existing, would arise.

When entering the site along the driveway the existing building is inconspicuous with Listed Building being the prominent view along the driveway.

The effect on the setting of the Listed Building would be similar to existing, as such it is considered that its setting would be preserved.

The extent of screening, and modest scale of the building is such that no adverse harm to the landscape setting or character and appearance of the countryside would arise.

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.

While there are properties along Highgate Road, they are sufficient distance from the proposed development not to be affected by the modest increase in scale. No amenity issues would therefore arise.

Highway Safety

The proposal would not increase the number of bedrooms within the development while existing off street parking would be retained. No highway safety implications would arise from the proposed development.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

It is considered that the proposals would comply with the policies contained within the Development Plan and guidance within the NPPF, and as such it is recommended that the application be approved.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : APPROVE

Case Officer: Declan Cleary

Recommendation Date: 07/02/24

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council