

Consultation comments on House Extensions and Alterations SPD

| Respondent | Comments | Officer Response | Potential change to SPD |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| North Yorkshire Council | <p>The draft document would not seem to pose any significant strategic issues for the County Council, and indeed the principle of ensuring the continued supply of good quality family and starter homes in the City whilst balancing the needs of students and other communities is generally supported. Therefore as an officer, response on behalf of the County Council and from a strategic planning perspective, I do not wish to raise any objections or make any further detailed comments in relation to any of the three consultation documents.</p> | Noted. | None |
| English Heritage | <p>We would broadly endorse the advice which the document provides for those considering making alterations to their dwellings and welcome the inclusion of reference to the additional requirements that might arise for those considering such works which might affect a Listed Building or where the property is in a Conservation Area. However, the SPD would benefit from inclusion of the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Given the both the number of Listed Buildings currently being used for residential purposes and the even greater number of properties which lie within one of the City's numerous Conservation Areas, the document ought to include a specific Section which provides more guidance to those considering making alterations to such buildings. This would include links to where further advice might be obtained and the key documents that might help them. · There is no mention of archaeology. For many extensions within the City Centre, an archaeological evaluation may be required. | <p>The SPD covers more general scenarios rather than the very individual assessments that typically relate to proposals in conservation areas and for listed buildings. A section on listed buildings or conservation areas may prove confusing to readers in respect to creating a 'two tier' assessment of applications.</p> <p>The benefits from producing a separate note for listed buildings and conservations areas will be considered.</p> <p>A link will be included in the annex to existing council advice in respect to conservation areas and listed buildings.</p> <p>Applicants will be informed when an archaeological evaluation is required. It is</p> | <p>None</p> <p>Link to online CYC Conservation area advice added to annex.</p> |

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| | <p>· For those cases where the alterations or extensions are likely to require planning permission, it would be helpful to include a Section which sets out the information that they will need to provide as part of their applications.</p> <p>We agree that an SEA would not be required for this document since the SPD does not provide a framework for other plans and strategies and is unlikely to have any significant environmental effects.</p> | <p>noted that most of the city centre is in a conservation area and it is made clear in the introduction (1.2) that in such locations additional criteria could apply.</p> <p>The document is not intended to provide a guide to the information that is needed when submitting an application. The council has an existing short document covering this and a link and short summary covering this aspect is contained in the annex (p25).</p> <p>Noted.</p> | <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> |
| Richard Beaton | <p>There does appear to me to be a major aspect of local development, which has a profound (and not always positive) effect on villages like this, which is missing from the list, and that is the question of infill development, or housing density.</p> <p>When gardens and remaining plots of land are built on (we have been here for nearly 30 years) there is often a very unattractive crowding together of two or three dwellings where only one was before, with the resulting loss of trees and hedging, and an increase in traffic. We live on the infamous 'rat-run' between the A59 and the ring road, and increases in housing density can only add to what is already an unpleasant (and at times dangerous) volume of traffic on Long Ridge Lane.</p> | <p>The SPD only relates to house extensions rather than new dwellings. The benefits from producing an SPD on new housing schemes will be considered.</p> | <p>None</p> |
| The Coal Authority | <p>Having reviewed your document, I can confirm that we have no specific comments to make on this document at this stage.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>None</p> |
| Jeff Porter | <p>I see no indication that your current proposals bear much if any relation to the national Permitted Development rules changes that were announced in October 2008 in England.</p> <p>Those changes seemed to me to be a more liberal and less nit-picking way</p> | <p>The guidance has been written to take account of the changes to permitted development legislation. The changes have removed the requirement for planning permission for some works, however,</p> | <p>None</p> |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | <p>of dealing with the whole business of people wanting to build extensions to their homes. Your current proposals, on the other hand, seem to me to be a step back to a pre-October 2008 position in which a raft of detailed and traditional regulations make it appear as if you are as determined as planners have ever been to make building an extension fraught with difficulty. Does this mean that you have abandoned the more liberal spirit of the national October 2008 PD rules? What weight do those 2008 changes have in planning decisions in York?</p> | <p>regulations in respect to some developments such as single storey rear extensions and outbuildings are now more stringent. The SPD seeks to strike a reasonable balance between assessing proposals using numerical standards and looking at the specific character of each site. Hopefully the SPD will provide more certainty for applicants and their neighbours and improve the quality of development.</p> | |
| <p>Wheldrake Parish Council</p> | <p>P7 v): “Townscape” not relevant to villages. Suggest “ Area Character and Street Scene” instead:</p> <p>P8 & 24: Suggest additional statement relating to checking for additional villages on the Website (Wheldrake VDS is near completion);</p> <p>P8 7.4): Suggest delete “townscape” – second line (see above);</p> <p>P9 h): Instead of first line – “Existing trees should be retained when ever practicable”:</p> <p>P12 10.2): Substitute “ harvesting” for recycling (second line):</p> <p>P12 10.3): Suggest “will” rather than “can” (first line) and delete “Permission would be unlikely to be given”:</p> | <p>Agree with comment. Instead of the word ‘Townscape’, ‘Character and Street Scene’ would better reflect the range of environments within the Council area.</p> <p>Agree, this will be updated.</p> <p>Agree – see above.</p> <p>Do not feel that a change in wording would significantly change the interpretation. It should be noted that limited protection can be given to trees that are not protected by a TPO or located in a conservation area.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Hard surfacing of a small area of a front garden does not need planning permission.</p> | <p>Wording changed</p> <p>Wording changed</p> <p>Wording changed</p> <p>None</p> <p>Wording changed</p> <p>None</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| | <p>P13 11.3): Substitute “may” for “sometimes do” (first line):</p> <p>P14 12.3): Suggest delete “and should not unduly block sunlight reaching solar panels on existing properties “ At end of section add “The potential shadowing effect of the extension on existing solar panels should be taken into account”:</p> <p>P15 12.7): Be consistent with dimensions in the document – metres or cm?</p> <p>P15 12.8): What if there is a change of neighbours? Suggest delete “unless neighbours.....” etc;</p> <p>P17 13.3): Last section – suggest “ also high level glazing”;</p> <p>P17 13.6): Substitute “area character” for “townscape”. Last line, substitute “within” for “ of”:</p> <p>P21/22 xv): First line - suggest “Fences and walls may have a significant impact.....”</p> <p>P21/22 xv): Third line - after “boundary” add “structure”;</p> <p>P21/22 xv): Suggest change 17.4 to 17.2 and first line add boundary “fence or wall” lower than.....:</p> <p>P21/22 xv): Third line add – “where they adjoin a highway (which includes a foot way adjacent to the road);</p> | <p>No change necessary. The wording provides adequate clarity.</p> <p>No change necessary. The wording provides adequate clarity.</p> <p>As both are metric this is considered acceptable.</p> <p>It is acceptable to overhang a neighbouring property if the owner of the land agrees and it otherwise meets planning requirements.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agree replace the word townscape. Unsure what refer to with reference to ‘within’.</p> <p>No change necessary. It is considered that the significant impact that boundary changes can have should be emphasised.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Swap paragraphs – Agreed.</p> | <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Wording changed</p> <p>Wording changed</p> <p>None</p> <p>Wording changed</p> <p>Wording changed</p> |
|--|---|---|---|

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| | <p>P21/22 xv): Suggest change 17.2 to 17.3 and delete the first line – i.e. to start “High front boundary walls.....”:</p> <p>P21/22 xv): “Where a side or rear....” should follow on as part of 17.3:</p> <p>P22 xvi): 18.2 – This seems to be contradictory because it suggests that extensions over 25% may be permitted without application, but then goes on to indicate that a planning application will be required.</p> <p>P22 xvi): 18.3 – Not clear what is meant by “limiting infilling” (Note that in Wheldrake such infilling has not been limited to the Conservation Area – so this could be added)</p> | <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed - Wall height figure deleted.</p> <p>No change – the paragraph relates to side and rear boundaries.</p> <p>Agree, change in wording needed to make it clearer.</p> <p>Agree – it would be helpful to clarify the meaning of ‘limited infilling’.</p> | <p>Wording changed</p> <p>Wording changed</p> <p>None</p> <p>Wording changed</p> <p>Wording changed</p> |
| Tom Langan | Control | | |
| Earswick Parish Council | Fully supportive of the conditions outlined in this document. If these conditions had been applied previously, not many of the extensions on Fosslands, Earswick would have been approved. | Noted. | None |
| Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council | <p>Strensall With Towthorpe Parish Council agrees with the content of this SPD which will prove to be great value to residents, architects, parish councillors and planning officers.</p> <p>However, we would wish to point out that within the document, there does not appear to be any reference to properties which are within conservation areas or may have permitted development rights removed.</p> | <p>1.3 - States that permitted development rights can vary with the property.</p> <p>1.2 - States that additional criteria will typically apply in conservation areas. Much of the document will however still be relevant.</p> | <p>None</p> <p>None</p> |
| Environment Agency | Paragraph 10.1 refers to areas at most risk of flooding in Flood Zone 3, but in fact it should also include areas in Flood Zone 2. Reference should be made in paragraph 10.1 to our Flood Risk Standing Advice, particularly the | Agreed wording changed and additional information/link added in respect to flood risk. | Wording changed /added |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | <p>advisory comments for domestic extensions as mentioned in your SFRA 2011 (paragraph 4.1.b). Our external web link for flood risk standing advice is: http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/planning/82584.aspx</p> <p>Paragraph 10.2 refers to using rainwater recycling and other sustainable approaches as a method of surface water drainage method which is a vague description of sustainable drainage systems (SUDS). We believe that there should be specific guidance given e.g. <i>'Improving the Flood Performance of New Buildings'</i> by the Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG). This guidance has been developed specifically for the design and construction of new buildings <u>and extensions</u> covered by the Building Regulations in England and Wales. It can be found on the following link: http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/improvingflood</p> <p>It should be noted that whilst the proposals for a rainwater harvesting tank are beneficial for the environment from a water quality and resources perspective, these systems cannot wholly be counted on as SUDS to store and reduce surface water runoff. This is because they have to be assumed to be full/ half filled at the time of a rainfall event and so would have no/ limited storage capacity.</p> <p>We support paragraph 10.3 and that permission would be unlikely to be given for a non-permeable surface. SUDS can be incorporated into individual gardens diverting rainwater away from buildings into storage areas. The Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) has produced guidance on permeable paving of front gardens which can be found on the following link: http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/pavingfrontgardens</p> <p>Paragraph 16.1 relating to granny annexes, we would like to point out that</p> | <p>Agreed wording changed and additional information/link added in respect to reducing flood risk.</p> <p>Agreed - Rainwater harvesting considered as a means of saving water rather than reducing flood risk.</p> <p>Comment noted additional link included.</p> | <p>Wording changed /added.</p> <p>Wording changed</p> <p>Link added</p> <p>Wording</p> |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|--------------------|
| | development of granny annexes <u>does not fall</u> into our flood risk standing advice of householder and other minor extensions. In accordance to our flood risk matrix, a self contained annex is classified as 'operational development with a site area less than one hectare'. We expect to see Flood Risk Assessment submitted in line with our guidance to demonstrate that the granny annexe can be developed safely in particular, addressing the provision of a safe refuge for single storey buildings. | Agreed - Information in respect to the need for a flood risk assessment for self contained annexes added. | changed/ added |
| Heslington Village Trust | The Trust supports both the overall objectives of the SPG and the detail. The Trust however would like to see greater prominence given to the requirement for developers to adhere to the policies expressed in the Village Design Statements where they have been adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance, as in the case in Heslington. | Agreed | Wording changed |