

COMMITTEE REPORT

Date: 3 December 2015 **Ward:** Fulford and Heslington
Team: Householder and **Parish:** Fulford Parish Council
Small Scale Team

Reference: 15/01689/FUL
Application at: The Coach House Fulford Park York YO10 4QE
For: Single storey rear extension and rooflights to side of The Coach House
By: Mrs Sarah Urmston
Application Type: Full Application
Target Date: 22 October 2015
Recommendation: Refuse

1.0 PROPOSAL

1.1 The application seeks permission for a single storey rear extension and roof lights to the east/side roof plane of The Coach House.

1.2 The application site is the former coach house and stables to Fulford Park House located in Fulford Village Conservation Area. The Coach House dates from the later nineteenth century, is in the French Gothic style and is considered as a 'building of positive value' in the Fulford Village Conservation Area Character Appraisal, 2008. The Coach House is located within the spacious mature landscape setting of Fulford Park House and within the context of a development of detached dwelling houses dating from the 1970's.

1.3 The application was called in for determination by committee by Councillor David Carr on 16 October 2015 as the application raises important planning issues relating inter alia to modern idiom design and period buildings, the conservation area, and permitted development rights.

2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Development Plan Allocation: Conservation Area: Fulford

2.2 Policies:

CYGP1 Design
CYH7 Residential extensions
CYHE3 Conservation Areas

3.0 CONSULTATIONS

INTERNAL

Design, Conservation and Sustainable Development

Ecology and Countryside

3.1 The bat survey of July 2015 recorded no evidence of bats roosting in the eastern wing of the Coach House which was considered to offer low potential. However, it is believed that a maternity roost exists in the western wing of the Coach House. This part of the building is separate from the eastern wing and will not be impacted by the works. The Officer concludes that the proposed single storey extension will not impact upon bats.

3.2 A precautionary approach to the roof works is recommended by undertaking a pre-works dawn survey. This would be a suitable approach if the works are undertaken between April and October. Ideally works to the roof should be undertaken in early spring or autumn to avoid the periods when bats are most vulnerable. No evidence of nesting birds was recorded during the visual assessment. An informative is recommended due to the building having low potential to support roosting bats

EXTERNAL

Fulford Parish Council

3.3 No objections to original proposals. Any comments on the revised proposals will be reported at Committee.

Neighbour Notification and Publicity

3.3 No responses received.

4.0 APPRAISAL

4.1 Key Issues

- Design
- Impact on neighbour's amenity
- Impact on the character and appearance of conservation area
- Impact on the non-designated heritage asset

4.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (March 2012) sets out 12 core planning principles that should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. A principle set out in paragraph 17 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 The NPPF, Chapter 7, paragraph 56 advises that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to make places better for people.

4.4 The NPPF, Chapter 12, Paragraph 131 states that development proposals should sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets and make a positive contribution to the conservation of heritage assets. New development should make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

4.5 The NPPF, Chapter 12, Paragraph 132 states that considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed by or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting.

4.6 The NPPF, Chapter 12, Paragraph 134 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

4.7 The NPPF, Chapter 12, Paragraph 135 states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

4.8 The NPPF, Paragraph 187 states that Local Planning Authorities should look for solutions rather than problems and decision takers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible. In considering proposals for new or improved residential accommodation, the benefits from meeting peoples housing needs and promoting the economy will be balanced against any negative impacts on the environment and neighbours' living conditions.

4.9 When a planning application relates to a property located in a conservation area, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 applies and imposes a duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area.

4.10 The York Development Control draft Local Plan was approved for development control purposes in April 2005. Its policies are material considerations in the determination of planning applications although it is considered that their weight is limited except when they are in accordance with the NPPF.

4.11 Development Control Local Plan Policy GP1 refers to design, for all types of development. Of particular relevance here are the criteria referring to good design and general neighbour amenity.

4.12 Development Control Local Plan Policy HE3 states that within Conservation Areas, proposals for external alterations will only be permitted where there is no adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area

4.13 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.

4.14 The Council has a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for House Extensions and Alterations and was approved on 4 December 2012. The SPD offers overarching general advice relating to such issues as privacy and general amenity as well as advice which is specific to the design and size of particular types of extensions or alterations. With regard to single storey rear extensions, paragraph 13.2 states that in assessing extensions beyond 3 and 4 metres in length, the council will have regard to the impact on sunlight, the relationship to windows and the height of the structure.

ASSESSMENT

4.15 The application seeks permission for a single storey rear extension and the installation of roof lights to the east wing of The Coach House. The proposals have been the subject of discussion with the agent and applicant. A permitted development alternative for the proposed extension was discussed with the agent.

ROOF LIGHTS TO THE COACH HOUSE

4.16 A total of four roof lights are proposed to the east wing of The Coach House; one roof light to the front roof plane; two roof lights to the side/east roof plane and one roof light to the side/west roof plane. The roof lights would be of a conservation style, fitted flush with the outer plane of the roof slope, clear glazed and opening.

4.17 With regard to design, in the revised drawings, the roof lights do not have vertical bars present and as a consequence the roof lights to the east/side roof plane have a strong horizontal emphasis. It is considered that in principle, the scale and location of the proposed roof lights would not harm the architectural character of The Coach House or the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area. In design terms, the installation of vertical glazing bars would enhance the appearance of the roof lights. It is considered that the roof lights would not give rise to any unreasonable loss of amenity to adjoining residents as a result of overlooking or loss of privacy due to the distance to neighbouring dwelling houses relative to the location of the roof lights.

SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION

4.18 It is proposed to erect a single storey rear extension to the east wing of The Coach House. The proposed single storey extension has a flat roof and is connected to The Coach House by a glazed link so that it would read as a separate element to the host building.

4.19 In revised proposals, the proposed rear extension would be approx 5.0 metres in length, including the glazed link, and approx 4.3 metres in width. The total height of the extension would be approx 2.5 metres. The flat roof of the extension and glazed link would be below the eaves height of the host building and would appear subservient. The glazed link would be stepped in from the east elevation of The Coach House, as would the east elevation of the proposed extension. The exterior of the extension would be finished in brick to match that of the host building and the windows and doors would be framed in timber with a natural finish.

4.20 The contemporary design of the extension would contrast with the distinctive architectural character of the host building that is in the French Gothic style with steeply pitched roofs present. It is considered that the design of the flat roof extension is not sympathetic or appropriate to the architectural character of the host building and would detract from the immediate setting of The Coach House. In revised proposals, the east elevation of the extension has been punctuated by a single vertical emphasis window and the south elevation by two vertical emphasis window openings. The limited fenestration to the side/east and rear/south elevations would maintain privacy within the extension. It is considered that the design of the elevations, that would be open to public view from Fulford Park, would appear somewhat bland and of limited visual interest in contrast to the distinctive architectural character of the host building.

4.21 The Coach House is considered as a 'building of positive value' in the Fulford Village Conservation Area Character Appraisal and is a non-designated heritage asset. The Coach House makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area. The proposed extension would

step forward of the existing south elevation of The Coach House and the mass of the extension would interrupt public views to the south elevation of The Coach House from Fulford Park. Although there is a hedge and shrubs present at the southern boundary of the garden ground, it is considered that the mass of the extension would appear visually intrusive and would not appear harmonious with the architectural character and composition of The Coach House.

4.22 In the Conservation Area Appraisal it is considered that the Fulford Park development is spaciouly planned, using house designs that suit the context, and that the landscaping is approaching maturity. In the proposed location, it is considered that the rear extension would detract from the spacious open character of the surrounding housing development situated in the former parkland associated with Fulford Park House.

4.23 Due to the distance between the extension and neighbouring dwelling houses, there would be no impact of neighbour amenity in terms of loss of light or over dominance.

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 With regard to the design, mass and location of the proposed extension, it is considered that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of this part of Fulford Conservation Area. The form and mass of the extension would appear visually intrusive in the streetscene and in public views to The Coach House from Fulford Park. The extension would detract from the spacious open character of this part of the conservation area. The design of the extension would not be in keeping with the architectural character and form of the host building that is considered a 'building of positive merit' or non-designated heritage asset. The design of the extension is not considered sympathetic or appropriate to the host building, would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset and there are no public benefits associated with the proposal that would outweigh the level of harm.

5.2 As such, the proposal does not comply with Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the NPPF and Policies GP1 (Design), HE3 (Conservation Areas) and H7 (Residential Extensions) of the Development Control Local Plan.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

1. The Coach House is situated in Fulford Village Conservation Area. The Coach House appears prominent in public views in Fulford Park from the south and south east. The design of the flat roof extension is not in keeping with the distinctive architectural character of the host building that is considered a 'building of positive

value' in the Fulford Village Conservation Area Appraisal, 2008. It is considered that the proposed extension would detract from the immediate setting of The Coach House and have a negative impact on the spacious open character of this part of the conservation area. The proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the existing character and appearance of the conservation area. There are no public benefits identified that would outweigh this harm. The design of the extension fails to comply with Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, guidance for heritage assets contained within the National Planning Policy Framework, (paragraphs 56, 132 and 134) and Policy HE3 (Conservation Areas) of the City of York Development Control Local Plan.

2. The design of the proposed single storey rear extension is not in keeping with the distinctive architectural character and appearance of The Coach House. The flat roof design of the extension is not considered sympathetic or appropriate to the host building. The design and mass of the extension would appear visually intrusive in public views to the south elevation of The Coach House from Fulford Park and would detract from the immediate setting of this 'building of positive value' in Fulford Village Conservation Area. Therefore, the proposal fails to comply with guidance relating to design and non-designated heritage assets contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraphs 56 and 135), Policies GP1 (Design) and H7 (Residential Extensions) of the City of York Development Control Local Plan.

7.0 INFORMATIVES: Notes to Applicant

1. STATEMENT OF THE COUNCIL`S POSITIVE AND PROACTIVE APPROACH

In considering the application, the Local Planning Authority has implemented the requirements set out within the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) in seeking solutions to problems identified during the processing of the application. The Local Planning Authority took the following steps in an attempt to achieve a positive outcome:

- Discussions with the agent and applicant with regard to the negative impact of the proposed extension on the architectural character of The Coach House, its setting and the spacious open character of this part of the conservation area. Revised proposals were submitted that did not address the concerns raised. The agent was advised that the application would be refused planning consent. A permitted development alternative for the rear extension of a reduced length was discussed with the agent. The extension was withdrawn from the proposals to form the subject of a householder enquiry. The roof lights to the side of The Coach House were included in the planning application. The application was called in for consideration by the Area Planning Committee and the agent then advised that the rear extension would be included in the proposals.

Notwithstanding the above, it was not possible to achieve a positive outcome, resulting in the proposals being recommended for refusal.

Contact details:

Author: Sandra Duffill Development Management Assistant

Tel No: 01904 551672