

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2024/0305
Valid 13/08/2024

GREEN ACRES GOW HOLE
FURNESS VALE

PROPOSED EXTENSION AND
ALTERATIONS

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Green belt location/ principle of development
- Design
- Amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site relates to a large detached plot, located within the green belt to the east of Furness Vale. The dwelling has an adjoining garage to the side elevation and has previously been extended to create a rear porch area which is now used as a utility room and a conservatory to the side elevation.

The dwelling has one neighbouring property, Goyt Cottage to the west and is accessed by a private road, at the bottom of which sits Meadows Farm, over 280m to the south of the application site.

PROPOSAL

The application proposed the following extensions and alterations:

- Demolition of the existing conservatory to side elevation
- Single storey rear extension
- New 3x dormer windows to the front elevation of the existing dwelling
- Replacement of the existing dormers to the rear elevation, amending the existing arrangement of 4 dormers to two larger dormers
- Demolition of the existing adjoining garage structure to the side elevation of the property and provision of a new separate garage structure to the rear of the property with the extension of hard standing to the rear of the property to allow vehicular access to the proposed garage structure.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Local Plan 2016

S 1 Sustainable Development Principles
S 1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
EQ 2 Landscape Character
EQ 3 Rural Development
EQ 4 Green Belt Development

EQ 6 Design and Place Making
CF 6 Accessibility and Transport

National Planning Policy Framework

Chapter 2: Achieving Sustainable Development
Chapter 12: Achieving well designed places
Chapter 13: Protecting Green Belt

Other relevant SPD's

Whaley Bridge Neighbourhood Development Plan
High Peak Design Guide SPD 2018
High Peak Residential Design Guide SPD 2005

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/2002/0546: Conservatory and rear porch. Approved 28/0/2002.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 26/09/2024
Neighbour consultation period ends: 26/09/2024
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None

Town / Parish Comments

Chinley, Buxworth & Brownside Parish Council: No objection

Environmental Health

None

Derbyshire County Council Highways

The proposed alterations and extensions to the property will increase the number of bedrooms from the existing four to six with the additional bedrooms likely to increase vehicle movements generated by the site and increase the demand for parking.

The site is located some distance from the highway boundary and it is considered that the application site has sufficient space to accommodate the likely parking requirements generated by the property all clear of the public highway.

The application site access/junction with the public highway is considered to have acceptable emerging and forward visibility in both directions and is of sufficient width to accommodate additional vehicular movements generated by the dwelling.

There are no highway authority objections to the application.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The site lies outside the built up area boundary and is located within the Green Belt and Open Countryside. Paragraph 153 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

NPPF paragraph 142 states the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

NPPF paragraph 153 states when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

NPPF Paragraph 154 states development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of the exceptions apply. Para 154 (c) states that the extension or alteration of a building is considered appropriate development provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

LP Policy EQ3 applies to any development proposal that is located in the open countryside. The policy seeks to ensure that new development is strictly controlled in order to protect the landscape's intrinsic character and distinctiveness and supports extensions to existing dwellings provided they are subsidiary to the building and do not have an adverse impact on the character of the landscape.

LP Policy EQ 4 states that within the Green Belt, planning permission will not be granted for development unless it is in accordance with national planning policy. As such it must be determined if the proposal is considered appropriate development for within the Green Belt.

The proposed extension and alterations amount to the extension or alteration of a building under para 154c.

Due to the close proximity of the proposed garage to the dwelling house, recent appeal decisions and case law appear to have generally adopted the approach that if a proposed outbuilding is within close enough proximity to the dwelling and a normal domestic adjunct to a dwelling house then it should be assessed as an extension to the property.

Examples include *Warwick DC v SSLUGC and others* [2022], the High Court had to consider whether a detached garden room could be an extension for the purposes of the exceptions to inappropriate development in the Green Belt (currently at NPPF 154(c)). The court accepted that a “normal domestic adjunct”, such as a garage or other outbuilding, could be physically separate from the main building. It noted that some detached outbuildings had less impact than an attached extension; confirming that “extension of a building” in NPPF 154(c) can include outbuildings which are normal domestic adjuncts to the building.

Appeal decision APP/H1033/D/22/3313417, made against HPBC for the refusal of a detached two storey garage. The appeal was dismissed, however the Inspector concluded, the proposal would comprise a normal domestic adjunct to the host dwelling and, in this instance, it can be considered an extension under paragraph 149 c) of the Framework (2022).

The proposed garage is less than 5m from the dwelling house, as such will be assessed under para 154c.

Therefore, the principle of development is acceptable subject to a detailed assessment of relevant planning considerations.

Impact on Green Belt

Paragraph 152 of the NPPF states Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

Paragraph 154(c) of the NPPF does state that “the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building” is appropriate.

The NPPF does not define the term ‘disproportionate’ however as a typical guide a figure of a 30% increase in floorspace from the original dwelling is not uncommon and is generally considered an acceptable extension in the Green Belt.

Approximate external floor space measurements have been undertaken by the officer and are outlined below:

	Existing	Proposed	Increase
Ground floor footprint	104.2m2	137m2	31.5%
First floor footprint	74.6m2	85m2	14%
Garage	35.7m2	43.9m2	22%
Total:	214.5m2	265.9m2	24%

The rear porch and conservatory have been discounted from existing floor space as these do not form part of the original dwelling, the conservatory is to be demolished so has not been included the percentage increase of floorspace. The garage however, does form part of the original dwellinghouse. Given the above, the proposed extension and alterations, including the garage would result in an overall average enlargement of the original dwelling by approximately a 24% increase in footprint.

The proposed development would not exceed a 30% increase in floorspace to the original dwelling house, as such the scheme would be considered a modest enlargement that would not constitute disproportionate development that would impact the openness of the Green Belt.

It is accepted that there would inevitably be a visual change to the aesthetics of the site comparable to its current state. However, just because a proposal can be seen does not make it harmful in visual terms. The nature of the proposal is appropriate for its rural and secluded location and due to its modest nature, it is considered that the visual aspect of openness would be preserved.

As such, it is considered that all aspects of the proposed development, would preserve openness of the Green Belt and the application is compliant with LP Policy EQ4 and relevant restrictive policies contained under Chapter 13 of the NPPF.

Design

LP Policy S1 sets out a number of sustainability principles which all new development proposals should incorporate in order to make a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities and to 9 protect, and where possible enhance the environment.

LP Policy EQ2 looks to resist development which would harm or be detrimental to the character of the local and wider landscape and will seek to protect, enhance and restore the landscape character of the Plan Area for its own intrinsic beauty and for its benefit to the economic, environmental and social well-being of the Plan Area.

LP Policy EQ3 refers to rural development proposals which lie outside of the defined built-up area boundaries and seeks to ensure that new development is strictly controlled in order to protect the landscape's intrinsic character and distinctiveness.

LP Policy EQ6 states that all development should be well designed to respect and contribute positively to the character, identity and context of High Peak's townscapes, having regard to matters of scale, height, density, layout, appearance and materials.

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states amongst other matters that new developments should add to the overall quality of the area, be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.

The Adopted Residential (SPD) (2005) chapter 9 states that:

- "extensions and alterations to existing houses can have a significant impact on the appearance of a house, neighbouring property and the street scene. It

is important, on all types of houses, that domestic development is carefully designed.”

- *chapter 9.4.1 states that: - “Appropriate extensions to the roofline can be made by extending the main roof to the side (a ‘catslide’ roof) or by creating a secondary gabled roof at right angles. In view of their often squat and ungainly appearance, the prevailing climate and ongoing maintenance problems, flat roofs should be avoided.”*

Para 9.4.2 states:

- *“Dormers pose difficulties in terms of design and overlooking. They should be kept as small and simple as possible; they will often be unacceptable on the front elevation of houses, especially terraced properties.”*

The High Peak Design Guide SPD (2018) contains useful design guidance for new development including extension, covering a number of different aspects, to ensure that schemes are of a high quality that is appropriate for its context. Para 5.10 states:

- *“Garages need to be designed and built in sympathy with the properties they serve. Materials and roof pitch should generally match the parent building. A separate garage is often the better solution.”*

A single storey flat roofed rear extension is proposed to enlarge the downstairs living area. Throughout the consultation period, amended plans were sought to reduce the depth of the extension, so it would not exceed 50% of the depth of the host dwelling, which made it appear a somewhat disproportionate addition. The agent agreed to amend the plans, with the proposed extension now extending 3.35m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling, remaining largely subservient to the main dwelling house.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Residential Design SPD states flat roofs should be avoided, following discussions with the agent, it became clear other roof forms were considered, however, due to the low eaves on the existing dwelling, a pitched roof would not be possible. Whilst it is noted the flat roof makes the extension appear somewhat bulky, due to the rear positioning and remote location of the application site, it would not be visible from any public vantage points. As such, no harm would be caused to the street scene and in this instance the flat roof is considered to be acceptable.

The proposed materials are stone to match the existing dwelling house and a reinforced bitumen flat roof.

It is noted a Public Right of Way sits to the east of the application site, however, the subject property is heavily screened to the rear by mature trees and shrubs, limiting views of the site. Furthermore, the PRoW is approx. 65.5m from the dwelling house, as such long distance views would be glimpsed at best.

Turning to the three dormer windows proposed to the front elevation, whilst dormers to the front elevation are generally discouraged, these dormers represent a modest

and simple design allowing the family to efficiently utilize the roof space. The large roof plane can comfortably accommodate the three small dormers, without appearing overly dominant, whilst there will be a visual change to the principal elevation, the dormers maintain a reserved appearance and will not harm the roof slope or character of the property. Furthermore, due to the very remote location of the application site the only visibility from the street are the residents of the neighbouring Goyt Cottage to the west and glimpses for the residents of Meadows Farm to the south, whilst using the private access road. Moreover, given the existing dwelling carries little architectural merit it is not considered the front dormers will cause harm to the street scene or character of the dwelling house.

There is a PRow which runs to the south-west, which sits approximately 50m from the application site at its closest point. However, given the generous distance and the high level intermittent mature trees parallel to the private access road, any viewpoints would only be glimpsed.

The proposed materials are slate tiles to the pitched roof structures to match existing and render to the walls, whilst there is no render on the existing property, Goyt Cottage, the neighbour to the west is fully rendered, as such this will not look out of context within the street scene.

The existing dormers to the rear elevation are of a lower quality design, the replacement and rearrangement of these with two larger dormers is considered to be no more harmful than the existing dormers. Due to the rear location there will be no impact on the street scene, given these are replacement dormers, it cannot be considered this element of the development would cause harm to the character of the dwellinghouse.

The existing adjoining garage which forms part of the original dwellinghouse is proposed to be demolished, with the construction of a new detached single storey garage to the north of the dwelling, with vehicular access leading to the rear of the property to the new garage.

With regard to the garage, the council's Residential Design SPD, paragraph 9.7 states that '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 detached garage is single storey and despite it being slightly larger than the existing garage, due to its depth, with a height increase of 0.5m from the existing eaves, and approx. 0.55m lower than the existing apex, the garage will be 3m at its highest point, as such it will still appear subservient to the main dwelling house.

The siting of the garage to the rear of the application site will have a limited impact on the street scene, remaining well screened within a remote location. The proposed materials are stone to match the dwelling house and a reinforced bitumen flat roof.

Whilst it is preferable for the roof pitch of a garage to match that of the existing dwelling, following discussions with the agent, it was made clear a flat roof is preferable for the applicant. It is considered the proposed development will not have an adverse impact on the appearance of the existing property in the context of the street scene

due to the isolated location and will remain well screened from vantage points, with very little impact on the character of the local area as the rear of the property is not visible in the street scene. As such it cannot be considered appropriate to refuse the application on this basis.

Accordingly, the siting, scale and proposed materials are considered appropriate and accord with the requirements of policies S1 and EQ6, the Residential Design Guide SPD and the NPPF.

Amenity

LP Policy EQ6 requires all new development to have a satisfactory relationship with existing land and buildings and protects the amenity of the area, which includes residential amenity of neighbouring properties. Aspects of residential amenity include impacts such as a loss of sunlight, overshadowing and overbearing impacts, loss of outlook, and loss of privacy.

The Adopted Residential Design Guide (SPD) (2005) paragraph 8.6.1 states that there should be 21 meters between adjacent habitable windows to provide an acceptable level of amenity.

Parah 135 of the NPPF states that planning should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

The application site lies within the Countryside within a largely isolated location, with only one neighbouring property, Goyt Cottage, which sits approx. 24m to the west of the application site. This is considered well above the Council's privacy standards, as such there are no amenity concerns regarding this neighbour, including overshadowing, loss of light or loss of privacy.

The application is considered to be compliant with Local Plan Policy EQ6, the Residential Design Guide SPD and the NPPF, with regards to potential impacts on neighbouring residential amenity.

Highway Safety

The proposal will increase the number of bedrooms from four to six, which requires 3 parking spaces to be in line with the Council's parking standards. There property has a large drive with parking provision for 3 cars. There are no highway authority objections.

As such, there are not considered to be any highway safety impacts arising from the proposed development, in line with LP Policy CF6.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The proposal is considered acceptable in principle and in terms of design and amenity and will not result in any adverse amenity impacts and is of acceptable design and is considered to be in accordance with the relevant policies put forward in the Local Plan and NPPF. Therefore, the application is recommended for approval

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Approve

Case Officer: Jennifer Robb

Recommendation Date: 13/12/2024

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council