## **COMMITTEE REPORT**

**Date:** 7 February 2019 **Ward:** Haxby and Wigginton **Team:** Householder and **Parish:** Haxby Town Council

**Small Scale Team** 

Reference: 18/02094/FUL

**Application at:** 16 Ashwood Glade Haxby York YO32 3GQ

**For:** Erection of a single storey side and rear extension.

By: Mr & Mrs Jagger
Application Type: Full Application
Target Date: 14 February 2019
Recommendation: Householder Approval

#### 1.0 PROPOSAL

1.1 This application seeks permission to erect a single storey side and rear extension to an existing bungalow. As originally submitted the scheme involved the erection of a single storey rear extension and a detached annexe but this has been amended to just a single storey side and rear extension.

## **CALL-IN**

- 1.2 Cllr Ian Cuthbertson requested a call-in on the original scheme over concerns relating to:
  - a) the height of the ridge on the extension
  - b) its proximity to neighbouring properties
  - c) the size and positioning of the proposed annex
  - d) the proposed development's lack of 'fit' with the street scene
  - e) the existence of a sewer or water main under the proposed structure

#### 2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Policies:

City of York Publication Draft Local Plan 2018

**D11Extensions and Alterations** 

City of York Council Development Control Local Plan 2005

CYGP1Design CYH7 Residential extensions

Page 1 of 7

## 3.0 CONSULTATIONS

#### **INTERNAL**

## Flood Risk Management Team (FRMT)

3.1 In respect of the original scheme the FRMT advised that the proposed development has not taken into account the location of the public sewers that cross the site and the application could therefore not be supported.

#### **EXTERNAL**

## **Environment Agency**

3.2 No objection following submission of revised details for the scheme.

## Yorkshire Water

3.3 Yorkshire Water objected to the original scheme on the grounds that the proposed annexe appeared to be within 2m of a sewer that runs parallel to the north eastern boundary of the site.

## **Neighbour Notification**

3.4 Occupants of nos. 1 and 2 Sandringham Close objected to the original proposals in terms of the size of the extensions and potential loss of light and privacy. There were also concerns about flooding and the design not being sympathetic. They have been consulted on the revised scheme and the occupants of no.2 have not made any comments on the revised plans but the occupants of no.1 have advised that they have no objections.

# Haxby Town Council

3.5 No objections

## 4.0 APPRAISAL

## **KEY ISSUES**

4.1 The key issue in the assessment of this proposal is the impact upon the character of the host building and the amenities of nearby residents.

## **POLICY CONTEXT**

Page 2 of 7

## National Planning Policy Framework

- 4.3 The National Planning Policy Framework, July 2018 (NPPF) sets out the Government's overarching planning policies and at its heart is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 127 states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments will achieve a number of aims including:
- function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development
- be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping
- are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting
- create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and promote health and well-being with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users

## Local Plan Policies

## City of York Publication Draft Local Plan 2018

- 4.5 The Publication Draft City of York Local Plan 2018 ('2018 Draft Plan') was submitted for examination on 25 May 2018. In accordance with paragraph 48 of the NPPF the Draft Plan policies can be afforded weight according to:
- -The stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the previous NPPF published in March 2012. (NB: Under transitional arrangements plans submitted for examination before 24 January 2019 will be assessed against the 2012 NPPF).
- 4.6 Policy D11:Extensions and Alterations is relevant and advises that development proposals will be supported where, inter alia, they respond positively to the immediate architectural context, local character and history in terms of the use of materials and detailing, scale and proportion, landscape design and the space between buildings and protect the amenity of current and neighbouring occupiers.

# City of York Council Development Control Local Plan 2005

4.7 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 very limited except where in accordance with the

Page 3 of 7

content of the NPPF. The relevant Local Plan Policies are Policy GP1, which requires development to respect or enhance the local environment, be of a design that is compatible with the character of the area and neighbouring buildings, protect private, individual or community amenity space and ensure residents are not unduly affected by overlooking, overshadowing or dominated by overbearing structures. 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.

## Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for House Extensions and Alterations

4.8 The Council has a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for House Extensions and Alterations and was approved on 4 December 2012. The SPD offers overarching general advice relating to such issues as privacy and general amenity as well as advice which is specific to the design and size of particular types of extensions or alterations. Paragraph 7.1 advises that a basic principle is that any extension should normally be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of both the existing dwelling and the street scene generally. In particular, care should be taken to ensure that the proposal does not dominate the house or clash with its appearance. In relation to single storey rear extensions Paragraph 13.2 advises that the Council will have regard to a number of factors including the impact on sunlight, the relationship to windows and the height of the structure

#### **ASSESSMENT**

## Context

4.9 The proposal involves a roughly rectangular site, which is located at the end of a cul-de-sac. There are two houses on its north western boundary (nos. 1 and 2 Sandringham Close) with a bungalow on its north eastern boundary and another on its southern boundary (nos.14 and 18 Ashwood Glade respectively). There is a 2m high close boarded fence along the boundaries with nos. 1 and 2 Sandringham Close and 18 Ashwood Glade. The boundary with no.14 Ashwood Glade consists of a row of shrubs, that ranges from circa 3m to 4m in height.

# **Proposals**

4.10 The proposed extension in the original scheme was 0.7m higher than the existing property and included a 6.8m high feature chimney on its rear elevation. The scheme also included erecting a detached pitched roof annexe, which would have been 1m from its north western boundary with nos.1 and 2 Sandringham Close and would have been constructed directly over the line of a sewer that runs across the north eastern edge of the site.

Page 4 of 7

- 4.11 The scheme has now been revised. The detached annexe has been dropped from the scheme and instead this accommodation is now provided in a 12m long, 4m wide flat roofed extension on the north western side of the bungalow; replacing an existing 6m long, 3.5m wide flat roofed garage. It is also much lower (2.9m instead of 5.5m) and with the nearest property (no.1 Sandringham Close) being 10.5m away with a 2m high close boarded fence between it is not considered there would be any adverse impact on neighbours to the north.
- 4.12 The scheme still includes a rear extension which is slightly wider and longer than originally proposed and now has a flat roof (2.9m high) with a glazed lantern. At its closest point it is sited circa 2m off the boundary with 18 Ashwood Glade to the south. The extension would be facing the side elevation of this property and no.18 has a side garage that would lie between the extension and its own side elevation. Again it is not considered that there would be any adverse impact on the occupants of this property, who have not objected.
- 4.13 The main external material would be render with a brick plinth and two brick panels (bricks to match existing) below windows on the north elevation. Fenestration consists of grey aluminium framed windows and sliding doors. The extensions have clean, simple lines and it is considered they will sit comfortably on the building and within the surroundings with very little, if any, of the scheme being visible from the street. It is considered the scheme in its revised form is entirely suitable for the location and would complement existing development.
- 4.14 With regards to the sewer, the latest plan from the architect indicates that the nearest the proposed extension would come to the sewer is 3.56m, which is 0.56 m greater than the distance required by Yorkshire Water.

## Flood Risk

4.15 The site lies within Flood Zone 2 and 3 (medium and high probability zones), however, Paragraph 47 of the PPG advises that minor developments are unlikely to raise significant flood risk issues. The applicants have submitted an FRA in support of the proposals. This confirms that floor levels of the proposed development will be no lower than the existing dwelling and that all new electrical sockets will be at least 450 mm above the internal floor level. It also advises that to ensure that the property does not suffer from water ingress to the sub floors through the air bricks, the current floors will be replaced by solid floors. In view of this officers are satisfied with the proposals in flood risk terms.

#### 5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 The removal of the detached annexe from the scheme has significantly reduced the visual impact on neighbours to the north. The replacement of a pitched roof on the proposed extension with a flat roof and removal of the feature chimney considerably

 reduce the overall visual impact upon the general surroundings and it is considered that they will respect the general character of the building and area and will have no adverse effect on the amenity of neighbouring residents. It is considered the proposals comply with national planning guidance, as contained in the National Planning Policy Framework, Publication Draft York Local Plan 2018, City of York Council Development Control Local Plan 2005 and the City of York Council's Supplementary Planning Document (House Extensions and Alterations).

#### **COMMITTEE TO VISIT**

**6.0 RECOMMENDATION:** Householder Approval

- 1 TIME2 Development start within three years
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans and other submitted documents

276.(10).01 revision 5

276.(10).02 revision 3

276.(10).03 revision 2

276.(10).04 revision 3

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out only as approved by the Local Planning Authority

3 The external render shall be off-white and the bricks to be used externally shall match those of the existing building in colour, size, shape and texture.

Reason: To achieve a visually acceptable form of development.

# 7.0 INFORMATIVES: Notes to Applicant

## 1. 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 (paragraph 38) 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: Removal of annexe and reduction in height of extension

Account has been taken of all relevant national guidance and local policies and with the attachment of conditions the proposal is considered to be satisfactory

Page 6 of 7

## **Contact Details:**

Author: David Johnson, Development Management Assistant

**Tel No:** (01904) 551665

Application Reference Number: 18/02094/FUL

Item No: 4e

Page 7 of 7