

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The host building is a former farmhouse, which was built in the late 18thC by the applicants' ancestors and has remained in the family until the present day. Mr. & Mrs. Haynes acquired the property in 2003 and carried sympathetic alterations to the property, which removed unsightly extensions. These works have enabled the building to make a positive contribution to the quality and character of the conservation area.
- 1.2 The property, which is regarded as an unscheduled heritage asset is situated in the Upper Denby conservation area.
- 1.3 This householder application seeks approval for the construction of a single storey fully glazed rear extension.

2.0 PLANNING HISTORY

- 2.1 2004/92512 the erection of a rear extension and the construction of a detached tandem garage. Granted and implemented in full.
- 2.2 2004/92513 conservation consent for the part demolition of existing extensions. Granted and carried out.
- 2.3 2022/62/92193/E the construction of a single storey rear extension. Application refused.
- 2.4 2023/62/91482/E the construction of a single storey rear extension. Application refused.

3.0 PLANNING STATEMENT

- 3.1 The officer's report for the 2022 application contained two inaccuracies. Reference was made to the residential amenity of the adjacent cottage. As the applicants own the whole of the land to the rear of the cottages there can be no adverse impact on residential amenity. The whole of the rear extension was the subject of the 2004 application and does not predate planning legislation.
- 3.2 KMC Local Plan policy LP24 includes guidance for the design of extensions. These, it suggests, should be subservient to the host building, in keeping with respect to scale materials and detailing. Awareness of any impact on the residential amenity of adjacent properties should also be considered.
- 3.3 KMC Local Plan policy LP35 deals with development in relation to the historic environment. This suggests that the preservation of the architectural and historical significance must be the overriding driver for any alterations to historic assets,

- 3.4 The above principles underpinned the design of the 2004 alteration, which continues to make a positive contribution to the conservation area.
- 3.5 Policy LP24 of the KMC SPD relating to extensions asserts that additions to properties should be well designed. Whilst this is not clearly defined reference is made to scale, compatible materials and the impact on residential amenity.
The proposed rear extension is subservient to the host building and employs materials and detailing, which are entirely compatible. The extension will not impact on the residential amenity of neighboring properties and being invisible transparent cannot adversely impact on the conservation area.
- 3.6 The design strategy will be reinforced by the blurring of the transition between between the inside and the outside of the property. The natural stone of the current building will remain visible and a flagged floor surface will be continued to form a terrace area.
- 3.7 There were no representations from neighbors or the parish council to the 2022 application, which was considered not to cause substantial harm to the heritage asset or conservation area. The comments regarding the design of the 2022 proposals have been addressed by the simplification of the proposed build form. The assertion that an extension to the rear of the property harms the legibility of the original building is erroneous as it abuts accommodation built in 2004. The legibility and character of the host building will not be impacted by this revised design. National and local planning policy encourages good design. Whilst guidance is offered on scale, materials and detailing good design is not defined and is therefore a matter for a subjective judgement.
- 3.8 Mr. & Mrs. Haynes have invested substantial sums into the repair, alteration and maintenance of Upper House, which as a consequence makes a significant contribution to the character and quality of the conservation area. This and the family connection to the property, which spans a period exceeding 200 years, will ensure that visual harm to the property will never be considered.

4.0 **DESIGN STATEMENT**

4.1 **Context.**

The application site is situated in the Upper Denby conservation Area, which is characterized by traditional stone cottages and converted farm buildings, Originally the settlement developed around livestock farming and included cottage-based textile manufacturing. This became redundant as manufacturing was concentrated in the mills which appeared during the C18 and C19 in nearby Denby Dale.

4.2 **Amount.**

This householder application seeks approval for the construction of a single storey rear extension.

4.3 **Layout.**

The layout of the proposed extension is derived from the plan and three-dimensional form of the host building. The impact of the proposals on the appearance of the host building has informed the design process.

4.4 **Scale.**

The scale of the proposed extension will be subservient the host property, which will remain fully legible.

4.5 **Appearance.**

The appearance of the proposed building has been designed to be transparent, which will ensure that the current built form will remain visible. Slim framed aluminium wall and roof cladding will maximise transparency and minimise visual impact.

4.6 **Landscape.**

Landscape treatments will be limited to the reinstatement of disturbed surfaces.

5.0 **HERITAGE STATEMENT**

5.1 The host building is a former farmhouse dating from the late 18thC. It is situated in the Upper Denby Conservation Area and makes a significant contribution to the character and quality of the village. The original outbuildings running to the north and east of the property have been converted to dwellings.

5.2 By the end of the 20thC the building group had evolved organically in response to the functional requirements of the farming business. This resulted in a disparate arrangement of materials and forms which concealed the original farmhouse.

5.3 At the time that the applicants took over the property the cottage to the south of Upper House and a large, detached garage had been demolished. The 2004 application included the removal of all the unsightly rear extensions and their replacement with a sympathetic design for single and two storey extensions, which preserved the legibility of the host building and presented a coherent architectural expression to the street scene.

5.4 The design of the proposed rear extension is based on a simple geometric form. Being transparent the current form of the building will remain legible.

The impact on the character and quality of the conservation area will be negligible.

6.0 PHOTOGRAPHS



1960s Aerial View



Current Street Scene