

COMMITTEE REPORT

Date: 12 April 2012 **Ward:** Strensall
Team: Householder and **Parish:** Earswick Parish Council
 Small Scale Team

Reference: 12/00733/FUL
Application at: 12 Whitelands Earswick York YO32 9FX
For: Two storey rear and single storey front and rear extensions
 (resubmission)
By: Mr Chowdhury
Application Type: Full Application
Target Date: 10 April 2012
Recommendation: Householder Approval

1.0 PROPOSAL

THE SITE:

1.1 The application site is a detached two storey dwelling set within a generously sized plot incorporating a detached double detached garage located to the side of the dwelling. The property is designed with a forward gable projection set down from the main ridge. There is a later two storey side extension along with a pitched roof porch in the centre of the principal elevation and a single storey rear extension all approved on 23.06.2005. The dwelling is well spaced from adjacent residential dwellings located in an area of similar property styles centred around a cul-de-sac comprising open plan front garden areas. The rear elevation is marked by a 1.8 metre high timber fence.

THE PROPOSAL:

1.2 Planning permission is sought to erect a two storey extension on the rear elevation incorporating a mono- pitched roof forming a gable continuing the existing fenestration incorporating materials that would match the existing dwelling. The extension at first floor level would project a distance of approximately 3.0 metres in to the rear garden and a total of 6.0 metres at single storey height. The additional windows at ground and first floor would replicate the existing window design providing views on to the rear garden. In addition the application includes an extension to raise the ridge height of a previously approved side extension and redevelopment and extension to the original porch on the principal elevation.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION:

1.3 The application includes a letter from the applicant explaining the reasons behind the extension. The applicant has confirmed that the extensions would provide additional living areas for the purpose of accommodating the applicant's elderly parent.

PROPERTY HISTORY:

1.4 One and two storey pitched roof side extensions (ref: 05/00987/FUL) approved 23.06.2005

1.5 This application has been brought before East Area Planning Sub-Committee by Councillor Doughty on the following issues of overdevelopment.

2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Development Plan Allocation:

City Boundary GMS Constraints: York City Boundary 0001

DC Area Teams GMS Constraints: East Area (2) 0005

2.2 Policies:

CYGP1 Design

CYH7 Residential extensions

3.0 CONSULTATIONS

Internal

3.1 None

External

3.2. Earswick Parish Council - Objections on the following issues:

- Size and scale
- Parking
- Overdevelopment

3.3 Neighbour consultation letters objections received from 9, 11 and 13 Whitelands on the following issues:

Application Reference Number: 12/00733/FUL

Item No: 5f

- Overdevelopment/ size and scale/ detrimental to the surrounding area.
- Detrimental to the surrounding area.
- Loss of space between the dwellings.
- Parking
- Inaccurate plans
- Possible change of use

4.0 APPRAISAL

4.1 KEY ISSUES

- Effect upon neighbours
- Effect upon surrounding area.

4.2 National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government's overarching planning policies. It sets out the importance of good design in making places better for people and emphasises that development that is inappropriate in context or fails to take the opportunities available for improving an area should not be accepted.

4.3 Development Control Local Plan Policy CYGP1 states that development proposals will be expected, amongst other things, to respect or enhance the local environment, be of a density, layout, scale, mass and design that is compatible with neighbouring buildings, and ensure that residents living nearby are not unduly affected by noise, disturbance, overlooking, overshadowing or dominated by overbearing structures.

4.4 Development Control Local Plan Policy CYH7 states that planning permission will be granted for residential extensions where: (a) the design and materials are sympathetic to the main dwelling and the locality of the development; and (b) the design and scale are appropriate in relation to the main building; (d) there is no adverse effect on the amenity which neighbouring residents could reasonably expect to enjoy.

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.

VISUAL APPEARANCE:

4.6 In terms of visual appearance the development of the principal elevation would be visually prominent within the street scene. However, the extension to the existing porch would break up the potential massing of the extended ridge height. As such it is not considered that there would demonstrable harm to the appearance or

residential character of the street. The extensions on the rear elevation would be visible when viewed from the rear gardens of the adjacent dwellings and oblique views between the spaces between the dwellings. Therefore it is not considered the appearance of the extension would have a detrimental impact on either the existing dwelling or the surrounding area which consists of mainly large well spaced dwellings set back from the public highway. Furthermore, the dwelling is situated in area of varied property styles, set back from the public domain, adequately separated from the adjacent neighbouring properties.

NEIGHBOUR AMENITY:

4.7 In terms of residential impact the main issues would be the detached dwellings on the rear elevation at 9, 11 and 13 Whitelands. These neighbours have made representations to the application on the following issues:

- Overdevelopment/ size and scale/ detrimental to the surrounding area.
- Detrimental to the surrounding area.
- Loss of space between the dwellings.
- Parking
- Inaccurate plans
- Possible change of use

4.8 The rear gardens of these adjacent dwellings have been inspected. Whilst it is accepted the extension would reduce the open appearance between the host property and the dwellings it is not considered that the proposal would appear overbearing or give rise to any unreasonable loss of amenity to adjoining residents as a result of unreasonable overshadowing or loss of light, due to the remaining distance to the shared boundary. The extension on the rear elevation would be an ample distance in the region of 6.0 metres on the ground floor elevation and 9 metres from the first floor from the shared boundary and an additional distance in the region of 33 metres from rear the rear windows screened by a close boarded wooden fence. New windows proposed on the rear elevation would serve en-suite facilities for the secondary bedroom and the proposed master bedroom. Therefore it would be unlikely that the extensions would result any significant overlooking and as such would be unlikely to create unacceptable loss of privacy. The proposed single storey extension would be screened by the close boarded wooden fence treatment thus would not be visible from within the public domain. Furthermore, the proposed development would leave an acceptable distance from the main living areas of the adjacent property, thus it is not considered that the site would appear overdeveloped or that the extensions would appear out of keeping in their spacious surroundings.

PARKING:

4.9 There is no specific evidence that the proposed development would result in parking problems. The applicant has stated that the proposal would allow his elderly parent to live at the property. Therefore there would be the potential for one extra car. It is considered that there is sufficient garage and off street parking available should this scenario arise.

INACCURATE DRAWINGS:

4.10 In terms of the submitted drawings, it is considered that sufficient information has been submitted for the application to be determined, and that the block plan/detailed floor plan clearly show the relationship of the proposed extensions in relation to the site boundary.

CHANGE OF USE:

4.11 There is no indication within the application that a change of use is proposed now or the future.

5.0 CONCLUSION

The design and materials are considered acceptable therefore the proposal is unlikely to detract from the character and appearance of the residential area. Nor is it considered that the revised proposal will appear overbearing or give rise to any unreasonable loss of amenity to adjoining residents. On this basis approval is recommended.

COMMITTEE TO VISIT

6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Householder Approval

- 1 TIME2 Development start within three years -
- 2 PLANS1 Approved plans - Drg No 11.53 2, 3 and 4
- 3 VISQ1 Matching materials -

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 amenity and living conditions of adjacent occupiers and the impact on the street scene. As such the proposal complies with Policies GP1 and H7 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan and the 'Guide to extensions and alterations to private dwelling houses' Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Contact details:

Author: Sharon Jackson Development Management Assistant

Tel No: 01904 551359