

## COMMITTEE REPORT

**Committee:** West & City Centre Area    **Ward:** Rural West York  
**Date:** 21 December 2006    **Parish:** Nether Poppleton Parish Council

**Reference:** 06/02233/FUL  
**Application at:** Dodsworth Hall Millfield Lane Nether Poppleton York YO26 6HR  
**For:** Single storey rear extension and vehicle access and car parking, new rooflights  
**By:** Honey Pots (Dodsworth Hall) Limited  
**Application Type:** Full Application  
**Target Date:** 7 December 2006

### 1.0 PROPOSAL

#### 1.1 SITE

1.1.1 Dodsworth Hall is located within the defined development boundary of Nether Poppleton. The old school house is located adjacent Millfield Lane (southwest) and is also adjacent 11 Millfield Lane to the northwest and 13 Millfield Lane to the southeast, which are residential dwellings. To the rear (northeast) is 16 Hillcrest Avenue. At present the property is vacant. A mature hedge bounds the property to both side boundaries and at the rear.

#### 1.2 PROPOSAL

1.2.1 Full planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension, formation of rooflights in the front and rear roof slopes of the property, formation of hard paved areas for the in/out access/exit, and the formation of 4 no. car-parking spaces. The extension is required to increase the floor area of the property to create an area for pre-school children. It is proposed that the single storey rear extension will be designed with a pitched roof. The extension will measure approximately 6.00 m in length x 2.50 m in height to eaves level and 3.60 m in height to its highest section. The extension would be principally glazed with Welsh slates proposed for the roof covering and the slates are also proposed to be affixed to the brickwork.

1.2.2 This application relates to abovementioned works only and does include change of use. Permission is only required for the aforementioned alterations and extension. Change of use permission is not required for a nursery as the property already has the benefit of an 'historic' use as D1 (non-residential institutions).

#### 1.3 HISTORY

04/04049/OUT - Erection of a new dwelling and garage after demolition of Dodsworth Hall - Refused - 07.01.2005.

1.4 This application is reported to sub committee at the request of Cllr Hopton.

## **2.0 POLICY CONTEXT**

2.1 Development Plan Allocation:

City Boundary York City Boundary 0001

DC Area Teams West Area 0004

2.2 Policies:

CYGP1  
Design

CYGP9  
Landscaping

CYGP11  
Accessibility

CYT4  
Cycle parking standards

CYT5  
Traffic and pedestrian safety

## **3.0 CONSULTATIONS**

3.1 INTERNAL

3.1.1 COUNTRYSIDE OFFICER

3.1.2 There are no bats recorded from this property, There are records of roosts nearby. Because of the work proposed, which would significantly affect any roost, if one is present, and the reasonable likelihood that such a roost could be present, it is recommended that a bat survey be undertaken prior to consideration of the application. It will now only be possible to ascertain if the loft space is or has been used and if there are any external features that could support a roost, however, this should provide enough information to assess the application.

3.1.3 HIGHWAYS

3.1.4 The following comments were received from the highways department on the understanding that the application does not require change of use permission and relates purely to proposed external works and extensions:-

- 3.1.5 The highways department consider it likely that many of the pupils will arrive by car as facilities, such as this one, are used extensively by working parents. They further state that the typical time taken to 'drop off' and 'pick up' children would be approximately 10 minutes each. The 'dropping off' and 'picking up' times will coincide with morning and evening peak travel times. This, highways consider, would result in a flurry of activity at these times and consequently traffic congestion. The highways department further consider that the section of road immediately fronting the site could only accommodate the parking of 2 vehicles at any one time safely without blocking the access/egress of the site itself. As a consequence other vehicles would have to park elsewhere along Millfield Lane. As a consequence highways consider it likely that parked vehicles associated with the development would therefore cause localised conditions, which would be prejudicial to road safety, disrupt the safe operation of the bus stop and the junction of Ebor Way with Millfield Lane, and also result in damage to the verges within Millfield Lane.
- 3.1.6 The proposed access and internal driveway are of restricted widths and manoeuvring space and may also result in the need for some staff vehicles to be parked on the public highway. The access and egress would nominally be only 2m wide. The highways department acknowledge that it is not possible to be accurate in this instance as both drives have mature hedgerows as part of the boundary. It is probably physically possible to pass along these drives but only with care.
- 3.1.7 A "standard" car is assumed to be 1.8m x 4.75m. There is no "standard" drive width except where a driveway is the sole access to a dwelling then it should be 3.2m wide to allow cars and pedestrians to pass simultaneously ; the recommended minimum garage door width is 2.1m; minimum practicable drive width is generally considered as 2.5m (but not generally quoted as a "standard").
- 3.1.8 As a consequence of the above points raised by the highways department they recommend that the application should be refused.

## 3.2 EXTERNAL.

3.2.1 Nether Poppleton Parish Council - No objection.

3.2.2 Neighbours - 2 objections were received in connection with the original submitted scheme. These objections related to:-

- Increase in noise from activities which would detrimentally impact upon adjacent neighbours residential amenity;
- Traffic movements at the rear and side of the hall are inappropriate and would further impact upon residents amenity in terms of noise and fumes, etc.; and
- The applicant has included part of the hedge which belongs to an adjacent neighbour.

## 4.0 APPRAISAL

### 4.1 POLICY

4.1.1 Draft Local Plan Policy CYGP1: 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.

4.1.2 Policy E4 of the North Yorkshire County Structure Plan states that buildings of special townscape, architectural or historic interest will be afforded the strictest protection

4.1.3 Poppleton Village Design Statement: aims to guide and influence the design of development in a way that preserves and enhances the character and distinctiveness of Poppleton. All developments should retain and enhance site features and should be carried out with great sensitivity, to respect its historic buildings and their settings. Grass verges should be retained. Ancient hedgerows should be identified, registered and protected. Car-parking should be concealed as far as possible and be provided within the curtilage of the building. The use of bland fencing such as interwoven and lap as a quick-fix boundary should be discouraged. Adopting more traditional boundaries such as hedging, low brick, wrought iron and post and rail should be encouraged.

4.2 The main considerations are:

- Design;
- Impact upon adjacent neighbours;
- Highways; and
- Other issues.

### 4.3 DESIGN:

4.3.1 Dodsworth Hall was built in 1850 and is a simple brick and slate hall with porch and modern kitchen extension to rear. The property retains its original character.

4.3.2 The design of the existing property is very simple/ plain and retains its rudimentary character of a turn of the century utilitarian building. Whilst it is noted that the property is not listed. Local plan policy GP1 requires

development to retain and/or enhance landmarks and other townscape features which make a significant contribution to the character of the area. PPS1 emphasises the importance of good design and requires developers to demonstrate that they have taken into account design in their proposals and have had regard for local plan policies. The Poppleton Village Design Statement requires that development is of a scale, design which is sympathetic and also uses appropriate materials. Also policy E4 of the North Yorkshire County Structure Plan seeks buildings of special townscape, architectural or historic interest be afforded the strictest protection

4.3.3 It is considered that due to the design and proposed use of materials, the extension fails to sympathetically enhance or retain the character of this property and consequently fails to satisfy the aforementioned policies. The proposed extension has the appearance of a conservatory, furthermore the design does not emulate the existing single storey projection. Elements which appear obtrusive in this proposed design are the soffit /fascia, excessive areas of glazing and the fixing of slates to the brickwork dwarf wall. Also the introduction of 8 no. rooflights is considered excessive and significantly alters the appearance of this turn of the century property. The proposed introduction of hard paving the front of the property is also considered to be inappropriate and would impact upon the setting of the property and the area. It is noted, however, that the property is not located within a Conservation Area and is not listed.

#### 4.4 IMPACT UPON ADJACENT NEIGHBOURS:

4.4.1 Objections have been received from 2 adjacent neighbours regarding loss of privacy and noise intrusion. However it should be borne in mind that this application pertains to physical works and alterations only. Change of use permission is not required as the property already has the benefit of an 'historic' use as D1 (non-residential institutions). As a consequence of this, it is difficult to consider objections regarding loss of amenity, as the applicant only requires permission for the extension and the other aforementioned work. However one could make a case, that the increase in floor area (and therefore children) and the access/exit and parking arrangements, could create additional intrusion to adjacent neighbours, above and beyond that which one would reasonably expect if the property was operated as a nursery, without the introduction of these works. However, on balance, it is considered that due to the minor scale of the proposed extension, this would not create such an additional loss of amenity to adjacent neighbours so as to refuse the application on these grounds. The vehicular movements etc. at the rear of the property would, most likely only be twice a day which is considered acceptable in terms of impact upon existing adjacent neighbours. However the practicability of these arrangements is discussed in more detail below.

#### 4.5 HIGHWAYS

4.5.1 The proposed access/exit arrangements and car-parking spaces at the rear of the property appear unworkable due to the lack of space for manoeuvrability. Furthermore car-parking at the rear would almost certainly become unusable

in winter/wet months which would either generate additional pressure for parking on the road adjacent the property and/or cause a traffic hazard due to mud being brought onto the road from vehicles exiting the site.

- 4.5.2 Highways confirm that the proposed access and internal driveway are of restricted widths and manoeuvring space which would most likely result in the need for some staff vehicles to be parked on the public highway.
- 4.5.3 Furthermore it is thought likely that parked vehicles associated with the development would cause unacceptable localised conditions, which would be prejudicial to road safety, disrupt the safe operation of the bus stop and the junction of Ebor Way with Millfield Lane, and also result in damage to the verges within Millfield Lane.
- 4.5.4 As a consequence of the above points raised by the highways department it is considered that the application fails to satisfy policy GP1 (b) and also highway safety requirements. Furthermore no cycle provision is provided which is contrary to the requirements of policy T4 of the local plan.

#### 4.6 OTHER ISSUES

- 4.6.1 Boundary disputes: Comments from 11 Millfield Lane (adjacent neighbour) state that they own part of the site which the applicant has included within their proposal. Normally, such an issue would be matter between the applicant and the neighbour. However if the applicant does not own this section of land then the access to the rear would be rendered unusable. Such a situation would a significant impact upon the practicability of the application. Therefore, it is considered important that the applicant and adjacent neighbour should confirm their boundaries and come to an agreement.
- 4.6.2 Accessibility: The application does not appear to make suitable provision for persons with mobility or sensory impairments to gain access or exit the property. As a consequence the proposal fails to satisfy policy GP11.

### 5.0 CONCLUSION

- 5.1 The proposed extension and other associated works, in the opinion of the Local Authority, are unacceptable in terms of design, appearance and impact upon highway safety.
- 5.2 As a consequence the proposal is recommended for refusal as it fails to satisfy policies GP1, GP11 and T4 of the City of York Draft Local Plan and the Poppleton Village Design Statement.

### COMMITTEE TO VISIT

#### 6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

- 1 The Planning Authority considers that in the absence of adequate on-site parking or child dropping off and picking up areas, the intensification and expansion of use and the attendant increase in traffic associated with the proposed development would be likely to result in vehicles being parked outside the site and consequently on the public highway. This would be to the detriment of the free flow of traffic, road safety and cause degradation of the highway verges. As a consequence the application fails to satisfy policy T5 of the City of York Local Plan (Draft) incorporating 4th set of changes - 2005 and guidelines 16, 31 and 39 of the Poppleton Village Design Statement.
- 2 The proposal fails to provide for covered and secure cycle parking provision which will harm the City Council's objectives of maintaining and promoting cycle usage in order to minimise traffic generation, reduce pollution, noise and the physical impact of traffic and is therefore contrary to Policy T4 of the City of York Draft Local Plan.
- 3 It is considered that due to the proposed design and use of materials, the extension fails to sympathetically enhance or retain the character of this property or the area. In particular the proposed extension and number of rooflights are not compatible with character of the building or the area and would create an incongruous feature. The proposed extension does not emulate the simple design of the existing single storey projection or the main building and appears incongruous. As a consequence the application fails to satisfy policy GP1 of the City of York Local Plan (Draft) incorporating 4th set of changes - 2005 and the guidelines 10, 11 and 14 of the Poppleton Village Design Statement.

## **7.0 INFORMATIVES:**

### **Notes to Applicant**

1. No bat survey has been submitted with this application. There are records of roosts nearby. Because of the work proposed, which would significantly affect any roost, if one is present, and the reasonable likelihood that such a roost could be present, it is recommended that a bat survey be undertaken prior to approval of any scheme.
2. Any re-submission of this proposal should incorporate features to allow access to the building for people with mobility or sensory impairments.

### **Contact details:**

**Author:** Richard Beal Development Control Officer

**Tel No:** 01904 551610