

## COMMITTEE REPORT

### THIS ITEM HAS BEEN WITHDRAWN

**Date:** 15 March 2012      **Ward:** Rural West York  
**Team:** Major and      **Parish:** Upper Poppleton Parish  
Commercial Team      Council

**Reference:** 11/03230/FUL  
**Application at:** Lime Tree House Main Street Upper Poppleton York YO26  
6DL  
**For:** Extensions to ground floor to provide extension to lounge,  
and en-suite facilities to existing bedrooms. Alterations to  
roof to provide 7 additional bedrooms at first floor level  
(revised scheme)  
**By:** Roseville Carehomes LTD  
**Application Type:** Full Application  
**Target Date:** 1 February 2012  
**Recommendation:** Refuse

## 1.0 PROPOSAL

1.1 The application is for a number of extensions to the Lime Tree House Residential Care Home. The proposed development includes raising the height of the roof of the rear extension to provide first floor accommodation the full length of the existing rear extension. The hipped roof would be altered to a gable roof. The first floor accommodation would create 8 further bedrooms. The proposed extension would increase in height from 5 metres to 6.5 metres. The roof accommodation would have 8 pairs of rooflights in the south elevation and 6 rooflights in the north elevation. There would be 5 no. ground floor extensions to the south elevation to provide toilet facilities to the bedrooms. There would be a single storey rear extension and a single storey side extension to the main building to create a larger lounge area.

1.2 The building was originally used as a dwelling but has been used as a residential care home for some time. The building has had a number of previous extensions. The property is sited within the Upper Poppleton Conservation Area opposite the village green. The surrounding uses are predominantly residential.

1.3 The application has been called into committee by Cllr Gillies on the grounds of the objections from the occupants of neighbouring dwellings, and the potential traffic and parking issues in the immediate vicinity.

## 2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

## 2.1 Development Plan Allocation:

Common Land and Village Greens GMS Constraints: VG 15 Upper Poppleton  
Village Green And Assoc Waste Lands

Conservation Area GMS Constraints: Upper Poppleton CONF

City Boundary GMS Constraints: York City Boundary 0001

DC Area Teams GMS Constraints: West Area 0004

## 2.2 Policies:

CYGP1 Design

CYHE2 Development in historic locations

CYHE3 Conservation Areas

CYC1 Criteria for community facilities

CYGP4A Sustainability

## 3.0 CONSULTATIONS

### INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

#### Highway Network Management

3.1 No comments received at the time of writing the report

#### Design, Conservation And Sustainable Development

3.2 Object. The increased mass and roof height of the rear extension together with the combined scale and mass of the proposed side and rear single storey extensions will appear visually dominant within the context of existing buildings in Main Street and have a negative visual impact that will harm the existing character and appearance of the conservation area.

### EXTERNAL CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

#### Upper Poppleton Parish Council

#### 3.3 Object

- The proposed extension is disproportionate development of the site
- It is overbearing to neighbouring properties
- The proposed extension is too close to the boundaries of neighbouring properties
- Concerned that the additional residential facilities will not have sufficient parking leading to on street parking on Main Street which is a narrow bus route

- The fire escape is inadequate, the exit is too narrow, the regulations state that residents should have to travel no more than 9 metres to a fire exit. The plans show the fire exit to be 30 metres away
- The plans do not take into account the 0.8 metre difference in the ground level between Lime Tree House and 11 Lime Garth
- There is no additional provision for extra staff
- There is a reduction in the size of the garden available to residents

## Letters Of Objection

3.4 Nine letters have been received raising the following objections to the proposals:

- Development out of character and scale not in keeping with the surrounding the low rise development and the character of the conservation area
- Cause increase traffic congestion
- Cause further off street parking
- Loss of privacy, light and outlook to surrounding properties
- Intensification of use and the existing noise issues
- The increase in the height of the roof and poorly designed en suite accommodation would create an ugly and overbearing structure to the neighbouring properties, marked contrast to the low key design of the existing building
- Incremental additions have reached huge proportions in the context of the residential area
- The surrounding properties have lost much of the skyline by virtue of previous extension the proposed would further impact negatively
- Reduction in the quality of outside amenity space to the occupants of Lime Tree House
- The increased hardstanding and the resulting surface water has not been addressed in the application
- Concerned that the means of escape are not sufficient and that the new stairwell/fire exit would be unusable
- Increase in refuse, impacting on the residential amenity of Toft Garth
- Foundations will impact on the retaining wall of 11 Lime Garth

## **4.0 APPRAISAL**

### RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

4.1 Two storey gable extension, two storey and first floor rear extensions to form additional residential bedrooms and ancillary accommodation – Refused because of impact on the visual amenity of the host building, the street scene, and the character

and appearance of the conservation area and harm to residential amenity (10/02297/FUL).

4.2 Erection of first floor pitched roof rear extension – Withdrawn (00/02423/FUL).

4.3 Erection of single storey extension to form four additional bedrooms. Approved (6/127/18G/FUL).

4.4 Extension to provide three en-suite bedrooms. - Refused due to overdevelopment of the site, which would erode the general amenity space around the building, to the detriment of the residential amenity of the occupiers of the property and the proposed increase in hardstanding area and associated vehicular parking to the front of this property would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area, which lies within a conservation area and would as a consequence, be harmful to both the character of the streetscene and setting of the building ( 6/127/18E/PA).

An appeal on this decision was dismissed (APP/C2741/A/95/258751)

4.5 Outline application for extension to residential home to provide four single bedrooms. – Approved (6/127/18D/PA)

4.6 Alterations and extension to form residential home for the elderly. – Approved (6/127/18C/PA).

4.7 Change of use of existing dwelling and outbuildings and land to private registered home for the elderly. – Approved (6/127/18B/PA).

## KEY ISSUES

- Impact on the building and the conservation area
- Impact on neighbouring property
- Impact on highway safety

## PLANNING POLICY

4.8 National planning policy contained within PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development', states that good design is indivisible from planning. Design which is inappropriate within its context, or which fails to take opportunities for improving the character and quality of an area or the way it functions should not be accepted. 'The Planning System: General Principles', the companion document to PPS1, advises of the importance of amenity as an issue.

4.9 PPS3 supports PPS1 with regards high quality new housing and encourages sustainable and environmentally friendly new housing development. It states that

careful attention to design is particularly important where the chosen local strategy involves intensification of the existing urban fabric. More intensive development is not always appropriate. However, it also states that the density of an existing development should not dictate that of new housing by stifling change or requiring replication of existing styles and form. When well designed and built in the right location, new housing development can enhance the character and quality of an area.

4.10 Policy HE7 of PPS5 'Planning for the Historic Environment' states that in considering the impact of a proposal on any heritage asset, local planning authorities should take into account the particular nature of the significance of the heritage asset and the value that it holds for this and future generations. In addition Local planning authorities should take into account the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the historic environment. The consideration of design should include scale, height, massing, alignment, materials and use.

4.11 The relevant development plan is The City of York Council Draft Deposit Local Plan, which was placed on Deposit in 1998. Reflecting points made, two later sets of pre inquiry changes (PICs) were published in 1999. The Public Local Inquiry started in 1999 but was suspended by the Inspector for further work to be done on the Green Belt. A Third Set of Changes addressing this further work was placed on deposit in 2003. Subsequently a fourth set of changes have been drafted and approved by Full Council on 12th April 2005 for the purpose of making Development Control Decisions, on the advice of the GOYH.

4.12 Policy GP1 'Design' includes the expectation that development proposals will, inter alia; respect or enhance the local environment; be of a density, layout, scale, mass and design that is compatible with neighbouring buildings and spaces, ensure residents living nearby are not unduly affected by noise, disturbance, overlooking, overshadowing or dominated by overbearing structures, use materials appropriate to the area; avoid the loss of open spaces or other features that contribute to the landscape; incorporate appropriate landscaping and retain, enhance or create urban spaces, public views, skyline, landmarks and other features that make a significant contribution to the character of the area.

4.13 Policy C1 'Community Facilities' states that a planning applications for social, health, community and religious facilities will be granted permission providing that the proposed development is of a scale and design appropriate to the character and appearance of the locality and it would meet a recognised need.

4.14 Policy HE2 'Development in Historic Locations' states that within or adjoining conservation areas, and in locations which affect the setting of listed buildings, scheduled monuments or nationally important archaeological remains (whether scheduled or not), development proposals must respect adjacent buildings, open

spaces, landmarks and settings and have regard to local scale, proportion, detail and materials. Proposals will be required to maintain or enhance exiting urban spaces, views, landmarks, and other townscape elements which contribute to the character or appearance of the area.

4.15 Supplementary Planning Guidance – Poppleton Village Design Statement (2003) sets design guidelines for development within the Poppleton Settlement. The guidelines pertinent to this application include: the importance and relevance of the Conservation Areas should be maintained and development should reflect and respect existing character in size, scale, materials, layout and landscape (8); scale, design and materials etc must all be considered and be sympatric (10); the existing character and traditions must be appreciated when contemplating new development (11); to conserve the special character of the traditional communities, the size, scale, and massing of new buildings and extensions should harmonise within neighbouring properties and space (12); new development should be mixed, with a variety of design type, size, scale, and materials to uphold the present juxtaposition of differing periods of development within the village (13); contemporary design should complement and be in sympathy with existing building character (14); adequate parking spaces should be provided within the cartilage of the property to avoid on-street parking (16); space should be maintained around dwellings to avoid the loss of soft landscaping (17); large areas of unbroken roof elevations should be avoided (23).

## IMPACT ON THE BUILDING AND THE CONSERVATION AREA

4.16 Lime Tree House is a detached two storey villa that has been the subject of significant alteration and extension in the twentieth century. A two storey side extension has been added to the original house together with a single storey rear offshoot extending some 37.5 metres from the original rear elevation of Lime Tree House. It is proposed to raise the height of the roof of the rear extension to provide seven additional en-suite bedrooms, a staff room and laundrette at first floor level. The height would be increased by 1.5 metres to 6.5 metres and the existing hipped end would be replaced by a gable. The north and south roof planes to the rear extension will be punctuated by a series of rooflights serving the bedrooms and access corridor. The existing single storey rear offshoot is partially visible from Main Street and the village green to the west, and from Lime Garth and Chantry Gap. The existing extension appears out of proportion with the original building and the increase in the height of the roof is considered to compound the effect and would appear at odds with the density and pattern of development of the surrounding streets, in addition by virtue of the scale would lack any subservience to the main building. The increased scale, height and mass of the rear extension will appear visually intrusive and overwhelm the scale and character of the original building.

4.17 The proposals include single storey side and rear extensions to the ground floor lounge to Lime Tree House. The proposed side extension would be to the side

of an existing two storey extension. The proposed single storey side extension appears subsidiary to the existing two storey building. However, the mass of the extension would infill the existing gap between Lime Tree House and Rosethorn Cottage. The gaps between the dwellings are considered to be important as they maintain and contribute to the feeling of spaciousness and the character of the conservation area. The proposed side extension will alter the degree of separation between Lime Tree House and Rosethorn Cottage and have a negative visual impact on the existing pattern of the built form that encloses the village green to the west.

4.18 The proposed extensions to provide en suite facilities to some of the ground floor rooms are considered to be of a modest scale, and when viewed on their own are not considered to result in visual harm.

4.19 The increase in the mass and bulk of the frontage together with the increased bulk and mass of the rear off shoot is not considered to be in keeping with the scale of development of the area or the existing properties that surround this part of the village green. The number of different roof pitches appears cluttered, awkward, and lacks visual cohesiveness, and can be viewed from the public realm. The proposed extensions would by virtue of the increased mass be unduly prominent within this context and have a negative visual impact on the existing character and appearance of the conservation area.

## IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURING PROPERTY

4.20 The proposed side extension is not considered to result in harm to the residential amenity of the occupants of the neighbouring dwellings. Rosethorn Cottage has two windows in the side elevation both to secondary rooms (bathroom and shower room) as such the proposed side extension is not considered to result in an undue loss of light to these rooms.

4.21 The increase in height of the rear extension would increase the presence of the extension to the occupants of the surrounding dwellings. The increase in height together with the resulting increase mass of the roof would result in a prominent addition that would cause a sense of enclosure to the occupants of Rosethorn Cottage, 1 Chantry Gap, 3 Chantry Gap, Toft Green (formally Rose Cottage), and 12 Lime Garth, and the potential dwelling that has recently gained planning permission (11/01996/FUL).

4.22 The rooflights in the southern elevation are to bedrooms and the rooflights in the north elevation are to a corridor. The corridor rooflights are not considered to result in a loss of privacy to the dwellings to the north, in addition the plans indicate that these windows would be obscurely glazed. As the application site is a care home it is considered that the occupants would spend more time in the bedrooms as this would be their only private space. The distance from the proposed rooflights to

the southern boundary varies between 8 to 9 metres together with the height of the windows would allow views into the gardens of Rosethorn Cottage and to a lesser extent 1 to 3 Chantry Gap (by virtue of a tall evergreen hedge). The distance between the rear elevation of 1 and 3 Chantry Gap is 13.5 metres, whilst there is a hedge marking this boundary which would provide an element of screening, much of the hedging is deciduous and as such the proximity and siting of the proposed rooflights is considered to result in a loss of privacy to these street dwellings.

4.23 The proposed alterations to the rear extension include the increase in height but also the alteration of the hipped roof to a gable roof, facing the side elevation of 11 Lime Garth. 11 Lime Garth has 2 secondary living room windows facing the proposed extension; however the main and larger windows to the living room are in the front and rear elevations. The proposed increase in bulk and height so close to the boundary is not considered to result in an undue loss of light to the living room by virtue of the other windows. The proposed rear extension would be more visible from the rear garden however it is not considered to result in a harmful sense of enclosure or cause a significant loss of light to the residential amenity of the occupants.

4.24 It is considered that the increase in height of the rear extension would cause a further loss of light and overshadowing to Toft Green, 12 Lime Garth and the permitted new dwelling at 12a Lime Garth to the north.

## IMPACT ON HIGHWAY SAFETY

4.25 No comments have been from Highways Network Management at the time of writing the report; Members will be updated at the committee meeting.

## FIRE SAFETY

4.26 Concerns have been raised that the proposed development does not fulfil fire safety regulations. These regulations are dealt with by Building Control and are not a planning consideration.

## 5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 For the above reasons the proposed extensions by virtue of the resulting mass and bulk would appear prominent, cramped, cluttered, and out of proportion with the original building and the scale of surrounding development. In addition by virtue of the increase in size and the siting of the windows would result in harm to the residential amenity of the occupants of the surrounding dwellings. Refusal is recommended.

## COMMITTEE TO VISIT



## **6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Refuse**

1 The proposed extensions by virtue of their design, mass, and their excessive scale, would result in a cumulative impact that would be unduly prominent and create a cluttered appearance that would be harmful to the visual amenity of the host building, the street scene, and the character and appearance of the conservation area. It is considered that this would result in a development that would appear cramped, dominant, and out of character and scale with the local form of development and the conservation area. The proposal fails to make positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the local environment. For these reasons the proposed development is considered to be contrary to Policies GP1, HE2, HE3, and C1 of the City of York Council Development Control Local Plan (2005); design guidelines 8, 10, 11, 12, and 14 set out in the supplementary planning guidance - Poppleton Village Design Guidance (2003); and national policy contained Planning Policy Statement 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' and Planning Policy Statement 5 'Planning for the Historic Environment'.

2 The proposed extensions by virtue of their size, height and proximity to adjacent dwellings would have an overbearing and over dominant impact on the occupiers and result in a loss of outlook and unacceptable sense of enclosure that would harm the residential amenity of the occupants of 12 Lime Garth, Toft Garth, Rosethorn Cottage, 1 Chantry Gap and 3 Chantry Gap. In addition the first floor rooflights in the southern roof slope windows of the proposed extensions would result in overlooking and a subsequent loss of privacy to Rosethorn Cottage, 1 and 3 Chantry Gap. The proposed increase in height and mass of the rear extension would result in a loss of light to Toft Green (formally Rose Cottage) and 12 Lime Garth. For these reasons the development is therefore considered contrary to Policies GP1 and C1 of the City of York Council Development Control Local Plan (2005); design guidelines 10 and 12 set out in the supplementary planning guidance - Poppleton Village Design Guidance (2003); and national planning guidance in Planning Policy Statement 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development'.

## **7.0 INFORMATIVES:**

### **Contact details:**

**Author:** Victoria Bell Development Management Officer

**Tel No:** 01904 551347