

3.0 CONSULTATIONS

3.1 Micklegate Planning Panel - No objection

3.2 No replies to neighbour notification letters

4.0 APPRAISAL

4.1 The key issues are considered to be:-

- Visual impact on the dwelling and surrounding area
- Impact on neighbouring properties

4.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) sets out 12 core planning principles that should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. Of particular relevance 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

4.3 Development Control 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.

4.4 Development Control Local Plan GP1 states that development proposals will be expected to (i) respect or enhance the local environment, (ii) 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; (iii) avoid the loss of open spaces, important gaps within development, vegetation, water features and other features that contribute to the quality of the local environment; (iv) retain, enhance and/or create urban spaces, public views, skyline, landmarks and other townscape features which make a significant contribution to the character of the area, and take opportunities to reveal such features to public view; and (v) ensure that residents living nearby are not unduly affected by noise, disturbance, overlooking, overshadowing or dominated by overbearing structures.

4.5 Supplementary Planning Guidance 'A Guide to Extensions and Alterations to Private Dwelling Houses' March 2001 states that (1.12) Good design and a scale of development that respects the original dwelling and established pattern of development are essential to making a quality extension. An extension in the style of the existing dwelling is likely to be the most acceptable. Paras 1.20/1.21 states that dormers should not extend across more than one third of the roof span and should not dominate the existing roof. Front dormers facing a highway are not

encouraged unless small in scale and in keeping with the style of the property. Dormers should incorporate matching materials and pitched roofs if possible.

SINGLE STOREY REAR ELEMENT

4.6 Being sited to the rear this element will not be highly visible to public view. A high rear boundary wall and gate are sited along the boundary with the rear lane, which is sited at a higher ground level than the dwelling. A pitched roof and a matching brick and tile construction are proposed. Sufficient amenity space will remain within the rear yard. Taking the above into account, along with the modest overall height proposed, it is not considered this addition will harm the character or appearance of the dwelling nor surrounding area. This addition will infill the area between the existing kitchen and common boundary with No. 45 Albemarle Road. This neighbouring dwelling already has a high single storey rear extension in place, thus no loss of amenity will occur.

FRONT DORMER

4.7 Amended plans were sought and received to reduce the scale proposed and to locate the dormer centrally within the roofslope in line with other dormers within the row. It is now considered the dormer to be of an appropriate size and design and proposes a matching hung tile to clad the roof and cheeks; and complies with CYC Supplementary Guidance as mentioned above. No harm to any neighbouring amenity will occur.

REAR DORMER

4.8 The rear dormer is considered to be overly large and bulky in design and will dominate the appearance of the rear roofslope, thus contrary to CYC Supplementary Planning Guidance mentioned above. This element alone, however, could be erected within permitted development rights, which is a significant material consideration such that the refusal of the application on the basis of the rear dormer would serve little purpose other than to delay implementation of the other (acceptable) elements of the application. No harm to any neighbouring amenity will occur.

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 It is considered that the proposal will not harm the living conditions of nearby neighbours or the appearance of the dwelling within the surrounding area. Approval is recommended.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Householder Approval

- 1 TIME2 Development start within three years -
- 2 VISQ1 Matching materials -
- 3 PLANS1 Approved plans - 2012/4/01B received on 27.07.12.

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 and the potential fall-back position of the rear dormer being permitted development if constructed in isolation, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to the impact on the residential amenity of neighbours or the impact upon the streetscene. As such the proposal complies with Policies H7 and GP1 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan and City of York Supplementary Planning Guidance to Householders (Approved March 2001)

2. THE PARTY WALL ETC ACT 1996

The proposed development may involve works that are covered by the Party Wall etc Act 1996. An explanatory booklet about the Act is available from City Strategy at 9 St Leonard's Place or at:

<<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/partywall>>

Furthermore the grant of planning permission does not override the need to comply with any other statutory provisions (for example the Building Regulations) neither does it override other private property rights (for example building on, under or over, or accessing land which is not within your ownership).

Contact details:

Author: Carolyn Howarth Development Management Assistant

Tel No: 01904 552405