Combined Design & Access and Heritage Statement

Erection of Oak framed Orangery at The Coach House, Leashaw, Holloway, Derbyshire, DE4 5AT

Prime Oak,
The Millworks,
Heath Mill Road,
Wombourne,
South Staffordshire,
WV5 8AP

CONTENTS

1.0. Introduction 2
2.0. Site Context and Surrounding Area 3
3.0. Proposed Development 5
4.0. National Planning Policy Context 6
4.1. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2024) 6
4.2. National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) 7
5.0. Local Planning Policy Context – Amber Valley Borough Local Plan 2022-2040, POLICY EN4 – Heritage Assets 8
6.0. Heritage Statement 9
6.1. The Coach House – Listing Summary 9
6.2. The Setting and its contribution to Significance 10
6.3. Dethick, Lea and Holloway Conservation Area – Significance 11
6.4. Impact on Historic Fabric and Listed Building Character 12
6.5. Visual and Spatial Impact 13
6.6. Overall Heritage Harm Assessment 15
7.0. Appearance, Design & Materials 16
8.0. Scale and Amount 17
9.0. Sustainable Development 18
10.0. Overall Conclusion 19

1.0. INTRODUCTION

1.1. This Combined Design & Access and Heritage Statement has been prepared by Prime Oak to accompany a joint Householder and Listed Building Consent application in respect of The Coach House, Leashaw, Holloway, DE4 5AT. The proposal comprises the erection of a mansard orangery within the existing internal courtyard of the property. The development is to be formed as a lightweight, traditionally informed addition using oak framing, natural stone to match the existing dwelling, Rutland Slate, and glazed oak-framed windows and doors, together with a flat roof section incorporating a pitched roof lantern.

1.2. The site is subject to two principal heritage constraints. Firstly, The Coach House forms part of the Grade II listed *"L Shape range of outbuildings to the north-east of Lea Hurst"* (List Entry No. 1335322, first listed 14 August 1985). Secondly, the site lies within the *Dethick, Lea and Holloway* Conservation Area. The proposal therefore requires assessment both in respect of direct effects on a designated heritage asset and its impact upon the character and appearance of the wider Conservation Area.

1.3. The statutory list description identifies the building as a former range of outbuildings now in residential use, dating from the early nineteenth century and constructed in coursed rubble gritstone with ashlar dressings, coped gables and a historic courtyard form. The list description also expressly notes that the building has experienced *"substantial C20 alterations to convert the outbuildings to dwellings with many additional openings"* and confirms that it is listed for its group value with Lea Hurst. That is an important part of the heritage baseline in this instance, because it demonstrates that the building's special interest does not derive from the courtyard elevations being wholly pristine or unaltered, but from the surviving historic form, material character, and relationship with Lea Hurst.

1.4. Lea Hurst itself is a Grade II listed house of considerable architectural and historic significance, notably as the former house of Florence Nightingale and her family. The associated outbuildings, including The Coach House, contribute to that significance through their group relationship and through their survival as part of the historic service complex. However, it is equally important to recognise that the particular courtyard area in which the orangery is proposed has already undergone notable alteration through modern domestic adaptation, including inserted openings, altered windows and doors, later courtyard treatments, and adjoining modern interventions. The proposal has therefore been deliberately directed toward the part of the asset most capable of accommodating sensitive change.

1.5. The central heritage and design principle underpinning the scheme is that the proposed orangery would infill an existing enclosed courtyard rather than extend built form out into open landscape or materially alter the principal public-facing character of the listed building. In design terms, the proposal seeks to remain visually subordinate to the host structure by virtue of its modest overall height, contained footprint, lightweight oak-framed glazed form, and the use of sympathetic materials. The intention is not to compete with the listed building, but to provide a clearly secondary and recessive addition that responds positively to the established architectural palette of stone, slate and timber.

1.6. This statement therefore: (i) describes the site and surrounding context; (ii) explains the form and materiality of the proposed development; (iii) sets out the relevant national and local planning policy framework; and (iv) provides a proportionate assessment of heritage significance and likely impact. Its purpose is to assist the Local Planning Authority in discharging its statutory duties under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and in determining the application on a properly informed basis.

2.0. SITE CONTEXT AND SURROUNDING AREA

2.1. The application site comprises The Coach House, located at Leashaw within the parish of Dethick, Lea and Holloway in Derbyshire. The building forms part of the historic group associated with Lea Hurst and lies within the Dethick, Lea and Holloway Conservation Area. The surrounding settlement pattern is characteristically rural in nature, comprising dispersed historic buildings and small hamlets positioned

within a landscape defined by mature vegetation, stone boundary walls and historic routes that follow the topography of the Derwent Valley fringe.

2.2. The Conservation Area encompasses the settlements of Dethick, Lea and Holloway and reflects their long historical development as rural communities with strong architectural and historic character. The Conservation Area Character Statement identifies the area as being distinguished by traditional buildings constructed predominantly of local gritstone with ashlar detailing, typically arranged in an informal and irregular pattern that reflects organic historic growth rather than planned urban form. Buildings are frequently set within generous plots, with strong enclosure provided by hedgerows, mature trees and traditional stone boundary walls.

2.3. Within this wider context, the built form of the Conservation Area is typified by traditional stone buildings with slate or clay tiled roofs, mullioned windows and relatively simple rectilinear forms. The character of the area derives not only from individual buildings but also from the way they are grouped together, the irregularity of building lines, and the relationship between built form and the surrounding rural landscape.

2.4. The Coach House itself forms part of the historic service buildings associated with Lea Hurst and is arranged in an "L" shaped configuration that historically enclosed a courtyard space. The form of such courtyard arrangements is typical of historic estate and service buildings, where functional outbuildings were organised around enclosed yards for working purposes. While the buildings have since been converted to residential use, the courtyard arrangement remains legible as part of the historic layout.

2.5. It is also relevant to note that the courtyard elevations of the building have been subject to a series of alterations over time associated with the conversion of the outbuildings to residential use. These include the insertion and alteration of windows and doors, the blocking and modification of historic openings, and the introduction of modern courtyard treatments and boundary structures. In addition, parts of the adjoining building group incorporate more recent architectural interventions, including altered window openings and modern glazed elements.

2.6. As a result, while the building retains its overall historic character and material palette, the courtyard elevation represents an area where the historic fabric has already experienced a degree of change and adaptation. This is an important consideration in heritage terms because it identifies a portion of the listed building where further carefully controlled intervention can potentially be accommodated without undermining the principal architectural composition or the wider appreciation of the historic group.

2.7. The proposed orangery is therefore located within the enclosed courtyard area of the building group rather than projecting outward into the wider landscape or altering the principal public elevations of the listed building. The siting of the development in this contained space ensures that the proposal remains visually contained within the historic built form of the courtyard and does not materially alter the way in which the building group is experienced within the wider Conservation Area.

3.0. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

3.1. The proposal comprises the erection of a mansard-style orangery positioned within the existing courtyard formed by the "L" shaped range of former outbuildings at The Coach House. The development would infill part of the courtyard space, creating a single-storey extension that remains visually contained within the established footprint of the existing building group.

3.2. The proposed orangery measures approximately 5.19 metres in depth and 9.1 metres in width along the front elevation, tapering to approximately 8.4 metres at the rear to reflect the geometry of the existing courtyard walls and surrounding building line. The overall ridge height is approximately 3.2 metres, ensuring the structure remains modest in scale and clearly subordinate to the surrounding stone buildings.

3.3. Architecturally, the proposal adopts a mansard-style roof arrangement finished in Rutland slates, reflecting the traditional slate roofing materials found within the surrounding historic buildings. The roof form incorporates a flat central section with a glazed roof lantern, allowing natural light to penetrate the internal space while maintaining a controlled overall roof height.

3.4. The structure itself is proposed to be oak framed, with extensive glazed panels forming the principal elevations of the orangery. Doors and windows are similarly proposed to be oak framed, ensuring consistency with the structural expression of the building and aligning with the traditional use of timber within historic ancillary structures.

3.5. At its base, the orangery will incorporate natural stonework to match the existing dwelling, ensuring visual continuity with the existing coursed gritstone construction of the Coach House. The combination of stone base, timber framing and slate roofing is intended to ensure that the proposal sits comfortably within the established material palette of the listed building and the wider Conservation Area.

3.6. The design approach intentionally adopts a lightweight architectural expression, with glazing and timber framing reducing the perceived mass of the extension when viewed from the courtyard. This approach ensures that the historic stone walls of the existing building remain the visually dominant elements of the courtyard environment.

3.7. Importantly, the development represents courtyard infill rather than an outward extension of built form into previously undeveloped space. The proposal therefore consolidates built development within the existing building envelope of the historic courtyard arrangement rather than expanding the footprint of the building group into surrounding open areas.

3.8. The proposal would form part of an existing residential planning unit and is intended to provide additional domestic accommodation associated with the dwelling. No subdivision of the property or creation of an independent planning unit is proposed. The development therefore supports the continued residential use of the listed building without altering the fundamental use or function of the site.

3.9. The overarching design principle guiding the proposal is that the orangery should remain clearly secondary to the host building, both in its scale and architectural expression. Through its modest height, lightweight construction and sympathetic material palette, the extension is intended to read as a discreet and subordinate addition within the historic courtyard setting.

3.10. As part of the proposal, an existing window on the southwest facing inset elevation is to be lowered to match the placement of an existing window to the left. When the proposal is completed, these will both be fully internal. Plan numbers 98528/10 and /11 identify this.





4.0. NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

4.1. NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF, 2024)

4.1.1. Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) establishes the Government's national policy for conserving and enhancing the historic environment. The Framework confirms that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of present and future generations.

4.1.2. The NPPF requires that planning applications affecting heritage assets describe the significance of those assets, including the contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the importance of the asset and the potential impact of the proposal. In the present case, the proposal relates to development affecting a Grade II listed building

within a designated Conservation Area, and this statement therefore provides a proportionate assessment of significance and potential impact.

4.1.3. Paragraph 212 of the NPPF states that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets when considering the impact of development proposals. The more important the asset, the greater the weight that should be given to its conservation. This principle applies irrespective of whether any harm would amount to substantial harm, total loss, or less than substantial harm.

4.1.4. The NPPF also recognises that heritage assets are capable of accommodating change, provided that such change is appropriately justified and sensitively designed. Paragraphs 213–215 establish that where harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset is identified, it must be clearly and convincingly justified. Where harm would amount to less than substantial harm, this should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

4.1.5. In addition, paragraph 219 confirms that local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting which make a positive contribution to significance should be treated favourably.

4.1.6. The NPPF therefore provides a clear framework for decision-making: development proposals affecting heritage assets should be informed by an understanding of significance, should avoid or minimise harm wherever possible, and where harm is identified it must be justified and weighed against the benefits of the proposal.

4.2. NATIONAL PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE (NPPG)

4.2.1. The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) provides additional guidance on how national planning policy relating to heritage assets should be applied in practice. The guidance emphasises the importance of understanding the significance of heritage assets and assessing the impact of development proposals on that significance in a proportionate and evidence-based manner.

4.2.2. The NPPG confirms that the significance of a heritage asset may derive not only from its physical fabric but also from its setting and the way in which it is experienced within the wider historic environment. Consequently, when assessing development proposals it is necessary to consider both direct impacts on historic fabric and indirect impacts arising from changes to the surrounding environment.

4.2.3. The guidance also recognises that not all elements of a heritage asset or conservation area will contribute equally to its significance. This is an important principle in heritage assessment because it acknowledges that some areas of historic buildings or sites may have

experienced alteration or adaptation over time and may therefore be more capable of accommodating sensitive change.

4.2.4. In assessing proposals affecting designated heritage assets, the NPPG advises that decision-makers should identify the degree of harm to significance and then weigh that harm against the benefits of the proposal. Public benefits can include a range of outcomes, including securing the long-term viable use of a heritage asset and supporting investment in its continued maintenance and conservation.

4.2.5. The guidance also emphasises that well-designed development can contribute positively to the historic environment where it respects established character, uses appropriate materials, and reinforces the qualities that make a place distinctive.

4.2.6. The national policy framework therefore supports development proposals that demonstrate a clear understanding of heritage significance and that respond sensitively to that significance through careful design, appropriate material selection, and a proportionate approach to change.

5.0. LOCAL PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT – AMBER VALLEY BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN 2022-2040, POLICY EN4 – HERITAGE ASSETS

5.1. Policy EN4 of the Amber Valley Borough Local Plan sets out the Council's approach to the protection and management of heritage assets across the Borough. The policy recognises that Amber Valley contains a significant number of heritage assets, including listed buildings, conservation areas and other historically important features which contribute to the distinctive character of the area.

5.2. The policy confirms that development proposals which preserve or enhance the significance of heritage assets will be supported. In determining planning applications, the Council will assess proposals in accordance with national policy and legislation, taking into account the significance of the heritage asset and the contribution made by its setting.

5.3. Where proposals may affect a heritage asset or its setting, applicants are required to provide a proportionate heritage assessment describing the significance of the asset and the potential impacts arising from the development. This statement therefore fulfils that requirement by providing an assessment of the significance of the listed Coach House building, its relationship with Lea Hurst, and its wider contribution to the Dethick, Lea and Holloway Conservation Area.

5.4. Policy EN4 reflects the approach established by the NPPF in distinguishing between substantial harm and less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets. Development proposals which would result in substantial harm or total loss of significance will only be permitted where exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated and where relevant policy tests are satisfied.

5.5. Where proposals would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset, the policy requires that harm be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including where appropriate the securing of the asset's optimum viable use.

5.6. The policy also encourages development which makes a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness, retains important architectural features and traditional materials, and respects the setting of heritage assets. Proposals should therefore demonstrate careful consideration of scale, design, materials and the wider historic context.

5.7. In the present case, the proposal has been developed with particular regard to these principles, ensuring that the extension remains subordinate to the listed building, utilises materials compatible with the existing structure, and is located within the enclosed area of the building group where change can be accommodated without undermining the significance of the wider heritage asset.

6.0. HERITAGE STATEMENT

6.1. THE COACH HOUSE – LISTING SUMMARY

6.1.1. The application site forms part of the Grade II listed *"L Shape range of outbuildings to the north-east of Lea Hurst"* (List Entry No. 1335322), first listed on 14 August 1985. The buildings were originally constructed in the early nineteenth century as ancillary service structures associated with the nearby house at Lea Hurst and historically functioned as estate outbuildings forming part of the wider domestic and agricultural complex serving the principal residence.

6.1.2. The listing description identifies the buildings as being constructed in coursed rubble gritstone with ashlar dressings**,** incorporating coped gables, ashlar ridge stacks and traditional masonry detailing typical of service buildings of the period. The architectural character is defined by relatively simple but robust vernacular construction, with the use of local stone materials forming an important part of the building's historic character and relationship with the surrounding rural landscape.

6.1.3. The plan form of the building group is described as an "L" shaped range, originally enclosing a courtyard space. Such arrangements are characteristic of historic service buildings, where ancillary functions were organised around working yards. The surviving courtyard form therefore contributes to the historic legibility of the complex and illustrates the functional relationship between the outbuildings and the principal house.

6.1.4. The listing description also records that the buildings have undergone substantial twentieth-century alterations associated with their conversion from outbuildings to residential use**,** including the insertion of additional openings. This observation is significant because it confirms that the buildings have evolved over time and that elements of the current elevations reflect later adaptations rather than entirely intact historic fabric.

6.1.5. The buildings are listed primarily for their group value with Lea Hurst**,** the adjacent Grade II listed house historically associated with Florence Nightingale. The architectural and historic significance of the outbuildings therefore derives not only from their physical fabric but also from their role as part of the wider historic estate complex surrounding the principal house.

6.1.6. The special interest of the listed outbuildings can therefore be understood to derive from several key attributes:

- *Their survival as historic estate service buildings associated with Lea Hurst;*
- *Their traditional construction in locally characteristic gritstone with ashlar detailing;*
- *The legibility of the historic courtyard arrangement; and*
- *Their contribution to the historic group value of the wider Lea Hurst complex.*

6.1.7. In heritage terms, the implication of this significance is that development proposals should preserve the overall historic form of the building group, respect the traditional material palette, and avoid interventions that would undermine the appreciation of the buildings as part of the wider historic group associated with Lea Hurst.

6.2. THE SETTING AND ITS CONTRIBUTION TO SIGNIFICANCE

6.2.1. The significance of the listed outbuildings is influenced not only by their physical fabric but also by their setting and historic relationship with the surrounding built environment**.** In this instance, the buildings historically formed part of the wider estate complex associated with Lea Hurst, and their significance is therefore closely linked to their functional and spatial relationship with that principal house.

6.2.2. Lea Hurst is itself a Grade II listed country house of considerable architectural and historic interest, constructed in its present form during the early nineteenth century and historically associated with Florence Nightingale and her family. The house forms the principal building within the historic group, with the surrounding outbuildings - including the Coach House - serving ancillary estate functions that supported the operation of the house and its grounds.

6.2.3. The outbuildings therefore derive part of their significance from this group relationship**,** illustrating the historic arrangement of service structures typically associated with country houses of the period. The spatial relationship between the principal house and its service buildings is a recognisable characteristic of historic estate layouts and contributes to the overall understanding of the historic site.

6.2.4. However, it is also important to recognise that the particular courtyard area in which the proposal is located forms part of the internal arrangement of the outbuilding group**,** rather than part of the principal architectural setting of Lea Hurst itself. The courtyard is visually contained

by the surrounding stone buildings and does not form a prominent component of the wider historic landscape setting associated with the main house.

6.2.5. Over time, the outbuildings have been converted from their original ancillary functions into residential use. As part of that process, the courtyard elevations have experienced a number of alterations, including the insertion and modification of openings, the alteration of windows and doors, and the introduction of modern architectural elements associated with domestic adaptation. These changes have resulted in the courtyard elevations exhibiting a more mixed architectural character than the principal external elevations of the building group.

6.2.6. The courtyard area therefore represents a part of the listed building where the historic fabric has already been subject to a degree of change and adaptation. While the overall historic form of the building group remains legible, the courtyard elevations do not retain the same degree of architectural integrity as some of the more publicly visible elevations of the building.

6.2.7. From a heritage perspective, this distinction is important because it indicates that the courtyard area is more capable of accommodating carefully designed change, provided that the wider architectural character of the building group and its relationship with Lea Hurst remain legible and unaffected.

6.3. DETHICK, LEA AND HOLLOWAY CONSERVATION AREA – SIGNIFICANCE

6.3.1. The site lies within the Dethick, Lea and Holloway Conservation Area**,** which was designated in recognition of the special architectural and historic interest of the settlements and their surrounding landscape. The designation reflects the historic development of the area as a series of rural hamlets and dispersed buildings that have evolved over time within the Derwent Valley fringe.

6.3.2. The Conservation Area Character Statement identifies the area as being defined by a strongly rural character, where historic buildings are typically arranged in an informal and irregular pattern that reflects organic historic development rather than planned urban form. Buildings frequently sit within generous plots and are often set back from the road within landscaped surroundings that include mature trees, hedgerows and traditional stone boundary walls.

6.3.3. A defining characteristic of the Conservation Area is the widespread use of local gritstone as the primary building material**,** typically laid as coursed rubble with ashlar dressings. Roofs are commonly finished in natural slate or traditional clay tiles, and buildings often incorporate traditional features such as mullioned windows, simple stone surrounds and robust masonry detailing.

6.3.4. The character of the Conservation Area is therefore derived not only from individual historic buildings but also from the collective qualities of the built environment, including the consistent use of traditional materials, the relationship between buildings and landscape, and the irregular pattern of development that reflects historic settlement growth.

6.3.5. Within this context, the Coach House contributes positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area through its traditional stone construction, historic form and its relationship with the wider group of buildings associated with Lea Hurst. The building therefore forms part of the historic architectural fabric that underpins the special interest of the area.

6.3.6. In assessing development proposals within the Conservation Area, it is therefore necessary to consider whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the established character of the area, particularly in relation to scale, form, materials and the way in which development sits within the surrounding historic environment.

6.3.7. In the present case, the proposed orangery utilises a material palette comprising natural stone, timber framing and slate roofing**,** which reflects the traditional materials identified as characteristic of the Conservation Area. Furthermore, the siting of the development within the enclosed courtyard of the existing building group ensures that the proposal remains visually contained within the historic built form and does not materially alter the wider character of the Conservation Area.

6.4. IMPACT ON HISTORIC FABRIC AND LISTED BUILDING CHARACTER

6.4.1. The primary listed building consideration is whether the proposed development would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Coach House as part of the Grade II listed outbuilding group associated with Lea Hurst. As set out in the listing description, the significance of the buildings is derived from their historic role as estate outbuildings, their traditional stone construction, and their contribution to the wider group value of the Lea Hurst complex.

6.4.2. It is important to recognise that the courtyard elevation of the building - where the proposed orangery would be located - has already been subject to a series of alterations over time. The listing description itself records that the buildings experienced substantial twentieth-century alterations associated with their conversion to residential use**,** including the insertion of additional openings.

6.4.3. Evidence from the existing elevations confirms that a number of features around the courtyard are not part of the original historic fabric. These include the insertion and repositioning of windows, the introduction of later door openings, and the presence of architectural features

such as triple Gothic-style arches that do not appear to form part of the original design of the outbuildings. In addition, sections of the adjoining building incorporate more recent elements including altered glazing and modern domestic adaptations.

6.4.4. The courtyard environment therefore reflects the evolution of the building through domestic conversion**,** rather than representing an entirely intact historic service yard. While the overall historic structure and material palette remain evident, elements of the courtyard elevations now display a mixture of historic and later interventions.

6.4.5. The proposed orangery has been deliberately located within this part of the building where historic alterations have already occurred. By directing the development toward an area of the building that has experienced adaptation, the proposal avoids intervention into the more intact and architecturally legible elevations of the building group.

6.4.6. In material terms, the proposal seeks to ensure continuity with the existing building by incorporating natural stonework to match the existing gritstone construction, together with Rutland slate roofing and oak framing**.** This approach reflects the established material palette of the building and avoids the introduction of discordant or visually intrusive materials.

6.4.7. The architectural approach also adopts a lightweight form of construction**,** with a glazed oak frame that reduces the perceived mass of the structure within the courtyard. This ensures that the historic masonry walls of the existing buildings remain visually dominant and that the new structure reads as a secondary addition rather than a competing architectural element.

6.4.8. Importantly, the development does not involve the removal of significant historic features identified within the listing description and does not alter the principal external elevations of the building group. The proposal therefore preserves the legibility of the historic outbuildings and their contribution to the wider group associated with Lea Hurst.

6.4.9. On this basis, the proposed development is considered to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building, with the intervention carefully directed to a part of the structure where change can be accommodated without undermining the defining characteristics of the asset.

6.5. VISUAL AND SPATIAL IMPACT

6.5.1. The visual impact of the proposed development must be considered both in terms of its relationship with the listed Coach House and in relation to the wider character and appearance of the Dethick, Lea and Holloway Conservation Area. In both cases, the key question is whether the proposal would materially alter the way in which these heritage assets are experienced or understood.

6.5.2. The proposed orangery would be positioned within the existing enclosed courtyard formed by the "L" shaped arrangement of the outbuildings**.** As a result, the structure would be visually contained within the internal space of the building group rather than extending outward into the wider landscape or altering the external silhouette of the historic buildings when viewed from surrounding areas.

6.5.3. The overall height of the structure - approximately 3.2 metres to ridge - ensures that the orangery remains clearly subordinate to the surrounding stone buildings, which form the dominant architectural elements within the courtyard. This controlled height prevents the development from appearing visually dominant and allows the historic masonry walls of the existing buildings to remain the defining features of the space.

6.5.4. The lightweight architectural expression of the orangery further reduces its visual presence. The extensive use of glazing combined with oak framing introduces a degree of visual permeability that prevents the structure from reading as a solid mass within the courtyard. In practical terms, this allows the historic walls of the surrounding buildings to remain clearly visible and ensures that the extension reads as a secondary element within the overall composition.

6.5.5. In terms of spatial impact, the proposal represents the infilling of part of the existing courtyard area**,** rather than the expansion of built form beyond the established building group. The development therefore consolidates accommodation within the historic footprint of the outbuildings rather than extending into surrounding open areas or altering the wider spatial relationship between the buildings and the landscape.

6.5.6. From the perspective of the Conservation Area, the proposed orangery is unlikely to have any meaningful visual presence in wider views due to its contained courtyard location and modest scale. The development does not introduce prominent new roof forms or building elements that would alter the broader townscape or landscape character of the area.

6.5.7. Similarly, the proposal does not materially affect the appreciation of Lea Hurst or its principal setting. The development remains confined to the internal courtyard of the outbuilding group and therefore does not intrude upon the principal architectural setting of the main house or its relationship with the surrounding landscape.

6.5.8. Overall, the proposal is considered to have a limited visual and spatial impact on both the listed building and the wider Conservation Area. The historic form and architectural hierarchy of the building group remain clearly legible, with the orangery reading as a contained and subordinate addition within the existing courtyard environment.

6.6. OVERALL HERITAGE HARM ASSESSMENT

6.6.1. In determining applications affecting listed buildings, the Local Planning Authority is required under Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building, its setting, and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. In addition, Section 72(1) of the Act requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

6.6.2. The assessment set out in this statement has considered the proposal against these statutory duties and against the policy framework established by the National Planning Policy Framework and the Amber Valley Local Plan. The analysis has identified that the significance of the listed outbuildings derives primarily from their historic association with Lea Hurst, their traditional gritstone construction, and the legibility of the historic building group.

6.6.3. The proposed orangery would be located within the existing internal courtyard of the building group, an area that has already experienced a degree of alteration associated with the historic conversion of the outbuildings to residential use. The proposal has been deliberately directed toward this part of the building in order to minimise any potential impact on the more architecturally intact elevations of the listed structure.

6.6.4. The design approach has also sought to minimise visual and architectural impact through the use of sympathetic materials and a lightweight architectural form. The use of natural stone to match the existing building, together with oak framing and slate roofing, ensures that the proposal sits comfortably within the established material palette of the listed building and the wider Conservation Area.

6.6.5. The modest height of the structure and its contained courtyard location ensure that the extension remains clearly subordinate to the surrounding historic buildings. The development therefore preserves the legibility of the historic outbuilding group and does not materially affect the appreciation of Lea Hurst or the wider historic landscape setting.

6.6.6. On the basis of the assessment provided in the preceding sections, the proposal is considered capable of preserving the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and preserving the character and appearance of the Dethick, Lea and Holloway Conservation Area.

6.6.7. If any heritage harm were to be identified by the decision-maker, it would fall well within the category of less than substantial harm at the lower end of the spectrum, arising primarily from the presence of a new structure within the courtyard rather than from the loss of significant historic fabric or alteration of the principal architectural composition of the building.

6.6.8. In such circumstances, paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that any less than substantial harm be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. These benefits include supporting the continued viable residential use of the listed building and enabling carefully controlled adaptation of the property in a manner that respects its historic character.

6.6.9. When considered against the statutory duties and the relevant planning policy framework, the proposal is therefore considered to represent a carefully designed and proportionate intervention that preserves the significance of the listed building and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

7.0. APPEARANCE, DESIGN & MATERIALS

7.1. The design approach for the proposed orangery has been developed with the clear objective of ensuring that the extension remains visually subordinate to the existing listed building while reflecting the established architectural character and material palette of the site. The intention is not to replicate the historic building in a manner that would blur the distinction between old and new, but rather to introduce a sympathetic addition that sits comfortably within the existing courtyard setting.

7.2. A key component of the design strategy is the use of materials that are consistent with those found within the existing building group and the wider Conservation Area. The base of the orangery is proposed to be constructed in natural stone to match the existing gritstone masonry of the Coach House. This approach ensures continuity of material character and helps visually anchor the new structure within the courtyard environment.

7.3. The primary structural form of the orangery is proposed to be oak framed, with extensive glazed panels forming the principal elevations. Oak is a traditional material that has historically been used within ancillary and estate buildings, and its use here provides a natural and visually appropriate contrast to the heavier stone construction of the existing structure.

7.4. The roof form adopts a mansard-style arrangement finished in Rutland slate**,** reflecting the use of natural slate within the surrounding historic buildings. The roof incorporates a flat central section with a glazed roof lantern**,** which allows natural daylight to penetrate the internal space while maintaining a modest overall roof height.

7.5. The use of glazing is also an important design feature in heritage terms. By introducing a lightweight and visually permeable structure, the extension avoids the appearance of a solid masonry addition that could otherwise compete with the historic building. Instead, the orangery is intended to read as a lightweight courtyard structure**,** allowing the surrounding stone walls of the listed building to remain visually dominant.

7.6. The overall appearance of the proposal therefore reflects a careful balance between traditional materials and contemporary detailing. The stone base, slate roof and timber framing ensure that the development aligns with the established architectural language of the site, while the glazed elements provide a degree of visual lightness appropriate for a courtyard addition.

7.7. Through this approach, the extension is intended to appear as a sympathetic and recessive addition within the courtyard rather than an architectural feature that competes with the historic building. The design therefore supports the continued legibility of the listed structure and the wider historic character of the building group.

8.0. SCALE AND AMOUNT

8.1. Scale and massing are central considerations when assessing extensions to listed buildings, particularly where development is proposed within a conservation area. The proposal has therefore been developed with the clear objective of ensuring that the historic Coach House remains the visually dominant element within the courtyard environment, with the orangery reading as a clearly subordinate addition.

8.2. The proposed structure measures approximately 5.195 metres in depth and 9.1 metres in width along the front elevation, tapering to approximately 8.4 metres at the rear to reflect the geometry of the existing courtyard walls. This tapering form ensures that the extension responds directly to the existing spatial arrangement of the courtyard and avoids introducing a rigid or incongruous footprint within the historic building group.

8.3. In height terms, the orangery has an overall ridge height of approximately 3.2 metres**,** which is modest in comparison to the surrounding stone buildings that enclose the courtyard. This controlled height ensures that the extension remains visually recessive and prevents the structure from competing with the established rooflines of the historic buildings.

8.4. The mansard-style roof arrangement plays an important role in managing the perceived scale of the development. By incorporating a lower roof profile with a flat central section and roof lantern, the design avoids the need for a full pitched roof across the entire footprint, thereby reducing the overall height and visual prominence of the structure.

8.5. In terms of massing, the proposal avoids the appearance of a solid masonry extension through the use of extensive glazing and an exposed oak frame. This approach reduces the perceived bulk of the structure when viewed from within the courtyard and ensures that the surrounding stone walls remain the dominant architectural elements.

8.6. The development also represents the infilling of an existing courtyard space rather than the outward expansion of built form into surrounding open areas. From a spatial perspective, the proposal therefore

consolidates development within the historic footprint of the building group rather than altering the broader relationship between buildings and the surrounding landscape.

8.7. When considered in terms of scale, massing and the amount of development proposed, the orangery is therefore considered to represent a modest and proportionate addition that remains subordinate to the existing listed building and respects the established form of the courtyard arrangement.

9.0. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

9.1. Sustainability in the context of historic buildings extends beyond purely technical energy measures and includes the conservation of embodied carbon, the continued viable use of existing structures, and the careful adaptation of heritage assets so that they remain functional for modern living. Retaining and sensitively adapting historic buildings is widely recognised as an inherently sustainable approach when compared to demolition and replacement.

9.2. The proposal supports the long-term sustainability of the listed building by providing additional domestic accommodation within the existing residential planning unit. By accommodating this space within a carefully designed extension, the proposal reduces the potential pressure for piecemeal internal alterations to the historic structure that could otherwise result in greater harm to historic fabric.

9.3. The development also represents a consolidated approach to domestic adaptation. By locating the orangery within the existing courtyard space, the proposal avoids the need for additional detached structures elsewhere within the curtilage which could otherwise increase the spread of built development across the site.

9.4. The use of oak framing also offers sustainability benefits where timber is responsibly sourced. Timber is a renewable material with comparatively low embodied carbon, and its use within the structure aligns with traditional building practices often associated with estate and ancillary buildings.

9.5. The inclusion of extensive glazing and a roof lantern allows natural daylight to penetrate the internal space, improving internal environmental quality and reducing reliance on artificial lighting during daylight hours. The design therefore promotes efficient use of natural light while maintaining a modest overall building height.

9.6. Importantly, supporting the continued viable residential use of the listed building contributes to its long-term conservation and maintenance**.** Historic buildings that remain actively used and well-maintained are significantly less likely to fall into disrepair, and carefully designed adaptations such as this can help ensure that heritage assets remain sustainable and functional for future generations.

10.0. OVERALL CONCLUSION

10.1. The Coach House forms part of the Grade II listed "L Shape range of outbuildings to the north-east of Lea Hurst", historically associated with the adjacent house and forming part of the wider historic estate complex. The significance of the listed buildings derives from their traditional gritstone construction, their historic function as estate service buildings, and their group relationship with Lea Hurst.

10.2. The site also lies within the Dethick, Lea and Holloway Conservation Area, where the special interest of the area is derived from the survival of traditional buildings constructed in local gritstone, the informal pattern of rural settlement, and the relationship between historic buildings and the surrounding landscape.

10.3. The proposal comprises the erection of a mansard-style orangery located within the existing courtyard formed by the "L" shaped arrangement of outbuildings. The development therefore represents the infilling of an enclosed courtyard space rather than the outward expansion of built form into surrounding open areas.

10.4. The design has been deliberately developed to ensure that the extension remains subordinate to the historic building**,** both in scale and architectural expression. The modest ridge height of approximately 3.2 metres, together with the lightweight oak-framed glazed structure and the use of sympathetic materials including natural stone and Rutland slate, ensures that the orangery sits comfortably within the existing architectural context.

10.5. The proposal has also been directed toward a part of the building where alterations have already occurred through the historic conversion of the outbuildings to residential use. The courtyard elevations therefore represent an area where the building has already experienced a degree of change and adaptation, and where carefully designed intervention can be accommodated without undermining the principal architectural character of the building group.

10.6. The assessment within this statement demonstrates that the development preserves the legibility of the historic outbuildings and does not materially affect the appreciation of the wider heritage assets, including Lea Hurst or the character and appearance of the Dethick, Lea and Holloway Conservation Area.

10.7. In accordance with the statutory duties under Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990**,** the proposal has been designed to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

10.8. If any heritage harm were to be identified, it would fall well within the category of less than substantial harm at the lower end of the spectrum**,** arising primarily from the presence of a new structure

within the courtyard rather than from the loss of historic fabric or alteration of the principal architectural composition of the building.

10.9. In such circumstances, paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that any less than substantial harm be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. These benefits include supporting the continued viable residential use of the listed building, enabling sympathetic adaptation of the property to modern living standards, and securing ongoing investment in the long-term conservation of the heritage asset.

10.10. When considered against the policy framework of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Amber Valley Borough Local Plan, the proposal is considered to represent a carefully designed and proportionate intervention that respects the historic character of the listed building and its wider setting. Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent are therefore respectfully sought.