

COMMITTEE UPDATE

Date: 5 November 2015 **Ward:** Micklegate
Team: Major and Commercial Team **Parish:** Micklegate Planning Panel

Reference: 15/01202/FUL
Application at: Trentholme Cottage 2A Trentholme Drive York YO24 1EN
For: Erection of 1no. three storey dwelling with storage building to rear following demolition of existing dwelling
By: Mr And Mrs M Nicholas
Application Type: Full Application
Target Date: 6 November 2015
Recommendation: Approve

1. Conservation Area

Road

The Tadcaster Conservation Area was designated in 1975. The area excludes the application site. It extends north from the site to include the semi-detached properties opposite the site and a further semi-detached pair fronting Mount Vale.

2. Additional responses from local residents

To clarify, the following responses have been received:

- Original submission: 17 objection responses and 1 letter of support from local residents, and 1 letter of objection from an interested party.
- Revised proposal: (i) 4 letters of objection and 1 letter of support from local residents at the time the officer's report was written; (ii) 15 objection responses and comments from 10 neighbouring properties received since the report was finalised.

An email has been received from Councillor Hayes asking that Members be made aware of the views of the 17 residents on Trentholme Drive who have objected to the scheme.

The further 15 responses reiterate previous concerns about the design of the building, its impact on the local environment and amenity as well as public safety during construction. Two of these responses (R and C Lee and D and S Finch) have been circulated in full to Members of the Committee. New comments are as follows:

- The 2m set back does not address concerns about the impact of an incompatible design on the street scene and set back of second floor results in front terrace that is open to abuse and a door facing down the street towards bedroom window;

- Impact at rear of no.145 is worsened by 2m setback, resulting in loss of light and overshadowing, loss of solar gain to this property from morning and afternoon sun and loss of highly sought after views of Little Knavesmire and Knavesmire;
- Retention of second floor terrace would invade privacy even with the glass screen, which does not extend along full length, and the potential for noise disturbance and misuse by other users (race goers or stag dos);
- Air source heat pump should be re-sited to minimise noise disturbance to neighbours;
- Damage to tree would be during construction not from widening of access itself;
- Working hours on site condition does not alleviate safety issues during construction;
- Request for current house, known locally as the Gamekeeper's Cottage and which served the Trentholme House estate, to be nominated as a non-designated heritage asset (separate request to include the building on the Local Heritage List);
- Assessment of heritage assets has not been undertaken in a proper manner as no heritage assessment submitted and disagrees with officer's comments in paragraphs 4.6-4.14;
- Disagrees with officer's report in respect of design, paragraphs 4.15-4.21, and the conclusion that the development would not harm character and appearance of the street;
- Question at site visit about what can be seen from the flat roof area was not answered;
- Concerns about planning process and officer recommendation being made to approve prior to all representations being received.

The potential impact on no. 145 is referred to in section 4.26 of the officer's report, including reference to the impact on amenity from the setback of the building within the plot and the proposed screen to the upper floor terrace. Conditions are suggested in respect of the front terrace and noise from the air source heat pump.

The Conservation Architect did make comments to the original submission as stated in the report. Further discussion has taken place with this officer prior to and since submission of the revised scheme, which has confirmed that she does not consider that there are conservation grounds to refuse the application.

There is, at present, no adopted Local Heritage List that has any official status. The Conservation Architect has confirmed verbally that, in her view, it would be unlikely that the circa 1958 dwelling would warrant inclusion on the list.

Whilst the additional objections of residents are noted, they do not alter the officer's recommendation.

3. Response from CYC Landscape Architect

Further to paragraph 4.30, the Council's Landscape Architect has requested that the widening of the vehicle access be omitted from the scheme to avoid risk of damage to the Cherry tree. She requests a condition to protect the tree and verge during construction.

No development shall take place until there has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority details of protective fencing that shall be erected around the entire grass verge in front of the application site for the duration of the demolition and construction operations. The fencing shall be robust and securely fixed into the ground such that it can not be readily moved, all in accordance with BS 5837 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction'. Reason: To protect the Cherry tree, grass, and ground conditions.

4. Additional plans

Two additional drawings have been submitted to support application.

- Shadow analysis (Drawing no. 1197_SK50_02_P1), which confirms that any overshadowing to rear elevation of 145 would be restricted to that of the extension and to early morning with any shadow virtually gone from the rear of 145 by 10am.
- Overlooking analysis (Drawing no. 1197_SK20_03_P1), which aims to demonstrate the effectiveness of the side screen to the rear terrace in terms of providing mutual privacy.

5. Late revision

Further to the site visit and comment from the Landscape Architect, late revisions have been made to the scheme as shown on drawing numbers:

- **1197_AR50_01_F** - Proposals
- **1197_AR20_01_C** - Roof Plan

These show the omission of the widening to the vehicle crossing from the scheme and the enclosure of the rear balcony with a glazed structure set back from the rear wall of the building and enclosed along its side with no.145 by a solid panel.

The late revisions respond to concerns raised and officers consider that they are not material in the context of the scheme. However, Members should be aware that residents have not had sight of the revised drawings before the meeting.

Author: Hannah Blackburn

