

COMMITTEE REPORT

Date: 10 January 2013 **Ward:** Micklegate
Team: Householder and **Parish:** Micklegate Planning
Small Scale Team Panel

Reference: 12/03313/FUL
Application at: 15 Dewsbury Terrace York YO1 6HA
For: Single storey side extension following demolition of existing car port
By: Mr Robert Wyke
Application Type: Full Application
Target Date: 18 December 2012
Recommendation: Householder Approval

1.0 PROPOSAL

1.1 This application seeks permission for a single storey pitched roof side extension following demolition of the existing car port. A Listed Building application also accompanies this application - ref. 12/03314/LBC.

1.2 The property is a later addition forming a return to a mid-nineteenth century terrace by GT Andrews. The property is grade II listed as a building of special architectural or historic interest, and is situated within the Central Historic Core conservation area. The site is adjacent to and prominent in views from the city walls, and is prominent in views from lower priory street.

1.3 Revisions have been submitted at the request of the conservation officer replacing the glazed canopy to front with slate and amending the proportions of the new side window at ground floor level.

1.4 The scheme has been called to committee by Cllr Brian Watson due to the amount of structural work proposed.

2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Development Plan Allocation:

Areas of Archaeological Interest GMS Constraints: City Centre Area 0006
Conservation Area GMS Constraints: Central Historic Core CONF
City Boundary GMS Constraints: York City Boundary 0001
DC Area Teams GMS Constraints: Central Area 0002
Listed Buildings GMS Constraints: Grade 2; 14 Dewsbury Terrace York
Listed Buildings GMS Constraints: Grade 2; 15 Dewsbury Terrace York

2.2 Policies:

CYGP1 Design
CYH7 Residential extensions
CYHE3 Conservation Areas
CYHE4 Listed Buildings

3.0 CONSULTATIONS

INTERNAL

3.1 DESIGN, CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - The scale of the proposed replacement structure and its basic pitched roof form sit comfortably with the host building and the street scene. The glazed canopy at the front and extensive glazing will be intrusive and at odds with the historic appearance of the building. Covering the whole of the front roof slope in slate has addressed concerns regarding the proposed extension as a whole.

EXTERNAL

3.2 CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY PANEL - The Panel felt that the proposal was an improvement on the current structure, but were concerned that the window in the side elevation was unnecessary and could be a security issue.

3.3 MICKLEGATE PLANNING PANEL – (original submission) The Panel have no objection to the principle of the development in replacing the carport, but would like to see materials and possibly design more sympathetic to the Conservation Area.

3.4 PUBLICITY - The application has been advertised by site notice, press advert and neighbour notification letter. No responses have been received.

4.0 APPRAISAL

KEY ISSUES:-

- Visual impact on the dwelling and conservation area
- Impact on neighbouring property

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

4.1 The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF) sets out the Government's overarching planning policies. At its heart is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The framework states that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment.

Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. A principle set out in paragraph 17 is that planning should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Paragraph 132 states that considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed by or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting.

4.2 The Development Control Local Plan was approved for Development Control purposes in April 2005; its policies are material considerations although it is considered that their weight is limited except where in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

4.3 Local Plan Policy GP1 states that development proposals will be expected to respect or enhance the local environment, be of a density, layout, scale, mass and design that is compatible with neighbouring buildings, spaces and the character of the area using appropriate building materials; and ensure that residents living nearby are not unduly affected by noise, disturbance, overlooking, overshadowing or dominated by overbearing structures.

4.4 Local Plan Policy H7 states that residential extensions will be permitted where (i) the design and materials are sympathetic to the main dwelling and the locality (ii) the design and scale are appropriate to the main building (iii) there is no adverse effect upon the amenities of neighbours (iv) proposals respect the spaces between dwellings; and (v) the proposed extension does not result in an unacceptable reduction in private amenity space within the curtilage of the dwelling.

4.5 Local Plan Policy HE3 states that within conservation areas, proposals will only be permitted where there is no adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area.

4.6 Local Plan Policy HE4 states with regard to listed buildings that consent will only be granted for development where there is no adverse effect on the character, appearance or setting of the building.

4.7 The City of York Council Supplementary Planning Guidance - Guide to extensions and alterations to private dwelling houses (2001) states that the basic shape and size of the extension should be sympathetic to the design of the original dwelling. The scale of the new extension should not dominate the original building. Proposed extensions should have pitched roofs and the materials should match those of the main property. For single storey extensions, obscured glazing should be fitted to any essential windows facing the neighbouring boundary where there may be a loss of privacy for neighbours.

VISUAL IMPACT ON THE DWELLING AND CONSERVATION AREA

4.8 The existing car port is of no special interest, being a lightweight, flat roofed structure with walls constructed from brick which is similar to that of the host building. The lower part of the north east wall appears to be a remnant of an earlier structure or boundary wall. The doors giving access to the carport from the house are modern and of no special interest.

4.9 It is proposed to replace the car port with a structure of similar size to provide an enlarged kitchen area and utility. The scale of the proposed replacement structure sits comfortably with the host building and the street scene. However, the glazed canopy at the front was considered to appear intrusive and at odds with the historic appearance of the building. It was therefore suggested that covering the whole of the front roof slope in slate would address this concern and would result in a more traditional addition, more in keeping with the existing building. This amendment has since been submitted by the agent.

4.10 It is proposed to install 2no. roof lights to the rear roof slope of the extension which will not be visible from wider views of the conservation area, nor the neighbouring terrace building. The small window proposed to the side elevation onto the alleyway was felt to be a security risk by CAAP members, however its design and location at the entrance to the alley way is not considered to be overly harmful. The new timber sash window has also been altered to a more appropriate scale, which is considered to be more in keeping with the proportions of the existing fenestration. It is also proposed to replace one of the basement windows, however during the site visit this window was boarded up so its condition could not be judged. As such, the applicant will need to submit details of this window prior to the LPA agreeing to its replacement.

IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURING PROPERTY

4.11 The eaves of the extension are situated just above the boundary wall and as such the impact on the neighbouring property will be minimal as the roof slopes away from the boundary. No loss of privacy or overshadowing will occur.

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 The proposed extension, as amended, is considered to be an appropriate addition to the host dwelling and will not harm residential amenity. Approval is recommended.

COMMITTEE TO VISIT

6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Householder Approval

- 1 TIME2 Development start within three years -
- 2 PLANS1 Approved plans - Drawing 1231.03 Rev. A received 17.12.12
- 3 VISQ8 Samples of exterior materials to be app -
- 4 Prior to development commencing on site, a drawing showing the south-east elevation of the boundary wall (scale 1:20) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: So that the LPA can be satisfied with these details.

- 5 Prior to works commencing on site, a sample for external surfacing details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the appearance of the listed building.

7.0 INFORMATIVES: Notes to Applicant

1. REASON FOR APPROVAL

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal, subject to the conditions listed above, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to the appearance of the listed building, conservation area, and residential amenity. As such the proposal complies with Policies GP1, H7, HE3 and HE4 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan and the 'Guide to extensions and alterations to private dwelling houses' Supplementary Planning Guidance.

2. STATEMENT OF THE COUNCIL'S POSITIVE AND PROACTIVE APPROACH

In considering the application, the Local Planning Authority has implemented the requirements set out within the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) in seeking solutions to problems identified during the processing of the application. The Local Planning Authority took the following steps in order to achieve a positive outcome:

Amended drawings were requested in respect of the design and appearance of the proposed extension.

Contact details:

Author: Elizabeth Potter Development Management Assistant
Tel No: 01904 551477